

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11139) granting a pension to Maria Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 11140) granting a pension to James M. Polsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 11141) granting an increase of pension to Moses E. Sturtevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 11142) granting an increase of pension to Wayne F. Wieder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11143) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11144) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11145) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Gaskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11146) granting an increase of pension to William J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARLAND: A bill (H. R. 11147) granting a pension to Dora H. Swartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 11148) granting an increase of pension to James W. Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11149) granting a pension to Louis H. Kraft; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 11150) granting a pension to Thomas Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11151) granting a pension to Hazel Beck Connor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11152) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 11153) granting a pension to Margaret A. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11154) granting a pension to John Lauffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 11155) granting a pension to Mary J. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 11156) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Keltner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11157) granting an increase of pension to Amara J. Bachelder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDOW: A bill (H. R. 11158) granting an increase of pension to James B. Paige; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11159) granting an increase of pension to John Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11160) granting an increase of pension to Ira Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 11161) granting a pension to John Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11162) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Custer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11163) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Bayless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the Elm Grove Farm Club, of Saline County, Mo., urging that the price of corn be restored and equitable arrangements be made concerning meat prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request): Petition of citizens of Indiana, asking for the establishment of a national conservatory of music and art; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request): Memorial of the editors of north Mississippi and west Tennessee, urging the passage of Representative Froom's bill relative to abridging the right of aliens to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, etc.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of the National Marine League of the United States of America; American Game Protective and Propagation Association, both of New York; and Morgan County Federation of Farm Women's Clubs, of Fort

Morgan, Colo., against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of J. H. Shaw and 53 other voters of Warren County, Ill., for the passage of proper legislation prohibiting the use of all food products in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Mrs. F. S. Tiekell, Oscar C. Beebe, Hilda Hole, and 29 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Placerville Shakespeare Club, of Placerville, Cal., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mabel Scott Curs, of Meeker, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of Erie County (Ohio) Medical Society, favoring House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Grinnell, Iowa, demanding the extermination of the German spy system; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the State Board of Education of Pennsylvania, asking aid for the public schools during the war; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, asking for the establishment of a free port at Philadelphia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring the Overman bill, providing for central control and responsibility for procuring war material and supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

Monday, April 1, 1918.

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

Almighty God, we come before Thee as the representatives of a Christian Nation out of the hope and glory of the season in which we have commemorated the power of the Christ over death and the grave, and the resurrection of the power and glory above all men and nations. In His name we come asking Thy guidance and blessing, that the spirit of this glorious season may abide with us; that we may know the power of His resurrection; that we may gain inspiration and hope as we face the great tragedy of the ages. May we go forward under His inspiring leadership and gain victory for truth and righteousness in the world. Hear us and fit us for the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. SAULSBURY and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a communication from the governor of Texas, transmitting a certified copy of a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Texas ratifying the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution, which will be read and placed on the files.

The communication was read, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AUSTIN, TEX.

House joint resolution 1.

Ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America at its second session, which amendment provides, in substance, that one year after the ratification of the amendment the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is prohibited; that Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation; and providing further that this article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution within seven years from the date of submission to the States by Congress.

PREAMBLE.

And whereas both Houses of the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America, at its second session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, in substance, to wit:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein): That the following amendment to the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States, as provided by the Constitution:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
THOS. R. MARSHALL,
Vice President of the United States
and *President of the Senate.*

I certify that this joint resolution originated in the Senate.

JAMES M. BAKER, *Secretary.*

Now therefore be it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Texas:

SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States adopted by the Sixty-fifth Congress of the United States of America at its second session and reading, in substance, as follows:—

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress—

be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of Texas.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the President of the United States, Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

F. O. FULLER,
Speaker of the House.
E. A. DECHERD, Jr.,
President of the Senate.

I certify that house joint resolution 1 was adopted by the house on March 1, 1918, and house concurred in senate amendments on March 4, 1918.

BOB BARKER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I certify that house joint resolution 1 was adopted by the Senate with amendments on March 2, 1918, by the following vote: Fourteen yeas, six nays, four pairs.

RALPH SOAPE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Received in the executive office this 5th day of March, A. D. 1918, at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a. m.

JOHN D. MCCALL,
Secretary to the Governor.

Received in department of state this 12th day of March, A. D. 1918, at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m.

GEO. F. HOWARD,
Secretary State.
By C. L. ISHERWOOD,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, George F. Howard, secretary of state of the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution 1, passed at the fourth called session of the Thirty-fifth Legislature of Texas, with the indorsements thereon, as now appears of record in this department.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto signed my name officially and caused to be impressed hereon the seal of State at my office in the city of Austin this 13th day of March, A. D. 1918.

[SEAL.] GEO. F. HOWARD,
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2469) to authorize the change of the name of the steamship *Caldera* to *A. T. Kinney*.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3400) to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, and Mr. BUTLER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7795) to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food by authoriz-

ing 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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President.

H. R. 5351. An act providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32, in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington; and

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.

PRICE OF TOMATOES.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, on the 8th of March I introduced a resolution in the Senate empowering and directing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to inquire as to the authority and purpose of a certain bulletin issued by the Food Administration relating to the price of tomatoes in a large portion of the country. I then expressed the hope that in some way somehow the various departments of the Government and bureaus would become so coordinated that the production of food would not be interfered with by bulletins issued by the Food Administration.

I am very glad to say that the agitation of the question through the debate on the resolution, which was adopted by the Senate, seems to have produced a result which is quite satisfactory to the producers of this great foodstuff.

About a week or a little less than a week after the resolution was adopted I had from the Food Administrator a letter dated the 13th of March in which he expressed his lack of desire to fix and stated that he had no power to fix the price of this foodstuff. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD, so that the RECORD may be complete respecting this matter. I do not think it is worth while to take the time of the Senate to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1918.

HON. WILLARD SAULSBURY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The circular (Bulletin No. 8) issued by the Food Administration of February 28, 1918, did not and was not intended as fixing the price per ton at which producers in Delaware, Maryland, and other States mentioned must sell their tomatoes. It was, as appears on its face, a bulletin of information to canners that the Army and Navy, for the canned tomatoes needed by them, were ready to receive tenders from canners, if they desired to make the same, for canned tomatoes based on the prices stated per ton of tomatoes. No one was required to bid and no limitation was made on the price per ton which anyone might ask for his tomatoes, but simply that if the canners wished they might make an offer to the Army and Navy on the basis mentioned.

The Food Administration has not power and no desire to fix the price of tomatoes.

Faithfully, yours,

HERBERT HOOVER.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Fergus County Union of the American Society of Equity, held recently at Lewistown, Mont., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Adopted by Fergus County Union of American Society of Equity now in session at Lewistown, March 15, 1918.

Whereas the bill now in committee in the Congress to enable President Wilson to extend further control in the fixation of prices affecting the agricultural industry is a measure vital to the efficiency of the food-producing forces of the Nation; and

Whereas the almost limitless supplies of foodstuffs now in the hands of Germany and its allies will make food for the armies and the workers of our enemies abundant; and

Whereas this situation makes it an imperative patriotic necessity that food production in this Nation shall be speeded up to an unprecedented maximum for this and succeeding years so long as the war shall last; and

Whereas the farm men and women of the Nation are willing and eager to make such effort in this direction as is bounded only by the limitations of human endurance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in their names we demand of Congress the immediate passage of the President's price-control measure, to the end that the treasonous profiteering that is now grinding down the morale of the farmers and strangling their patriotic impulses and purposes shall cease during the war and permanently thereafter; and be it further

Resolved, That we tender to President Wilson the assurance of our loyalty without stint and measurelessly in every effort he may put forth to make this continent safe for and give the fullest enjoyment of democracy in finance, in transportation, in agriculture, production, and in the production of all things needful in the grim business of war and in the nobler acts of peace when and so soon as peace again shall be given our beloved country.

J. F. ARNOLD, *President*.
L. O. BATTEY, *Secretary*.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cornwall, Meriden, Fairfield, and Hartford, and of Local Branch No. 86, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by the St. Paul Association, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the enactment of legislation providing for the taking of receipts for registered mail, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of Slate Workers Union No. 15178, of South Poughkeepsie, N. Y., praying for a second trial for Thomas Mooney, of San Francisco, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Balfour, of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Voltaire, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Williston, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Drain, Oreg., and a petition of Callamette Grange, No. 543, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lime County, Oreg., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a memorial of the Phoenix Furniture Co., of Charleston, S. C., remonstrating against Government ownership of furniture factories, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of sundry rural letter carriers of Orangeburg, S. C., praying for an increase in the salary of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Gratiot-Isabella-Clare County Medical Society, of Riverdale, Mich., praying for an advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dundee, Mich., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry employees of the post office at Berlin, N. H., praying for an increase in the salary of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PENROSE presented resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Bourse, of Pennsylvania, favoring the repeal of the act of March 1, 1913, authorizing the valuation of the physical property of carriers, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3570) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 347) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3434) prohibiting the issuance of patent under lieu selection 2904, serial 1034, Olympia, Wash., reported it adversely and submitted an adverse report (No. 344) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 954. A bill to amend an act approved June 22, 1910, entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands" (Rept. No. 345); and

S. 2460. A bill authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club (Rept. No. 346).

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 8496. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 348); and

H. R. 9160. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain

widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 349).

WHITE RIVER BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10365) granting the consent of Congress to the Forsyth special road district of Taney County, Mo., to construct a bridge across White River, at Forsyth, Mo., and I submit a report (No. 343) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

BIG SANDY RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4127) to authorize the W. M. Ritter Lumber Co., a corporation, to construct bridges across the branches and tributaries of the Big Sandy River and their tributaries, in the counties of Buchanan and Dickenson, in the State of Virginia, and I submit a report (No. 342) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

CLARK FORK RIVER BRIDGE, IDAHO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4102) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across the Clarksfork River in Bonner County, Idaho, and I submit a report (No. 341) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "Clarksfork" and insert "Clark Fork," and in line 8 to strike out "Clarksfork" and insert "Clark Fork."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across the Clark Fork River in Bonner County, Idaho."

SOUTHERN STATES LUMBER CO.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1738) for the relief of the Southern States Lumber Co., and I submit a report (No. 340) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. A similar bill has passed the Senate before, but it did not get through the House because of the lateness of the session. It has been reported favorably twice by the committee and has passed the Senate once. I ask, therefore, for the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. May we have the bill read before it is acted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the Southern States Lumber Co., a corporation, Pensacola, Fla., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$603.79.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for 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. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4221) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root National Forest, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4222) for additional buildings, equipment, and repair facilities, San Antonio Arsenal, San Antonio, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 4223) making appropriations for rebuilding keeper's dwelling, oil house, wharf, etc., at Aransas Pass Light Station, Tex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4224) to punish disloyalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 4225) for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co.; Babcock & Willcox; Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co.; and the C. H. Klein Brick Co., each of which companies furnished to Silas N. Opdahl, a failing Government contractor, certain building materials which were used in the construction of Burke Hall, at the Pierre Indian School, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4226) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dixon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4227) granting an increase of pension to Pulver Kline (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Richards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4229) to provide for admissions to the St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4230) granting a pension to Maggie S. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4231) to amend the shipping act, approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States, with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4232) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 4233) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel M. Betz;

A bill (S. 4234) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Adams;

A bill (S. 4235) granting an increase of pension to James T. Alford;

A bill (S. 4236) granting an increase of pension to John F. Austin;

A bill (S. 4237) granting an increase of pension to Jackson E. Stocker; and

A bill (S. 4238) granting a pension to George H. Hauf (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 to aid the State of Washington in the maintenance and support of its marine school, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York in reference to installment payments of the excess-profits taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How long is it?

Mr. CALDER. It will take about one-eighth of a page of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, held March 7, 1918, the following preamble and resolution, presented by its committee on State and municipal taxation, were unanimously adopted:

INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX.

Whereas the provision in the revenue laws of the United States now requires the payment, on or before June 15 of each year, of Federal taxes, including personal and corporation income taxes and excess-profits taxes of large amounts, based upon income or earnings for an

entire year; and as in many cases the income or earnings from which such taxes are payable are fully absorbed in conducting the business of the taxpayer and can only be withdrawn therefrom at great burden and inconvenience to the individuals, firms, or corporations by whom payment must be made; or if the money be borrowed from the banks, with a resulting money stringency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York strongly recommends to the Congress of the United States that the existing revenue law be so amended as to authorize the payment of the total excess-profits taxes in four installments, on the 15th of June, August, October, and December of the year 1918 and each year thereafter.

Respectfully submitted.

ALFRED E. MARLING, *Chairman*,
WILLIAM C. DEMOREST,
LEONOR F. LOREE,
JAMES BROWN,
WILLIAM H. WHEELOCK.

Of the Committee on State and Municipal Taxation.

Attest:

EUGENIUS H. OUTERBRIDGE, *President*.
CHARLES T. GWYNNE, *Secretary*.

NEW YORK, March 9, 1918.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—GEORGE W. JOHNSON.

On motion of Mr. WALSH it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 1217, Sixty-third Congress, first session, granting a pension to George W. Johnson, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ALLEYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If this is the proper time, I desire to ask that Senate resolution 219, which I presented on Friday, may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 219, submitted by Mr. JONES of Washington on the 29th ultimo, 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, extending, 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ON DUTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate resolution 216.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in line 2, to strike out "non-combatant"; in line 3, after the word "officers," to insert "of the several staff corps"; in line 4, to strike out the word "an"; and, in line 5, after the words "the war," to insert "and are now assigned to duty in the District of Columbia," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to transmit to the Senate the number of commissioned officers of the several staff corps in the United States Army within the draft age who have received their commissions since the outbreak of the war and are now assigned to duty in the District of Columbia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, some days ago there came over from the House the bill (H. R. 2617) to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, and it was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The same bill was introduced in the Senate and was reported out on two separate occasions favorably by the Judiciary Committee. In view of the fact that the Senate bill is on the calendar I ask that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that the bill be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to discharging the committee from the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRONNA. I ask for the reading of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America hereby consents to and ratifies the compact and agreement entered into between the States of Oregon and Washington relative to regulating, protecting, and preserving fish in the boundary waters of the

Columbia River and other waters, which compact and agreement is contained in section 20 of chapter 188 of the general laws of Oregon for 1915, and section 116, chapter 31, of the session laws of Washington for 1915, and is as follows:

"All laws and regulations now existing, or which may be necessary for regulating, protecting, or preserving fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction, or any other waters within either of said States, which would affect said concurrent jurisdiction, shall be made, changed, altered, and amended in whole or in part, only with the mutual consent and approbation of both States."

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the right of the United States to regulate commerce, or the jurisdiction of the United States over navigable waters.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that there may be printed along with the proceedings which have just been had the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the Sixty-fourth Congress and also the report of the committee of the House made on the 7th day of March, 1918, on the same bill.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[S. Rept. No. 513, 64th Cong., 1st sess.]

COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 6097):

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6097) to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, having considered the same, report it to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass.

The advisability of this legislation is set forth in the following communication from Mr. A. L. Thurman, Solicitor for the Department of Commerce:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 7, 1916.

Hon. J. W. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE ALEXANDER: I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, inclosing H. R. No. 6097, to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, and asking me to please give the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries my opinion as to the merits of the bill and the wisdom of enacting it into law. This same matter was covered in S. 2529, introduced by Senator Charles F. Johnson, and sent to the department by the Committee on Fisheries of the Senate for an expression of opinion. The matter was referred by the department to the Bureau of Fisheries, and I am inclosing you a copy of letter to Senator Johnson prepared by the bureau and signed by Assistant Secretary Sweet, which seems to entirely cover the matter. The department is of the opinion that the bill should be enacted into law.

Yours, very truly,

A. L. THURMAN, Solicitor.

JANUARY 8, 1916.

Hon. CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Fisheries,
United States Senate, Washington.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of January 3, inclosing a copy of S. 2529, a bill ratifying the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, I beg to advise that this is regarded as a meritorious and desirable measure and its passage is recommended.

It is essential for the welfare and conservation of the fisheries of the Columbia River that the legislation affecting them be consistent and harmonious, and as the jurisdiction over that stream and certain of its tributaries is divided between the States party to this compact, it is highly important that the laws of the two should be in accord. The recent sessions of the Legislatures of Oregon and Washington took cognizance of this, and the fisheries regulations relating to these waters are now uniform in the two States. It is desirable that this condition should be perpetuated by ratification of the compact which, while not preventing modification of the present laws by mutual agreement of the two States, will make impossible their amendment by any ill-considered action of one State.

Very truly, yours,

E. F. SWEET,
Acting Secretary.

Memorials to Congress have been passed by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, respectively, urging upon Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact above referred to and giving its consent to the compact and agreement between the States named, as required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The compact is embodied in the memorials and is set forth in the bill. The memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington is as follows:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington:

"We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent, show, and pray as follows:

"Whereas the Legislatures of the States of Oregon and Washington did appoint committees from their respective bodies to confer each with the other and to recommend legislation necessary to be provided for the regulation, preservation, and protection of salmon and other food fishes in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Washington and Oregon have concurrent jurisdiction, and over waters within the boundaries of said States which might be of concurrent interest; and

"Whereas said committees did meet in Portland, Oreg., on the 6th day of February, 1915, and did agree on the necessary measures and legislation to be enacted by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, and in their reports to their respective bodies did recommend, 'We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon, whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification by joint agreement by said States'; and

"Whereas said report was adopted by both the house of representatives and the senate by the passage of senate concurrent resolution No. 8; and

"Whereas the legislature did fulfill the recommendations by enactment of house bill No. 170, which in section 108 reads as follows:

"SEC. 108. Should Congress by virtue of the authority vested in it under section 10, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, providing for compacts and agreements between States, ratify the recommendations of the conference committees of the States of Oregon and Washington appointed to agree on the legislation necessary for the regulation, preservation, and protection of fish, in the waters of the Columbia River, over which said States have concurrent jurisdiction, and other waters within either State which would be affected by said concurrent interest, the recommendation being as follows:

"We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification only by joint agreement by said States'; and said recommendation having been approved by resolution adopted by adopting the report of the conference committee, then, and in that event, there shall exist between the States of Oregon and Washington a definite compact and agreement, the purport of which shall be substantially as follows:

"All laws and regulations now existing, or which may be necessary for regulating, protecting, or preserving fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction, or any other waters within either of said States, which would affect said concurrent jurisdiction, shall be made, changed, altered, and amended in whole or in part only with the mutual consent and approbation of both States.' Therefore be it

"Resolved (the house concurring), That we urge upon Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact and giving its consent to the compact and agreement between the States of Washington and Oregon as is required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America."

The memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon is as follows:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the Legislatures of the States of Oregon and Washington did appoint committees from their respective bodies to confer each with the other and to recommend legislation necessary to be provided for the regulation, preservation, and protection of salmon and other food fishes in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Washington and Oregon have concurrent jurisdiction, and over waters within the boundaries of said States which might be of concurrent interest; and

"Whereas said committees did meet in Portland, Oreg., on the 6th day of February, 1915, and did agree on the necessary measures and legislation to be enacted by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, and in their reports to their respective bodies did recommend 'We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification by joint agreement by said States'; and

"Whereas said report was adopted by both the house of representatives and the senate by the passage of senate concurrent resolution No. 4; and

"Whereas the legislature did fulfill the recommendations by enactment of senate bill No. 265, which in section 20 reads as follows:

"SEC. 20. Should Congress, by virtue of the authority invested in it under section 10, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, providing for compacts and agreements between States, ratifying the recommendations of the conference committees of the States of Oregon and Washington, appointed to agree on the legislation necessary for the regulation, preservation, and protection of fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which said States have concurrent jurisdiction, and other waters within either State, which would be affected by said concurrent interest, recommendation being as follows:

"We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification only by joint agreement by said States'; and said recommendation having been approved by resolution adopted by adopting the report of the conference committee, then, and in that event, there shall exist between the States of Oregon and Washington a definite compact and agreement, the purport of which shall be substantially as follows:

"All laws and regulations now existing or which may be necessary for regulating, protecting, or preserving fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction, or any other waters within either of said States, which would affect said concurrent jurisdiction, shall be made, changed, altered, and amended in whole or in part only with the mutual consent and approbation of both States.' Therefore be it

"Resolved (the house concurring), That we urge upon Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact and giving its consent to the compact and

agreement between the States of Washington and Oregon as is required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state February 20, 1915."
The authority of Congress in this connection is unquestioned. The first clause of section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that "no State shall enter into any treaty." In the third clause of the same section of Article I it is provided that "no State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State." These two clauses dealing with the powers of the State to enter into treaty or contract relations with other States or foreign nations are significant in that the framers of the Constitution sought to bar absolutely all treaties between individual States and foreign powers, a function reserved solely to the Federal Government, but did not take away the power of the States to make compacts having no political significance. To distinguish such latter arrangements from the treaties mentioned in the first clause of section 10, they were designated as compacts and agreements. The power of the States in connection with such compacts and agreements was limited by requiring that such compacts should not be entered into without the consent of Congress, this prohibition being undoubtedly intended to guard against abuses of the privilege thus retained to the States.

There are a number of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States defining the force and effect of compacts and agreements entered into between the States and upholding such compacts where they have been consented to by Congress, whether such consent was expressly directed by act of Congress or granted inferentially. (*Green v. Biddle*, 8 Wheat, 1; *Poole v. Fleeger*, 11 Peters, 185; *Virginia v. Tennessee*, 148 U. S., 503; *Wharton v. Wise*, 153 U. S., 155; *Stearns v. Minnesota*, 179 U. S., 223.)

The reasons for the passage of the acts containing this compact and for the request that it be ratified by Congress may be briefly given as follows:

For about 300 miles the Columbia River separates the States of Washington and Oregon. The dividing line between the two States is described in the act of Congress approved February 14, 1859, entitled "An act for the admission of Oregon into the Union," and beginning at—
"a point due west and opposite the middle of the north ship channel of the Columbia River; thence easterly, to and up the middle channel of said river, and where it is divided by islands, up the middle of the widest channel thereof, to a point near Fort Walla Walla, where the forty-sixth parallel of north latitude crosses said river; thence east, on said parallel, to the middle of the main channel of the Shoshone or Snake River." (11 Stat., 350.)

A previous act of Congress (10 Stat., 172), which was the act establishing the Territorial government of Washington, provided that the Territory of Oregon and the Territory of Washington should have concurrent jurisdiction over all offenses committed on the Columbia River.

The act admitting Oregon as a State provided that the State of Oregon should have concurrent jurisdiction in civil as well as criminal cases on the Columbia and all other rivers and waters bordering on the said State so far as the same shall form a boundary to said State, and any other State or States now or hereafter to be formed and bounded by the same, and that said rivers and waters should be common highways and forever free to the inhabitants of said States and to all other citizens of the United States.

Theoretically the questions arising over the boundary line between the two States should not be serious, but practically the matter is surrounded with much difficulty, especially since the unusual size of the stream and the changes made by lapse of time make the middle of the channel uncertain as to location. A few years ago the dispute as to the boundary line became so serious that the matter was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. (State of Washington v. State of Oregon, 211 U. S., 127.) This case, however, fixed the boundary line for only a few miles at the mouth of the river.

The fishing industry along the Columbia River is highly developed, the citizens of both States fishing in its waters under licenses issued by their respective States. In the enforcement of the fishing laws in effect in the two States serious difficulties have in the past arisen on account of the differences in these laws. The method of fishing the river with nets and other gear is such that many persons fishing therein carry on operations within the territorial limits of both States. Often such operations are carried on simultaneously in both States. Without identical laws or laws practically identical the laws of each State are rendered practically useless as regards citizens operating under licenses issued by the other State. (In re Matson, 69 Fed., 535; Ex parte Desjetro, ex parte Furua, 152 Fed., 1004; *Neilsen v. State of Oregon*, 212 U. S., 315.)

An examination of the opinions in these cases will show the difficulty in enforcing any law of one State in the absence of a similar law in the other State.

In the Matson case cited above the defendant Matson was operating under a license issued by the State of Washington. He was arrested by officers of the State of Oregon for violation of the laws of Oregon relating to fishing on Sunday. The court held that where the act on account of which he was convicted was not contrary to the laws of the State which issued his license, he could not be convicted in the other State for violation of the laws of such other State, although the concurrent jurisdiction of the two States over the Columbia River is unquestioned.

We find many precedents for this kind of legislation, a list of which is set forth in the appendix hereto attached.

The committee, however, in reporting favorably upon this legislation in no wise desires to express its opinion upon the merits or wisdom of the bills enacted by the two States, but simply in response to the said memorials of both of the said States memorializing and asking the consent of Congress to said compact and agreement entered into between the said States, gives its opinion that Congress has the power and should give its consent to said compact and agreement, and accordingly recommends the passage of the bill.

ACTS OF CONGRESS GIVING CONSENT TO AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES.

Resolution of May 12, 1820 (3 Stat., 609). Kentucky and Tennessee, February 2, 1820. Boundary line.
Act of June 28, 1834 (4 Stat., 708). New York and New Jersey, September 16, 1833. Boundary line, execution of process, etc.

Act of January 3, 1855 (10 Stat., 602). Massachusetts and New York, May 14 and July 21, 1853. Cession of district of Boston Corner by Massachusetts to New York.

Act of February 9, 1859 (11 Stat., 382). Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Attorney General directed to assent to agreement between States in adjustment of boundary dispute before Supreme Court.

Joint resolution of February 21, 1861 (12 Stat., 250). Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Joint action for removal of raft from Red River (past or prospective agreements).

Joint resolution of March 10, 1866 (14 Stat., 350). Virginia and West Virginia. Cession of Berkeley and Jefferson Counties to West Virginia.

Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat., 481). Virginia and Maryland, January 16, 1877. Boundary line.

Act of April 7, 1880 (21 Stat., 72). New York and Vermont, November 27, 1876, and March 20, 1879. Boundary line.

Act of February 26, 1881 (21 Stat., 351). New York and Connecticut, December 8, 1879. Boundary line.

Act of October 12, 1888 (25 Stat., 553). Connecticut and Rhode Island, May 25, 1887. Boundary line.

Act of August 19, 1890 (26 Stat., 329). New York and Pennsylvania, March 26, 1886. Boundary line.

Act of July 24, 1897 (30 Stat., 214). South Dakota and Nebraska, June 3 and 7, 1897. Boundary line.

Joint resolution of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat., 1465). Tennessee and Virginia, January 28 and February 9, 1901. Boundary line.

Act of March 1, 1905 (33 Stat., 820). South Dakota and Nebraska. Boundary line.

Act of January 24, 1907 (34 Stat., 858). New Jersey and Delaware, March 21, 1905. Jurisdiction over Delaware River, process, etc.

Joint resolution of January 26, 1909 (35 Stat., 1160). Mississippi and Louisiana. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction (prospective agreement).

Joint resolution of January 26, 1909 (35 Stat., 1161). Mississippi and Arkansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction (prospective agreement).

Joint resolution of February 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1163). Tennessee and Arkansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction (prospective agreement).

Joint resolution of June 7, 1910 (36 Stat., 881). Missouri and Kansas. Boundary line and criminal jurisdiction (prospective agreement).

Joint resolution of June 10, 1910 (36 Stat., 881). Oregon and Washington. Boundary line (prospective agreement).

Joint resolution of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat., 882). Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. Criminal jurisdiction on Lake Michigan (prospective agreement).

Act of October 3, 1914 (38 Stat., 727). Massachusetts and Connecticut, March 19, 1908, and June 6, 1913. Boundary line.

(McCLENON, May 18, 1916.)

[H. Rept. No. 360, 65th Cong., 2d sess.]

COLUMBIA RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

MR. HADLEY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 2617):

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2617) to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, having considered the same, report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The advisability of this legislation was set forth in a communication from Mr. A. L. Thurman, solicitor for the Department of Commerce, in a report of this committee on a similar bill which passed the House of Representatives in the Sixty-fourth Congress, but failed to pass the Senate. A copy of the communication referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 7, 1916.

Hon. J. W. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE ALEXANDER: I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, inclosing H. R. No. 6097, to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, and asking me to please give the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries my opinion as to the merits of the bill and the wisdom of enacting it into law. This same matter was covered in S. 2529, introduced by Senator CHARLES F. JOHNSON, and sent to the department by the Committee on Fisheries of the Senate for an expression of opinion. The matter was referred by the department to the Bureau of Fisheries, and I am inclosing you a copy of letter to Senator JOHNSON prepared by the bureau and signed by Assistant Secretary Sweet, which seems to entirely cover the matter. The department is of the opinion that the bill should be enacted into law.

Your, very truly,

A. L. THURMAN, Solicitor.

(Copy.)

JANUARY 8, 1916.

Hon. CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Fisheries,
United States Senate, Washington.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of January 3, inclosing a copy of S. 2529, a bill ratifying the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, I beg to advise that this is regarded as a meritorious and desirable measure and its passage is recommended.

It is essential for the welfare and conservation of the fisheries of the Columbia River that the legislation affecting them be consistent and harmonious, and as the jurisdiction over that stream and certain of its tributaries is divided between the States party to this compact, it is highly important that the laws of the two should be in accord. The recent sessions of the Legislatures of Oregon and Washington took cognizance of this, and the fisheries regulations relating to these waters are now uniform in the two States. It is desirable that this condition should

be perpetuated by ratification of the compact which, while not preventing modification of the present laws by mutual agreement of the two States, will make impossible their amendment by any ill-considered action of one State.

Very truly, yours,

E. F. SWEET,
Acting Secretary.

Memorials to Congress were passed by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, respectively, at the sessions of 1915, urging upon Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact above referred to and giving its consent to the compact and agreement between the States named, as required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The compact is embodied in the memorials and is set forth in the bill.

The memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington is as follows:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington:

"We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent, show, and pray as follows:

"Whereas the Legislatures of the States of Oregon and Washington did appoint committees from their respective bodies to confer each with the other and to recommend legislation necessary to be provided for the regulation, preservation, and protection of salmon and other food fishes in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Washington and Oregon have concurrent jurisdiction, and over waters within the boundaries of said States which might be of concurrent interest; and

"Whereas said committees did meet in Portland, Ore., on the 6th day of February, 1915, and did agree on the necessary measures and legislation to be enacted by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, and in their reports to their respective bodies did recommend, 'We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon, whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification by joint agreement by said States'; and

"Whereas said report was adopted by both the house of representatives and the senate by the passage of senate concurrent resolution No. 8; and

"Whereas the legislature did fulfill the recommendations by enactment of house bill No. 170, which in section 108 reads as follows:

"Sec. 108. Should Congress, by virtue of the authority vested in it under section 10, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, providing for compacts and agreements between States, ratify the recommendations of the conference committees of the States of Oregon and Washington appointed to agree on the legislation necessary for the regulation, preservation, and protection of fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which said States have concurrent jurisdiction, and other waters, within either State which would be affected by said concurrent interest, the recommendation being as follows:

"We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification only by joint agreement by said States"; and said recommendation having been approved by resolution adopted by adopting the report of the conference committee, then, and in that event, there shall exist between the States of Oregon and Washington a definite compact and agreement, the purport of which shall be substantially as follows:

"All laws and regulations now existing, or which may be necessary for regulating, protecting, or preserving fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction, or any other waters within either of said States, which would affect said concurrent jurisdiction, shall be made, changed, altered, and amended in whole or in part only with the mutual consent and approbation of both States." Therefore be it

"Resolved (the house concurring). That we urge upon Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact and giving its consent to the compact and agreement between the States of Washington and Oregon as is required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America."

The memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon is as follows:

"To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"Whereas the Legislatures of the States of Oregon and Washington did appoint committees from their respective bodies to confer each with the other and to recommend legislation necessary to be provided for the regulation, preservation, and protection of salmon and other food fishes in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Washington and Oregon have concurrent jurisdiction, and over waters within the boundaries of said States which might be of concurrent interest; and

"Whereas said committees did meet in Portland, Ore., on the 6th day of February, 1915, and did agree on the necessary measures and legislation to be enacted by the Legislatures of the States of Washington and Oregon, and in their reports to their respective bodies did recommend, 'We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification by joint agreement by said States'; and

"Whereas said report was adopted by both the house of representatives and the senate by the passage of senate concurrent resolution No. 4; and

"Whereas the legislature did fulfill the recommendations by enactment of senate bill No. 265, which in section 20 reads as follows:

"Sec. 20. Should Congress, by virtue of the authority invested in it under section 10, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, providing for compacts and agreements between States, ratifying the recommendations of the conference committees of the States of Oregon and Washington appointed to agree on the legislation necessary for the regulation, preservation, and protection of fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which said States have concur-

rent jurisdiction, and other waters within either State which would be affected by said concurrent interest, recommendation being as follows:

"We further recommend that a resolution be passed by the Legislatures of Washington and Oregon whereby the ratification by Congress of the laws of the States of Oregon and Washington shall act as a treaty between said States, subject to modification only by joint agreement by said States'; and said recommendations having been approved by resolution adopted by adopting the report of the conference committee, then, and in that event, there shall exist between the States of Oregon and Washington a definite compact and agreement the purport of which shall be substantially as follows:

"All laws and regulations now existing, or which may be necessary for regulating, protecting, or preserving fish in the waters of the Columbia River, over which the States of Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction, or any other waters within either of said States, which would affect said concurrent jurisdiction, shall be made, changed, altered, and amended in whole or in part only with the mutual consent and approbation of both States." Therefore be it

"Resolved (the house concurring). That we urge upon Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation ratifying and confirming the compact and giving its consent to the compact and agreement between the States of Washington and Oregon, as is required by section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state February 20, 1915." The Secretary of Commerce has recently advised the committee of the continuing necessity for this legislation, as will be seen by reference to his letter, a copy of which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 16, 1918.

HON. J. W. ALEXANDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE ALEXANDER: I am in receipt of yours of the 15th instant inclosing copy of H. R. 2617, a bill to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, and inquiring if occasion for enacting this bill into law still exists.

The occasion does still exist, and the bill should be enacted into law. You will probably recall that I referred to it in my letter to you of yesterday covering legislation affecting this department pending in your committee. The report of the committee, submitted by the House of Representatives (64th Cong., 1st sess., report No. 379), covers the attitude of the department in regard to this bill.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary.

That the States of Oregon and Washington are still desirous of having the proposed compact ratified is evidenced by the fact that a joint committee from the legislatures of these two States which met at Seattle, Wash., on Saturday, February 3, 1917, to confer upon matters pertaining to their joint fishing interests on the Columbia River, embodied in its report the following recommendation, to wit:

"We renew the recommendations of the joint conference committee of 1915, that Congress shall ratify the laws of the States of Washington and Oregon relative to the fisheries on the Columbia River to the end that such ratification shall act as a treaty between said States which shall be subject to modification only by joint agreement of both States."

The fishing industry along the Columbia River is highly developed, the citizens of both States fishing in its waters under licenses issued by the respective States. In the enforcement of the fishing laws in the two States serious difficulties have in the past arisen on account of the differences in these laws. The method of fishing with nets and other gear is such that many fishermen carry on operations within the territorial limits of both States. Often such operations are conducted simultaneously in both States. Without identical laws or laws practically identical the laws of each State are rendered practically useless as regards citizens operating under licenses issued by the other State. (In re Matson, 69 Fed. 535; ex parte Desjeiro, ex parte Furua, 152 Fed. 1004; Neilson v. State of Oregon, 212 U. S. 315.)

The necessity for Federal legislation, if the terms of the compact and agreement are to be given effect, is apparent on reference to section 10 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, which, among other things, provides that "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State."

There is ample precedent for such legislation. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly upheld such compacts and agreements between States which have been consented to by Congress. (Green v. Biddle, 8 Wheat., 1; Poole v. Flegger, 11 Pet., 185; Virginia v. Tennessee, 148 U. S., 503; Wharton v. Wise, 153 U. S., 155; Stearns v. Minnesota, 179 U. S., 223.)

The States of Oregon and Washington having entered into a compact and agreement providing for the regulation, preservation, and protection of salmon and other food fishes in the waters of the Columbia River over which they have concurrent jurisdiction, the enactment of the bill reported herewith is proposed to render such provisions effectual.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the bill (S. 1484) ratifying the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish, now on the calendar, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 389) to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forest, Ariz.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7795. An act 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, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SHIPYARDS AND PLANT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3388) to amend the emergency shipping funds provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 30, 1917, so as to empower the President and his designated agents to take over certain transportation systems for the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, and for other purposes. This is a bill reported by the Committee on Commerce, and the matter seems to be quite urgent now. It has to do with providing transportation facilities for employees in the shipyards. I think there is no real opposition to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 4, after the word "June," to strike out "thirtieth" and insert "fifteenth"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "operated," to strike out "by steam or electric power," and in the same line, after the word "all," to insert "cars"; in line 3, after the word "thereof," to strike out "to the end that the same be utilized" and insert the word "necessary," so as to make the section read:

That section 1 of the emergency shipping fund provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act of June 15, 1917, is hereby amended by adding a new provision reading as follows:

"(1) To take possession of, lease, or assume control of any street railroad, interurban railroad, or part thereof wherever operated, and all cars, appurtenances, and franchises or parts thereof commonly used in connection with the operation thereof necessary for the transfer and transportation of employees of shipyards or plants engaged or that may hereafter be engaged in the construction of ships or equipment therefor for the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 8, to strike out "section 3" and insert "paragraph (b) of section 1"; in line 10, before the word "line," to strike out "fourth" and insert "third," and in the same line to strike out "section" and insert "paragraph"; in line 12, after the word "street," to strike out the word "car"; and in line 13, after the word "thereof," to insert "cars and other equipment necessary to operation," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That paragraph (b) of section 1 of said act is hereby amended by adding, after the word "material," in the third line of said paragraph, the following words: "or take possession, lease, or assume control of any street railroad, interurban railroad, or part thereof, cars and other equipment necessary to operation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to add as an additional section, the following:

SEC. 3. That upon taking possession of such property, or leasing or assuming control thereof, just compensation shall be made therefor, to be determined by the President, and if the amount thereof so determined by the President is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States of America to recover such further sums as added to 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.

The President may exercise the power and authority hereby vested in him through the several departments of the Government, and through such agency or agencies as he shall determine from time to time.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, when this bill was called up some weeks ago I objected at that time to its consideration. I do not object now, because I am convinced that the Shipping Board must have some such authority as that proposed to be conferred by this measure. It seemed to me then, and it does now, that the results desired could be obtained through the Director General of Railroads. The Shipping Board, however, believe that more speedy action can be obtained by giving them the authority proposed under this bill.

The one danger, Mr. President, is that in case the Shipping Board are not exceedingly careful, they may have imposed upon them worthless railways at an exorbitant figure. I have had some doubt of the wisdom of the measure, but I do know that something must be done to relieve the situation in some of the out-of-the-way shipyards, which have been constructed

during the past year or so. I have talked with the Shipping Board officials about the matter, and have expressed the hope to them that they will exercise the greatest possible care to avoid the danger of the Government being imposed upon in this matter. I shall not object to the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the emergency shipping fund provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, so as to empower the President and his designated agents to take over certain transportation systems for the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, and for other purposes."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD, in connection with the bill, a telegram from Admiral Bowles, who is in charge of the work in the agency yards at Hog Island, at Bristol, Pa., and at Newark, N. J., representing the Emergency Fleet Corporation. He explains in the telegram the importance of this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida to have printed in the RECORD the telegram presented by him?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., February 10, 1918.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Chairman Senate Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge that you secure passage of Senate bill 3388, authorizing the President to take over transportation systems in order that we may have authority necessary to secure transportation of shipyard workers. We are endeavoring and have, in many cases, already negotiated satisfactory arrangements, but in other cases transportation companies are absolutely refusing to negotiate or to provide facilities. This is occurring in places where actual delay is occurring in the production of ships. I believe trolley companies are opposing passage of the bill, hoping to obtain some more comprehensive measure to cover their general difficulties of finances, but in the meantime delay is very detrimental to ship production and should not be permitted to continue.

BOWLES.

EDUCATION OF ADULT ILLITERATES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4185. This bill was before the Senate a few days ago, and we were stopped in its consideration by the expiration of the morning hour at 2 o'clock. It is the bill (S. 4185) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia moves to proceed with the consideration of the bill named by him.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Can the Senator tell us whether or not this bill is likely to provoke any discussion?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we can dispose of it in a very few minutes. It is a short measure.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There are one or two bills on the calendar that the War Department is very insistent shall be passed. We should try to get those bills through, and they have not yet been acted upon either by the Senate or by the House of Representatives. If, however, the Senator from Georgia thinks the bill moved by him will not take long to consider, I shall not insist on proceeding with the bills to which I refer.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think the bill for which I ask consideration will take much time. This also is one of the bills which the War Department is very anxious to have put through. It is a bill to authorize an appropriation for the Bureau of Education to aid the War Department in its work with the illiterates in the cantonments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to the consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, to proceed with the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4185) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the only criticism which was made upon this bill when it was previously before the Senate was that the amount proposed to be appropriated was not sufficient to accomplish the work. I now desire to say to the Senate that in the cantonments the War Department controls

funds to use for the employment of teachers to aid in the accomplishment of the desired result, but it is the wish of the War Department, as I am advised, that the Bureau of Education should supervise and give direction to its effort to remove illiteracy both in the cantonments and among the men of draft age, and also to stimulate instruction in English, so that all drafted men may at least be able to understand English sufficiently to comprehend orders.

I have been asked to suggest as an amendment that the appropriation for the first year be increased to \$100,000, to continue available until expended. Therefore I move to amend, in line 9, page 2, by substituting "\$100,000" for "\$50,000"; and I also move to add, on page 2, line 10, after the date "1918," the words "to continue available until expended."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be regarded as agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, on page 2, line 10, after the word "and," where it occurs the second time, I move to insert the words "fifty thousand dollars," so that after the first year the appropriation will remain at \$50,000, as contemplated in this bill as originally reported.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether he expects that this bill will be a continuing appropriation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is limited to a few years. The time is limited in the bill.

Mr. KING. Is it limited to the time of the war?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; under its language the appropriation is limited to \$50,000 a year until 1928.

Mr. KING. But is it limited in its operation to those who are in the military and naval service of the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. It contemplates, first, the devotion of the fund to the drafted men. The emergency of the situation was brought to public attention by the discovery of the fact that so large a number of drafted men can not speak English and can not read and write it. The fund is continued for a few years for the purpose of generally stimulating the fight throughout all the States to eliminate the illiteracy of those of mature years.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, legislation having for its object the stimulation of education is desirable, but there is another angle to the question. In legislating here we must keep in view the distinction between the powers and duties and limitations of the Federal Government and the prerogatives and responsibilities of the States as sovereign governments. Because an act of Congress might bring beneficent results, it would not be justified if it offended against the rights of the States or was beyond the general purpose for which the Federal Government was organized. The Federal Government may have power to do many things which it ought not to do and the performance of which would unduly aggrandize its powers and tend to devitalize the States.

Appropriations of money to the States unquestionably would aid the States, but the appropriations might be wholly unauthorized and might establish precedents which would be highly dangerous to the Republic. The people, often without thought, request Federal aid for purely domestic and local concerns. The States are not beggars; they are not wards of the General Government, living off its bounties and gratuities. The States have the work of nations to perform and should perform their work with courage and independence.

The education of the people within the States is a duty resting on the States. They can not and they ought not to shirk it. It would be cowardly for them to abdicate the responsibility of caring for the educational and the moral needs of the people and devolving upon the National Government this local and important duty.

This bill points toward Federal control of education. It seeks justification because there are found to be illiterates within the States.

The theory seems to be that the States have failed to educate the people up to a standard to be desired; therefore the National Government should intervene. The bill, as I understand it, is different from what the Senator from Georgia declares it to be. It is not a measure to aid those now in the military or naval service of the United States. It carries an appropriation to secure information which any educator of standing already possesses or which can be obtained by a few hours' search in the Library in this city. It will increase some one's salary or multiply offices and give a number of estimable and amiable gentlemen a chance to work for a Government which is now staggering under a burden daily increased by the employment of additional servants.

We already know what the educational system of the States is. Statistics are voluminous and instructive. We are familiar

with Europe's educational systems, and we are familiar with the methods or lack of methods employed to aid illiterates in making themselves more useful as members of society.

The words "to extend their knowledge of subjects pertaining to their welfare and to their duties as citizens and responsibilities as citizens and members of society" clearly indicate a purpose to authorize an inquiry into matters which pertain to the work and duty of the States.

Suppose a number of persons acting under this bill, if it shall become a law, shall write elaborate reports upon the duties of citizenship and how persons shall act to measure up to the "responsibilities as citizens and members of society," what will they say that has not been said by the greatest educators of this country?

Mr. President, this bill is a delusion and a snare. It will serve no useful purpose and is the entering wedge to a control by the parent Government of the educational systems of the States. It is a seductive measure. It calls for cooperation with the States. It calls for work already done, but which, if not done, should be performed by the States. Under the war spirit we would justify any legislation. Faddists and reformers are here in great number seeking all sorts of foolish and hysterical legislation under the pretext that the exigency of war demands it.

The statement of the Senator from Georgia, if I correctly interpreted his remarks, is an indictment of the educational systems of the States; it is a declaration that they have failed to discharge their duties in educating those within their borders. Ergo, Congress must step in and control education.

I might add in passing that I am at a loss to understand how any Senator indoctrinated in the faith of Jefferson and educated to the view that the Union is composed of "indestructible States" can support this measure.

It looks to me, Mr. President, as if this measure is another evidence of the hysteria that now manifests itself in various parts of the Union. If some supposed evil exists in the States, immediately there is a rush to Congress for the purpose of remedying the evil. The theory seems to be that the States are absolutely impotent to manage their own affairs and perform their sovereign duties, and that, if the States can only be touched with the magic power of the Federal Government, immediately all evils vanish, all mistakes are corrected, and virtue is created and progress ensues. My experience is that the Federal Government, no matter which party is in power, no matter what it undertakes, fails to perform the labor, if it pertains to local and domestic affairs, as efficiently as the States would perform it; and it is agreed by all that in the performance of business undertakings the National Government falls far short when measured by the standard applied to private enterprises. The States regard education as the most important work devolving upon them. They heavily tax the people for educational purposes. They can discharge this great responsibility far better than can the Federal Government.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to ask the Senator a question. Has he studied this bill to see that the Federal Government under this bill is not presumed to take any part in educating illiterates? It is simply a bill to stimulate the States to take action. For instance, take the State which I have the honor in part to represent. We would get under this bill as originally reported \$180 a year, and as the bill now stands \$360 a year, because, on the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the amount of the appropriation has been increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000 for the present year. It therefore means only \$360 for the State of Vermont, a sum so small that the Senator at once can see that nothing is contemplated in the way of actual education by the Federal Government. We simply, at the suggestion of the War Department and of the Bureau of Education, wish to try to bring to the States the necessity of doing this work.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think I understand the purpose of the bill, and, notwithstanding the plea that the Senator's question presents, I am not converted to the wisdom of the measure. In the first place, if it is merely for the purpose of stimulating the States to increased educational effort, it is not going to be effective, because the appropriation, as the Senator himself suggests, is not sufficiently large to be very much of an incentive or a stimulation to additional effort within the States.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I will say that under the vocational educational bill passed two or three years ago we already have the machinery by which

the Vocational Educational Board, without any great amount of labor, can bring to the attention of the States facts which will stimulate them to carry forward this work. We have 5,516,000 illiterates in the United States over the age of 10. We have, I believe, of illiterates above the age of 20, 4,600,000. I do not know the percentage of illiterates in the State of Utah, but I know that in one State the percentage is above 30 per cent; I think 35 per cent.

Mr. KING. I want to state to my friend that the State of Utah fortunately stands, I think, second or third in the list of the States of the Union when it comes to the matter of education.

Mr. PAGE. Well, the Senator certainly can not have any objection to the Federal Board of Vocational Education, with all its machinery ready to undertake this work, going to the States and explaining the great necessity for this work at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that is exactly the argument that is made whenever the Federal Government intrudes itself into the activities, prerogatives, rights, and duties of the States—

Mr. PAGE. But is—

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me—and that is the very reason why the States have been debauched. Whenever you promise a State a Federal appropriation under which the State is to be relieved from the responsibility which rests upon it, opposition which ought to spring instinctively in the hearts of its Representatives is silenced. When a large Federal appropriation is to be spent in their midst for rivers or harbors, or roads or bridges, or education, or any private concern, then most Representatives are willing to receive it, and many of the people find a multitude of reasons for its acceptance.

Mr. PAGE. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, there is nothing of that kind in this bill; we do not propose to give the States a single dollar to be by them expended. We simply, through the Board of Vocational Education, propose to advise the States as to the best methods for taking up the work against illiteracy. Not one single dollar under the bill can be paid to the States, and I hardly see how they could be debauched under this bill.

Mr. KING. Oh, Mr. President, in using the word "debauched," I did not have particular reference to this bill; and yet one of the reasons urged by the distinguished Senator who is now interrogating me in favor of it, is that some of the States—and he mentioned the amount which his State would receive—would obtain some benefits as the result of the appropriation. It may possibly be within the purview of the Federal Government to adopt some system of preparing aliens who come to this land and seek citizenship for the duties of citizenship; but I deny that it is the duty or that it is within the constitutional power of the Federal Government to go into the States and control the educational systems therein. No State should be so abject, and so lost to its high mission and duty, as to ask the Federal Government for aid in the educational work which devolves upon it.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. I am not prepared to agree to the position taken by the Senator from Utah; but that is a matter which is immaterial, because it is not in any way suggested by this bill. Let me read the first three or four lines of the bill.

That the Commissioner of Education shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior—

Which means the Vocational Educational Board—

investigate the methods that have been and are now used in any part of the United States and in foreign countries in teaching illiterate men and women to read and write and in inducing and assisting those of meager education to extend their knowledge of subjects pertaining to their individual welfare and to their duties and responsibilities as citizens and members of society—

And so forth.

Now, this subject has been brought up at this time by Secretary Lane with the advice and suggestion of the War Department, largely for the purpose of taking care of the illiterates now in the Army. The statistics show that there are to-day—I have forgotten the exact number—about 700,000 illiterates within the draft age.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I have no objection to an appropriation being expended by the War Department, or, if it is deemed best, by the Commissioner of Education, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in teaching those who are now in the service of the Government in the Army and in the Navy, and who, because of their unfamiliarity with the English language, may not be able to discharge the duties resting upon them as faithfully and as effectively as if they did understand our language.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will read the letter of Secretary Lane he will see that the purpose he had in mind at the time this bill was suggested was to look after the men who come back from the war with an arm gone, or a leg gone, or an eye gone, or with some other injury that prevents their entering into the work in which they were engaged when they went into the service. There seems to be to-day a demand upon us that is very pressing along these lines, and I think that was the idea of the Secretary in suggesting this bill, although it is made broad enough to stimulate a general discussion and investigation on the part of the States with reference to illiteracy. I think if the Senator will consider this bill carefully he will see that it is a very worthy measure and does not seek to put into the hands of the States the expenditure of any Federal money to be expended by the States, but is simply as the bill says—to investigate the best methods by which this can be done.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if this bill were drawn along the line of the theory just suggested by the Senator a wholly different question would be presented. As I understand him, he is pleading now for some legislation that will enable the Government to better care for those who may be disabled by reason of the war, to improve their education, to the end that they may not be charges upon the public, and that they may be more useful in society. Now, there may be, and doubtless is, a duty resting upon the Federal Government to care, so far as is just and proper, for those who may be wounded and injured in the war; and if a broad and comprehensive measure dealing with the question of educating the wounded were presented I feel sure it would receive sympathetic consideration. But this is not such a bill; it is a useless and unnecessary measure, simply providing an inquiry about a matter which is understood by all educated persons. As stated, we have statistics as to the illiteracy not only in the States but in other countries. This bill does not reach the point suggested by the distinguished Senator, and can not be justified.

Mr. PAGE. I think the Senator errs, in this particular: The bill does not seek to investigate the extent of illiteracy in foreign countries. It seeks to investigate the methods that are being used in foreign countries to meet exactly the condition to which the Senator has just referred.

Mr. KING. No; to meet the question of illiteracy, segregated or dissociated entirely from the question of war and the injuries which result to those who may be engaged in the war.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator has taken the trouble to read the letter of Secretary Lane—

Mr. KING. I have read it carefully.

Mr. PAGE. He will find that the whole essence of that letter is to do exactly what the Senator suggests it is proper to do. I believe the bill ought to pass, because while it does not make an appropriation large enough to do the work, it sets the wheels in motion; it stimulates inquiry as to the best methods of teaching illiterate men, of whom we have perhaps 700,000 now within the draft age. I do not know the exact number. The letter of Secretary Lane, however, is very particular to say that the main purpose of this measure is to do something for those men who are now in the service.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I regard this bill as a covert attack upon the educational systems of the States, and as an entering wedge to taking from the States the control of their educational system, or, at least, to devolve upon the Federal Government, in part, the obligation of educating the people within the States.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

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

Mr. KNOX. I only want to suggest that this discussion brings vividly to my recollection a discussion along the same lines in the Senate when I had the honor to be a Member of it on a previous occasion, when, upon an appropriation bill, I offered an amendment to appropriate \$50,000 for the purpose of investigating the causes leading to mine explosions. At that time the question was very acute, because there had been a number of very serious mine explosions in the West and in the Southwest, resulting in the loss of many lives and the injury of many persons. The argument was made against the proposed appropriation that it was invading a function of the States; that mines are permanently located things, wholly within States, and their operation an operation of a local nature; and that the Federal Government sustained no relation to the subject, and that it was an invasion of the powers of the States for us to undertake to appropriate money to make any such inquiry.

The matter was discussed at great length, some of the most distinguished Senators of that day taking part. I remember

distinctly Senator Hale, of Maine, than whom no greater Senator ever sat in this Chamber, in my opinion; the late Senator Bacon, of Georgia; and quite a number of the other distinguished Senators of that time; and we finally succeeded in having the amendment adopted. I might say parenthetically that the activities thus initiated have now developed into the Bureau of Mines, an institution which is doing as great work for humanity in the United States as any bureau or department of the Government. We came to the conclusion at that time that we had a right to make such investigations. That, as I understand, is all that this bill proposes to do—to make investigations into methods; not to enter into States and install anything, except, perhaps, as the bill says in its latter portion, at the invitation or request of the States, whenever they extend such invitation.

We have been for years appropriating money, and vast sums of money, to inquire into the best methods of agriculture. We are appropriating vast sums of money for the benefit of the mariner and the farmer and the public at large for the purpose of foretelling weather conditions. We are appropriating vast sums of money to kill the boll weevil in the South and the gipsy moth in the Northeast. We are appropriating money constantly for kindred purposes, and we have gotten past the place where it can any longer be said that the aid of the Federal Government in making investigations and even in exterminating pests that assail the agriculture of the country or the cattle of the country or anything of that kind is beyond the Federal function. In my judgment, Mr. President, this is a meritorious measure in that it only proposes to inquire into educational conditions and to devise remedies; and it seems to me that the education of the illiterates of the United States is quite as much a matter for our concern as the appropriation of money for the various purposes I have indicated.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KING. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill proposes to go a little further, because it proposes to devise efficient economic methods for teaching adult illiterates—men and women, and so forth—and that information is to be furnished to and to be used by the States.

Mr. KNOX. That was exactly the purpose for which the appropriation of \$50,000 for the investigation of the causes of mine explosions was proposed.

It went that far; and every Senator knows what a tremendous work has been done for the miners in the United States. I remember that the first bureau was established in the city of Pittsburgh. These investigations were made in an extraordinarily thorough manner by the Federal investigators, and the conclusions they reached were furnished to the mining bureaus of the various States. As I say, from one activity to another it has now developed into a Federal mining bureau which is doing a very important work. So, if the Senator from Utah will permit me just one more moment—I feel that I have trespassed too much upon his time—

Mr. KING. I am very glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. KNOX. While there is no man in the Senate who is more desirous than I to avoid infringing upon the just and legitimate powers and functions of the States, and no man in the Senate who has yielded to the Senator from Utah a higher meed of praise for the stand that he is constantly taking in defense of the rights of the States, yet I think in this particular we have established precedents so numerous that it would be hardly just, in view of the great purpose designed to be accomplished by this bill, to turn it down upon any such ground.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know that anything that I said warranted the conclusion—and I think, perhaps, the Senator from Pennsylvania reached that conclusion—that I denied the power of the Federal Government to make this appropriation. There may be the power to do an act which is inexpedient and usurpative. Congress might have power to bridge every creek in my State, but it would be improper and wrong to do so. But what I am particularly declaiming against is that these constant appropriations made by the Federal Government for expenditure within the States are atrophying the States, robbing them of their virility and independence, and causing them more and more to appeal to the Federal Government to aid them in purely domestic affairs and the performance of functions pertaining solely to the States.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia. I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico in a moment. But before doing so, let me add that the paternalism thus resulting will increase, and the activities of the General Government will be

multiplied, until in the course of time we will have no States—only empty shells—and a huge, overshadowing Nation will control us.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the object of this bill is to furnish leadership and suggestion as a result of broader studies than would be likely to be made in a single State. Then, I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not think that the National Government more than the States is to blame if there is illiteracy on the part of foreign-speaking, non-English-speaking immigrants who are in the United States? If there is a blame, does it attach to the States? Furthermore, if there is still a large portion of the negro population that can not read, should all of that blame be charged to the States?

I only want to add that the statistics furnished us by the Secretary of the Interior lead to the conclusion that the illiterates sought to be reached especially by this bill are largely immigrants whose children can not speak English, foreigners, and negroes who have not yet advanced as we hope they will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would not want to be placed in the attitude of judging where the blame should be placed, whether upon the Federal Government or upon the States, for the conditions to which the Senator refers; but I have no hesitancy in saying that I think the Federal Government has been derelict in its duty in admitting into this country so many people who were not qualified for citizenship, who did not appreciate the responsibilities that flow from accepting citizenship, and who had no conception of the ideals, hopes, aspirations, and faith of the true sons of America. We have not absorbed, indeed, not assimilated those welcomed to our shores.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the Senator, he admits that the Federal Government has the constitutional right to make this appropriation. Am I correct about that?

Mr. KING. Speaking generally, I will say that Congress can make this appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I am correct about that, what higher or better purpose could be found than the purpose of educating the illiterates of our country, regardless of whose mistake it was?

Mr. KING. Oh, Mr. President, because a government has the power academically and theoretically to do a certain thing, that does not justify, in morals or in law, the performance of the act itself. Perhaps, as an academic proposition, the Government of the United States has the power to build the roads of Tennessee, but in my opinion it would be a wrong for the Federal Government to undertake the construction of the highways for the people of Tennessee. The Federal Government perhaps, as a bald question of the exercise of plenary power, might spend \$100,000 for the education of the colored people within the State of Tennessee, but it would be an abuse of that power, it would be wholly unwarranted for the Federal Government to make the appropriation. The plea of the Senator would justify the Federal Government going into the States and doing police duty, running the courts, maintaining the hospitals and asylums, and performing all the obligations resting upon the States. Some States might be willing to so abase themselves as to cease to be independent and sovereign and live upon the charities of the Federal Government, but if that condition should long continue this Republic would cease to exist. I want to warn Senators against this practice of having Congress do for the States that which they should do for themselves.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, it would have been better, possibly, if I desired to make a speech not to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KING. I am sure it will improve my remarks if the Senator proceeds now before I yield the floor.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is very flattering. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he did not agree with my idea of the duty of the Government of the United States to educate some portions at least of the illiterate population. The suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was along the line of the question that I desired to propound.

The States have nothing to do with the matter of immigration or the matter of making citizens. That is the province of the National Government. No protest of the State of California can avail in the matter of any treaty concerning naturalization, for instance, nor immigration, for instance. The National Government makes immigration laws and admits illiterates. The National Government makes citizens of these people and forces them upon the States. It has no internment ground upon which

these illiterate immigrants may be placed, unless you might say that they should go to the District of Columbia or the Territory of Alaska. As soon as they are admitted at Ellis Island or at San Francisco, if they come from the other direction, or anywhere else that they may land, they scatter throughout the States of the Union. The Federal Government provides how and when they shall become citizens, and has no educational qualifications at all in its law, except as recently adopted upon the immigration act. Now, is it not, in the Senator's judgment, as in mine, the duty of the United States to assist, at least, in the education of the illiterates whom it forces upon the people of the States?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that I felt that the Federal Government had been derelict in its duty in admitting to citizenship so many persons who failed to appreciate the responsibilities which citizenship involves; and I think there should be some change in our immigration laws that would restrict citizenship to narrower limits and to those only who love this country, its Constitution and its laws, its institutions, and its glorious history; those who desire liberty under law and who can comprehend in part, at least, the high mission and the ideals of this Republic.

Mr. FALL. But—

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, answering the inquiry which the Senator propounds, and which is a fair one, I think it within the power of the Federal Government to aid in preparing for citizenship those who come to this land and seek citizenship in this Republic.

I might not oppose a proper and comprehensive measure the object of which was to prepare for citizenship the class just referred to. I should not oppose a measure suggested by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Vermont, that aided in the education of those who are wounded in this great conflict and who return from the war unprepared to make a livelihood.

Mr. FALL. Then I think from the Senator's remarks generally he does agree with me that the Government of the United States, having failed to perform its duty in the past with reference to the admission of illiterates and making citizens of them first, has the power to make an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. KING. Yes; I concede that.

Mr. FALL. Now, having the power and having failed in its duty to those citizens heretofore, those citizens having arrived in the States, they were forced to accept those illiterates, with which they had nothing to do and over whom they had no power at all. Having failed in its duty, I say that the natural conclusion the Senator must arrive at is that at which I have arrived in considering this bill. It is that the United States not only has the power but it is the duty of the United States to assist in providing for the education of these illiterates.

Now, as the letter of the Secretary of the Interior seems to be the principal ground for the inquiry commented upon by the Senator from Vermont, we may realize the necessity of commencing the good work which the United States is undertaking now to perform in the cantonments among the drafted men. I think that is perfectly proper, but I would object to a provision leaving this investigation and this work to be performed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior rather than the Secretary of War. In so far as those men are concerned, there will be an inevitable conflict between the two Cabinet officers. Here are men enlisted for the military service in the cantonments. Here are various other men who are registered, and I can see very well where there could be a conflict in the matter of attempted education of those who are registered but not drafted and those who are drafted or enlisted. The Commissioner of Education should cooperate with the Secretary of War and not with the Secretary of the Interior in reference to the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FALL. I am trespassing on the time of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think I can relieve the Senator's mind upon that subject. The Commissioner of Education, of course, conducts the bureau in the Interior Department. The Interior Department for many years was the branch of the Government to which bureaus were assigned that did not fit anywhere else. It was an assembly of many disconnected bureaus. The Bureau of Education is a bureau of the Interior Department.

Mr. FALL. I understand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Secretary of the Interior has practically nothing to do with it.

Mr. FALL. I understand.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. At the present time, so far as the cantonment work is concerned, the commissioner will be in

cooperation with the Secretary of War; and I know that there will be no friction at all between the War Department and the Bureau of Education, but, on the contrary, I am advised the Secretary of War, conferring with the Secretary of the Interior, desires this help from the Bureau of Education, and it will entirely cooperate inside the cantonments under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. FALL. That may be very possible, but the objection, it strikes me, is much better founded than the Senator would think. We have departments of the Government overlapping one another. No one knows where the authority of one begins and the authority of the other ends, each assuming authority. Under the terms of the bill itself that cooperation which is so much to be desired under the direction of the Secretary of War in reference to drafted men is not provided for.

The Commissioner of Education shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, investigate—

And so forth.

Under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. That is all right as a general proposition. There is no objection to it in the world because his bureau is a part of the Interior Department. It is a portion of the working force of the Interior Department. The men who are drafted and under military law are under the direction of the military authorities, and there should be no possible interference by anyone under an act of Congress in the education of those men, except that such efforts should be directed by the Secretary of War and the military authorities.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Commissioner of Education could not go into the cantonments except in cooperation with the Secretary of War. This act of Congress does not authorize him to go into the cantonments.

Mr. FALL. It authorizes him to educate these citizens or to investigate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. He could not go into the cantonments.

Mr. FALL. The very fact that the Senator and myself are arguing the proposition, one taking one point of view and the other the other, is an argument against the provision.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What should we do to allow the two Secretaries to cooperate?

Mr. FALL. I would offer a very short amendment to the work to be done under the provisions of the bill with the drafted man by inserting "and enlisted men in the service of the United States."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will draw an amendment providing that the work done in the cantonments must be done under the direction and after the approval is had of the Secretary of War, I accept it at once.

Mr. FALL. I am in favor of the general proposition. I differ from the Senator from Utah upon the broad statement of the proposition; that is, I am in favor of this authority being given to the Commissioner of Education, and I do not care with whom he confers as a general proposition, but I am pointing out the specific condition here, which, to my mind, presents an almost insuperable obstacle. If you are going to undertake to carry out the proposition that the Senator from Vermont is speaking of and upon which he bases, apparently, his support of this measure—that is, the purpose to educate or to assist in educating illiterates now in the Army. Then the Commissioner of Education in this matter may be under the direction of the military authority and not under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. But there is not one word in the bill upon the general proposition that it is the duty of the United States, after admitting these illiterates and forcing them upon the States, to cooperate in their education.

I hope the Senator from Utah will pardon me for taking up his time.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to have received the suggestions of the Senator from New Mexico. The criticism he urges against this bill shows that it is not based upon the proper theory and can not be defended upon the ground suggested by the Senator from Vermont or the Senator from Georgia. It is not a bill providing for the care of illiterates by the Government of the United States whom it has permitted to come into the country and whom it has placed within the States; it is not a bill for the purpose of educating the illiterates and infirm who are in the Army or Navy. It is not a bill to make better soldiers and sailors and to enable them to better discharge the duties resting upon them in rendering military service to the Government. This bill will be construed by the States as a purpose upon the part of the Federal Government to enter their borders and to aid in the general system of education, and will be made the basis for petitions to Congress or demands upon the Federal Government to aid in State education.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to say that the department in drawing this bill sought to meet the objection of just such men as the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I am flattered to think that the department should have such men as myself in mind.

Mr. PAGE (reading)—

Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay teachers or school officers in any State or Territory or in the District of Columbia for teaching or for conducting or supervising any school or schools: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Education shall not undertake to promote the teaching of adult illiterates and men and women of meager education in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia by cooperation or otherwise without the written invitation or consent of the board of education or the chief school officer of such State, Territory, or District of Columbia.

They tried to put up the bar against any possible use of this money to educate men in the States. But in passing I want to say we expect that very soon there may come back from Europe men who by reason of the war have been placed where they can not go on with their usual avocation, and we want to stimulate and prepare the States to take care of those men when they come back and fit them so that they will be self-supporting and self-respecting citizens.

Mr. KING. The more the bill is read and the more it is explained—and it is well and ably explained by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Georgia—the greater the objections appear. If it is the purpose of this scheme to adopt a broad and comprehensive system for educating and caring for those who may receive wounds in the war, to aid them better after their return to make a livelihood, then it utterly fails. It is not broad; it is not comprehensive; it is narrow and dogmatic and will prove wholly ineffectual. If it is for the purpose of discharging a duty heretofore not discharged by the Federal Government, according to the contention of some, namely, attempting to educate those who sought citizenship before thrusting upon the States men who were wholly incompetent to discharge the duties of citizenship, then it utterly fails to accomplish that purpose.

I think the Senators having this bill in charge in the committee were actuated by the very best motives and had in mind the curing of an evil, but I do not think the bill is broad enough to accomplish either of the purposes suggested. It will prove misleading and deceptive and be regarded by the States as an effort on the part of the Federal Government to go into the States and aid in the control of State education and will be regarded as a declaration by the Federal Government that hereafter it purposes going into the States and aiding them in the discharge of duties which clearly rest upon the State.

The criticism offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] is certainly well founded. It leads to conflict between the Interior Department and the War Department. It occurs to me that it would be the part of wisdom to recommit the bill, in order that a broad and comprehensive measure might be reported that will meet the evils and correct the abuses to which reference has been made.

This is simply a waste of \$50,000 or \$100,000. It has been promoted largely, doubtless, by some bureau of the Government that wants to increase its activities and augment its powers. We have bureaus of this character almost daily knocking at our doors. Some agency is created, and it wants to expand and become a bureau, and then when it becomes a bureau it wants additional power and will knock at the doors of Congress and demand that it shall be made a department.

Of course, we need departments and we need bureaus, but this burning desire on the part of agents and officials to expand and increase their power and the willingness with which Congress yields to their demand for appropriations and extension of power leads me upon this occasion to call attention to this character of legislation and to ask this committee, if they desire wholesome and proper legislation, to reconstruct this bill along safe and sane and rational lines.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to read the first few lines of the bill and then ask the Senator a question.

That the Commissioner of Education shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, investigate the methods that have been and are now used in any part of the United States and in foreign countries in teaching illiterate men and women to read and write.

How much of this appropriation does the Senator think it will take to accomplish that investigation?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the reports that we have now from the Census Department reveal the conditions in the United States, and the report that we can get here in the library will furnish the rest of the information suggested in the lines just read by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree with the Senator that there is never a bureau that does not want to expand itself into something bigger than a bureau. If the Commissioner of Education undertakes to carry out the directions that I have read in the bill and appoint agents to traverse the United States and very likely to go abroad, what will become of the \$100,000?

Mr. KING. It will be wasted, of course—

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course.

Mr. KING. In traveling expenses, in office expenses, and frittered away without any results being accomplished. This is a waste, I repeat, and if the subject is worthy of attention it should be treated in a scientific and a rational way.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. If the Senator will allow me a sentence, the difficulty is that too often when some evil, fancied or real, exists some one—and to use a vulgarism, "the woods are full" of faddists and reformers—rushes to Congress and asks for an appropriation, and we make the appropriation without proper investigation and without the adoption of a scientific method of treating the subject. The appropriation is lost, a deficiency is created, further appropriations are sought, and in the end the enterprise is abandoned or we have to supplement the former appropriation by additional ones and increase the agencies and instrumentalities to tremendous proportions. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to say to the Senator that I quite agree with him in the suggestion he made a little while ago, that if this was a plan to educate to some extent the men who come back from the battle front wounded, and from the hospitals, if that could not be accomplished through existing instrumentalities such as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Red Cross, and it was necessary to employ teachers, I would be very glad to vote for an appropriation of that kind.

Mr. KING. I should be very happy to vote for it also.

Mr. GALLINGER. But it does seem to me to expend \$100,000—and that will be only a beginning—in ascertaining to what extent illiteracy prevails, which has already been ascertained, I apprehend to some extent at least, and then to employ teachers to educate not only the soldiers but illiterates of the country, will be an absolute waste of money.

I suggested the other day that my predecessor, Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, advocated with great zeal and ability an educational bill which was to take care of the illiterates largely in one section of the country; that he proposed over six or seven million dollars to start with, and I think it was an increasing appropriation year by year until a very much larger amount was expended.

Mr. KING. I think the aggregate, as I recall the bill from reading it many years ago, was about \$27,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. As much as that, certainly. There was, I think, a good deal of sense in that, because it would have accomplished something, but to give a dribble simply because the Commissioner of Education wants to add to his activities is, to my mind, a waste of money.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just one word in reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox], who, I regret, has left the Chamber. I want to say that you can easily differentiate the illustration to which he referred from the instant case. The Federal Government owns millions and hundreds of millions of acres of public domain, on which are situated mines and within which are immense and rich mineral deposits. It would be a proper function of the Government, although it might be rather paternalistic, for it to make investigations of the mining properties and of the mining deposits within its own domain and to investigate those that were operating some of the properties that were owned by the Government, as it had a proprietary interest in the public domain, and, having that proprietary interest, it had the right to legislate as a proprietor with respect to its own domain; but education is a duty resting upon the State; it is one of the police powers of the State to properly care for the education of those within its borders, as it is a part of the police powers of the State to take care of the local courts and to see that justice is administered and the rights of property and of life are safe and secure.

Mr. President, when I rose I had no intention of occupying the floor more than a moment. In conclusion, I want to say it is a matter of regret for me to have to differ from the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is usually—indeed, I might say always except upon this occasion—a safe leader and a wise and valuable counselor. I appeal to the Senator to let this bill go back to committee to reconstruct it along broad and comprehensive and rational lines, having in mind the stream of men who probably will come from across the sea wounded, bruised, and maimed, to the end that they may be better cared

for in the few years or the many years, God willing, that shall yet be in store for them; and also keeping in view the question of the duty of the Government with respect to those who seek citizenship in this Republic. If the Senator from Georgia will draw a bill of that character, I have no doubt it will receive practically the unanimous support of the members of this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is another of those cases where "even-handed justice" commends the "poison'd chalice to our own lips." For years and years a lot of us have stood in the two Houses of Congress begging the Republican Congress to consider the fact that we had ignorance enough upon our own shores without importing more of it, but, in spite of all that we could do and say, the importation has kept up year after year, until now an "American" may mean almost anything. Without homogeneity of language there can be no homogeneity of traditions, of ideals, or of purposes; there can be no harmony of action; there can be no concerted national movement of any description. Men may say what they please—the old rationalists and the other people debated about it for centuries—but men think in words; men think in language. The man who has not words and language in which to think can not think much. He may think about what he is going to eat and about what he is going to wear, as a little baby thinks about where it is going to get its milk, and feels anxiously for it; but he is not much beyond that. When men have different languages they can not cooperate with one another unless there take the place of language centuries-old traditional history and myths and universal custom and century-old congealed, intense nationality against despotism, as these things did take the place of language in Switzerland, let us say, and in Belgium so that the Germans even now can not separate the Flemings from the Walloons.

Mr. President, I think that the main thing to be done in teaching adults in the United States is not so much to remove their illiteracy as it is to teach them English and something about English institutions. I could go down into the mountains of eastern Kentucky and east Tennessee and western Virginia, where the Republican Party, I believe, claims that the most illiterate vote of the South is cast, and, by the way, cast for the Republican ticket, and I could find about 20 men out of a possible hundred who could not read a word, and who yet were wise men upon election day, men who have some political information. It was stated before the war that in one of the States of this Union the best schooled and best educated people politically in the Union lived, and yet a people who constituted the least literate State in the Union. They were politically and democratically schooled because of their habits of life. They had their weekly county court days; they had their musters every Saturday, they had their joint debates; every question of constitutional and civil rights was discussed before them, and, of course, in their own language; and they became a highly educated people politically.

Of the population of ancient Athens the same thing may be said. There was not a very large percentage of people among the "fierce democracie of Athens" that could read or write, but it was the best educated population that the world has ever seen—politically, dramatically, artistically, aesthetically—simply because of the habit of the people living together constantly, hearing discussions in their own tongue, which happened to be, with the exception of the English, the broadest and most voluminous and most comprehensive and world-comprehending tongue that the world thus far has ever known.

Mr. President, with these ideas in my mind, I want to offer a couple of amendments to the pending bill—one to the title. After the words "United States," at the end of the title, I desire to add "and for aiding the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens."

Mr. GALLINGER. Should not the Senator say "to illiterate aliens and naturalized citizens"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; because there may be a man who speaks Bohemian and writes it, but yet who does not know a word of English. So far as we are concerned, he is just as absolutely ignorant of our institutions and patriotism as if he did not know anything at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are a whole lot of people who came over here from Germany, who have never yet learned any language but German, and who to-day remain Germans because of that fact.

By the way, I will add, if the Senator will pardon me the addition, that I happen to have a boy down in the Army who was thrown accidentally into the command of a lot of Pennsylvania miners—Bohemians, Slovaks, Slovenians, Polaks, Italians—some of whom he found could not read and write, and a great many of whom he found could read and write, but could not even speak English and could not obey the words of

command without extra drill. One of the first things that the boy's division commander ordered him and some others to do, was to try to teach those men enough English at any rate to get their meals and to obey military orders.

Now, to go on, I also propose, on page 2, line 1, after the words "United States," to insert "to aid the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens." Of course, the fellow who understands English will not be taught, and the man who does not understand English will be taught.

One more word, Mr. President, and I shall take my seat, with an apology for taking up a lot of the time of the Senate, not only to-day but during last week, a part of which time I have since concluded was uselessly employed. I hope that it is not in this instance.

Our law, our Magna Charta, our habeas corpus, our parliamentary freedom, our Bill of Rights, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, all of the muniments of our civil, political, and individual liberty were written in the English language. It is not an accident that the only language which has been able to perpetuate liberty allied with law and with order has been the English language, because the history of the language and the history of the people who spoke it and speak it have been identical upon those lines. That is not all. When we come to consider this great language that we speak, with the possible exception of Homer and of Dante, one a Greek and the other an Italian, there is nobody who will stand in the same class with Shakespeare or Milton; when we come to consider the sweet singers in the language, there is nobody who stands with Tennyson, with Moore, and with Burns known to the language of any people in this world; and when we come to consider the science of the world, beginning with Sir Francis Bacon and running down through Sir Isaac Newton and Huxley and Darwin and Agaziz to the last of them all, to the men who are now taking command of the scientific information of the world and showing English and American and Canadian and Australian ability in that line, and running through the great metaphysicians, Herbert Spencer, Sir William Hamilton, and Stewart, and all the balance of them down to now; the great inventors who invented the steam engine, the spinning jenny, the railroad, the telegraph, and nearly everything else worth having, including the electric light, it is this race that has produced them.

Now, how can people who come over here and do not understand the language comprehend the traditions, the spirit, the idealism, and the aspirations and the science and the poetry and the history of the people who speak English and who have derived with their mother's milk and with their language a love for order conjoined with liberty—neither autocracy upon the one side conjoined with despotism, furthering the interests of one rather than the many, bolshevikism, on the other hand, conjoined with mobocracy, establishing the despotism of the many, is the thing the world seeks, but the good old safely guarded English-speaking, democratic liberty, which France, thank God, seems to have learned after having gone through much travail and labor? How can they do it? What is there back of them? What is there in their literature; what is there in their science; what is there in their daily walk and conversation to teach it to them?

I have frequently said that the most valuable information that I have ever secured in my life was from men who had no particular standing in the world, who read about three newspapers, including magazines as newspapers—one monthly, one weekly, and one daily—kept up with what was going on in the world, and then thumbed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am aware of the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not considered a very highly respectable newspaper, but for the man who reads it—and I confess I have not the patience to do it—but for the man who has the time and has the patience to do it, as I had for the first three or four or five years after I came into public life, it is the most perfect newspaper of political thought that this world ever furnished or ever will furnish, except that it may improve upon itself. So that I have met men down in Mississippi, one or two or three mule farmers, that would all at once open up a vista and say: "Well, John, how did you happen to vote this way upon that bill?" I would say, "My dear fellow, I do not remember the bill, and I do not remember how I voted on it"; but, of course, he knew all about it; he had nothing to do but to read the RECORD and his paper. The man who said "Give my enemies many books" was about right, and Hobbes, who said, "Fear the man who reads one book," was also partially, though not altogether, right. There is a broader scope for human thought than that, thank God.

Mr. President, I offer these two amendments, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Georgia in charge of the bill to them. If in wording them rather hurriedly I have not worded them with sufficient descriptive force, the Senator from Georgia

can amend them. The amendments read in this way—I should like the Senator to note them—I propose to amend the title by inserting the words “and for aiding the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens”; and, then, in line 13, on page 1, to add the words: “to aid the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens.”

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and I have largely had the responsibility in the Committee on Education upon this bill. I personally do not object to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Mississippi if the Senator from Vermont does not. So far as I am concerned, speaking for myself, I am willing to accept them, because I think that there is no more essential service in education to be rendered the country by this bill than to see to it that every person in the United States speaks English.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia understand that his amendments have been agreed to?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The formal amendments which I offered were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reporters do not have it so recorded and the Chair is informed that they were not even stated at the desk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, yes; I think they were. Mr. President, I only offered one amendment, which was to increase the appropriation of \$50,000 to \$100,000, and make it available until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment is in three parts and is as follows: On page 2, line 9, to strike out “\$50,000” and insert “\$100,000”; in line 10, after “1918,” insert the words “to continue available until expended”; and in line 10, after the word “and,” to insert “\$50,000,” so that if amended the paragraph will read:

That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to continue available until expended, and \$50,000 for each succeeding fiscal year until June 30, 1928.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Chair announced that the amendment had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be considered as one amendment, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not understand what the view of the Senator from Vermont was.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we enter into an arrangement whereby we are to aid States in any form of public education, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, instead of there being \$50,000 appropriated, we would have to make it \$500,000 or \$5,000,000. I do not think the appropriation carried by this bill is at all commensurate with any plan that seeks to aid the States in the matter of education.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Vermont that my view of the amendment, in view of the balance of the bill, is that it should be construed to mean that the aid should be suggestive, just as the whole scheme of the bill is suggestive; that it only emphasizes the importance of teaching English and does not enlarge the responsibility, but directs the force toward the effort to teach English.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to illustrate by just one point. The Senator will remember that the bill for the promotion of vocational education provides for night schools for those boys or men who are engaged in manufacturing; but it limits the night schools to boys who are actually engaged in work, and anyone outside can not avail himself of the benefits of these night schools. In view of the boys that are coming back from Europe armless or legless, it seems to me that the board of vocational education would suggest to the States that they change that so that there might be enrolled in these night schools these men who need some special education to enable them to become self-supporting.

If nothing but that should result from this bill, it would be worth one hundred times more than we appropriate. If the Senator from Georgia is correct and he does not feel that by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi we shall enter upon a scheme of education, I have no objection to the amendment; but it seems to me that we would do that if we should adopt the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that when these boys come home from the war and return to their respective homes the States are going to ignore them and their claims for education?

Mr. PAGE. I simply know that the law as it exists to-day upon our statute books, unless it should be violated, would prevent the acceptance of these men in these night schools. If this bill is passed the Board of Vocational Education will suggest the amendment of the law so that without violation of law these men may be taken in; and to my mind that is one of the great purposes of this bill. It is to take care of the men who come back and who need to have an added amount of education in order that they may become self-sustaining.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I suggest to him that this bill does not make any provision of that character. It does not carry an appropriation of that character. It is not sufficiently broad to warrant expenditures of that character.

Then I recur to the question I propounded to the Senator a moment ago; and I think that is the fatal mistake that is made by the Senator and those entertaining his view. They assume that the States will fail to appreciate the legitimate demands made upon them by those who return from the war. The States are going to be interested in the proper care of those who have been wounded and maimed. They will provide industrial and other schools to take care of those who may settle in their midst and who may need attention. The theory seems to be that the States are absolutely atrophied; that they are going to refuse to discharge their duties and their responsibilities; that they are going to rest upon the Federal Government the care of all those who may be in their midst; that the Federal Government owes to the people the duty to care for them and to educate them and to support them; that the States are mere supernumeraries in this great dual system of Government in which we live.

It is against that spirit that I am complaining, because I think it is going to be destructive of our form of government, and that the States will wind up with being beggars and supplicants at the feet of Congress, and refuse to discharge the duties resting upon them, because Congress has been inviting them to come and partake of its bounty, and to devolve upon the Federal Government responsibilities which, under the Constitution, rest upon the States themselves.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont pardon me a word?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly. I yield the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Utah is not quite correct in saying that the States will take care of these soldiers. I am greatly interested in extending aid to the soldiers who come home wounded from the battle fields of France; but they will not all go to their States. The Government has turned over this great Walter Reed Hospital in the city of Washington, and 27 wounded soldiers appeared there a day or two ago, and there probably will be more than a thousand wounded soldiers there in the near future. Those men could not be taken care of by the States, so that it is quite right that the Government should at least extend its benefactions to those men.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Heretofore I made the observation—perhaps before the Senator came into the Chamber—that I was in favor of some broad and comprehensive scheme by which the Federal Government would make provision, at least, independently or with the aid of the States, to care for the education of those who come from the battle field wounded and maimed, and who are unable to take care of themselves in life; and by anything I said just now I did not mean to convey the idea that I thought the whole duty and responsibility should be devolved upon the States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Several bills have already been prepared on that subject, looking toward the National Government following in the lines that all the warring nations have pursued, of providing for the reeducation vocationally of wounded soldiers. Those bills are now being considered by experts on the subject, and I hope to have as nearly as possible a perfected bill from the experts to submit to the Senate within the present week.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does not the Senator from Georgia think that this bill might as well be held until that scheme is worked out?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think so. I do not think it has anything to do with that bill. What I am anxious to see, what the Secretary of War desires, what the Secretary of the

Interior desires, is the leadership of the Bureau of Education in directing the forces—not furnishing the forces, but directing the forces—in the cantonments, in a way superintending the forces in the cantonments, who are using funds and are now laboring to teach the soldier in the cantonments to read and write, and to teach those who do not even understand English, how to speak and read it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why does not the Senator say "cantonments" in this bill, then?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not stop there. It does not pretend to go there alone.

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not get there, according to the terms of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a short amendment that puts it more distinctly there. I did not draw the bill. This is a bill drawn by a department.

Mr. GALLINGER. As usual, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I introduced it; but, as usual, I am glad to have it amended on the floor of the Senate. As usual, I believe that a department bill is all right for us to start with, but that after we get it we ought to study it and perfect it and give it the benefit of our broader experience.

Mr. GALLINGER. I recall more than one effort that has been made by the Bureau of Education to extend the activities of that bureau in directions to which Congress has not agreed; and I think this is an instance of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are two amendments that I was going to suggest. The first is on the line of thought thrown out by the Senator from New Hampshire. I was going to suggest that we strike out, beginning with the words "investigate the methods," down to the word "shall," in line 11.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had my bill marked exactly in that way and was going to move that amendment, and I hope the Senator will offer it himself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will move the amendment, I am ready to accept it. Then I want to suggest an additional amendment at the close of paragraph 1, providing that any action taken by the Commissioner of Education to remove illiteracy among the enlisted men of the Army or Navy shall be undertaken only by the approval or direction of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively. That, I think, helps function his work in that line.

I think those two amendments, the one gathered from the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire and the other gathered from the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, improve the bill very substantially.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator does not himself offer the amendment on page 1, I will take the liberty of offering it now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, so far as I can speak for the committee, I accept it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to strike out, commencing after the word "Interior," in line 4, down to the word "devise," in line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has not been disposed of.

Mr. GALLINGER. I supposed it had been. Let it be acted upon first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 1, after the words "United States" and the comma, it is proposed to insert "to aid the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens, to," so that if amended it will read:

To aid the States in teaching English to aliens and naturalized citizens, to promote plans for the elimination of illiteracy—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now I ask that the amendment I offered be stated from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 4, after the word "Interior," it is proposed to strike out, commencing with the words "investigate the methods that have been," and so forth, down to and including the words "he shall," in line 11, so that if amended it will read:

That the Commissioner of Education shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, devise efficient and economic methods—

And so forth.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will ask the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Georgia

to a further amendment, which I think may be considered properly as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. After the word "shall," in line 11, I move to strike out the word "devise" and insert the following:

Cooperate with the educational authorities of the several States in devising.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the committee—I think wisely—has almost entirely excluded the cooperation of the States. For instance, the last proviso is:

Provided further, That the Commissioner of Education shall not undertake to promote the teaching of adult illiterates and men and women of meagre education in any State or Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, by cooperation or otherwise, without the written invitation—

Of the State authorities.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I read the bill, and I have noted that particular language. It refers to the promotion of teaching, and provides that it may not be promoted by Federal authority unless by consent of the State authorities. But, if the Senator will excuse me, the Federal authorities may devise plans and seek to impose those plans without first having consulted the State authorities in regard to what plans may be most adaptable to conditions in a particular State, and hence I thought that all plans and methods for the teaching of adult illiterates should be devised by cooperation between the Federal authorities and the State authorities.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator's proposed amendment comes after the amendment I have offered, after a word that will remain in the bill. I ask that the amendment I propose be acted upon, and then the Senator can offer his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Now, Mr. President, I move to strike out the word "devise," in line 11, on the first page, and insert "cooperate with the educational authorities of the several States in devising."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think we will object to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, for the life of me I can not see what real benefit this measure is going to be. Our educational systems are conducted under the supervision of the respective States. As I understand it, the only place in all of the United States or any of its outlying colonies or provinces where the Commissioner of Education has any authority is in Alaska. This money, \$100,000, is asked for for purposes of investigation—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; we have stricken out that provision.

Mr. CALDER. Well, even if it is stricken out, it provides for the spending of \$100,000 of the people's money, and little can be done in the way of actual education with that sum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. KING. The Senator will keep in mind the fact that the Senator having this bill in charge has stated that his committee already is considering two or three measures looking to the education of those who come back from the battle fields and who may need education and need vocational training, and also to prepare the aliens who come into our midst for citizenship and the duties and the responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I have that in mind, and intended to refer to it.

Mr. KING. The Senator will pardon me for mentioning it.

Mr. CALDER. I know there is grave need of something being done to give to many of our enlisted and drafted men the rudiments of an education. I know an officer who has had to do with the organization of a regiment in the South—a drafted regiment. He tells me that at least 10 per cent of the men drafted in this particular command were not able to read or write, and many of them had to place their marks opposite the pay roll when they were receiving their monthly pay from the Government. Now, if some scheme can be evolved whereby we can teach the men to read and write that we draft into our Army, I shall be very glad to vote for it; and, as the Senator from Utah suggests, whenever an arrangement is made to give an education, vocational or otherwise, to the men who come back wounded from the battle fields of France, then I shall be more than pleased to vote for a measure of that character.

The Senator refers to educating the alien, the man who is not familiar with our language when he arrives upon our shores. In the cities of my State, particularly in New York

City, we are working out that problem now. We have a series of night schools and of settlements, centers where every effort is being made to have the man of foreign birth and language understand just what America means, the things it stands for. We are educating these men there. It seems to me hardly necessary to pass this measure, and I doubt myself if it will be of any material value.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of moving to recommit this bill, but I will yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer, to come in at the close of section 1, the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1, after line 5, add the following proviso:

Provided, That any action taken by the Commissioner of Education to remove illiteracy among the enlisted men of the Army or Navy shall be undertaken only by the approval and direction of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has an amendment pending. Without objection, it will be agreed to. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be agreed to without objection.

Mr. KING. I have heretofore stated, Mr. President, that this measure is too narrow; that it does not accomplish the object which the Senators have in view. It is deceptive, not intentionally so, and misleading. With the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] it must be the purpose—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3771.

COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider 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. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hollis	New	Smoot
Beckham	James	Norris	Sterling
Caldor	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Thompson
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Tillman
Curtis	Kendrick	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	Konyon	Pittman	Trammell
Fall	King	Polindexter	Underwood
Fletcher	Knox	Ransdell	Vardaman
France	Lewis	Robinson	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Shafroth	Walsh
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Hale	McKellar	Sherman	Watson
Harding	McLean	Simmons	Wolcott
Hardwick	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Henderson	Martin	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] is detained on official business.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily detained on important public business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina to yield to me to offer a resolution. I was detained in the Committee on Finance during the morning hour and was not able to be present, as I had intended to be.

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose.

DAY OF PUBLIC HUMILIATION, PRAYER, AND FASTING.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer a concurrent resolution, and notwithstanding it is somewhat unusual to make the request, I ask that the resolution be read and that its consideration be immediately proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it being a duty peculiarly incumbent in a time of war humbly and devoutly to acknowledge our dependence on Almighty God, and to im-

plore His aid and protection, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to recommend a day of public humiliation, prayer, and fasting, to be observed by the people of the United States with religious solemnity and the offering of fervent supplications to Almighty God for the safety and welfare of our cause, His blessings on our arms, and a speedy restoration of an honorable and lasting peace to the nations of the earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was unanimously agreed to.

EDUCATION OF ADULT ILLITERATES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the Senator from North Carolina does not desire to press the unfinished business just at this time; and if that is the case, I should like to ask unanimous consent for action upon the bill which was before the Senate when the hour of 2 o'clock arrived.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know how long that would take. I should like to know that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we are about through with what we wish to say. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has stated he would move to recommit the bill. In reply I want to say that if the Senate is not willing to pass the bill, we might as well dispose of it. We have finished our work on it in committee and the Senate has completed its work on it in the Senate. I see no advantage from committing the bill. It has no relation, in my opinion, to any other measure pending before the committee. It stands entirely upon a basis of its own. It is for the Senate to determine whether it wishes to invest \$100,000 for the first year in enabling the Bureau of Education to cooperate with the forces of the War and the Navy Departments and with the forces in the States in seeking to remove illiteracy, to stimulate work among grown men and women who do not speak English to learn English. That is the object of the bill, and the only object.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire very much to go on with the unfinished business this afternoon, but there has been a discussion for an hour and a half on the bill which the Senator from Georgia has in charge. It looks to me like the discussion is about ended. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] tells me that he has two important bills that he desires to get up this afternoon. The chairman of the Committee on Finance also tells me that he has a conference report to present. Probably I ought to yield for that purpose, but I give notice to the Senate that this is the last time I am going to yield, except for a conference report or some bill that it is absolutely necessary to pass at once. I, therefore, shall ask temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business for the passage of the bill the Senator from Georgia has in charge and also the bills which the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has in charge and for the conference report which my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] wishes to present. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose, giving notice that when the bill comes up to-morrow I shall insist on its being kept before the Senate until it is disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if the passage of the bill which he has in charge is not of more interest to the people for the prosecution of the war than the two bills the Senator from Oregon has in charge?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know the character of those bills.

Mr. SMOOT. If so, I think it would be my duty and the duty of other Senators to object to laying the unfinished business aside.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am ready to go on with the unfinished business. I am anxious to go on with it, and I should like to have some one object.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, before I object, to state the provisions of the bills he desires to have acted upon at this time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The most important one is a bill involving a number of amendments to the national-defense act, which the War Department is quite anxious to have disposed of. The other bill, personally, I do not see is one of very great importance, and yet the Shipping Board feels that it ought to be passed. It is to enable the Shipping Board to acquire certain property that they have been unable to acquire, and they desire to acquire it in order that the shipbuilding program may be carried out.

Mr. SMOOT. I will then ask the Senator from North Carolina to make a request to lay the unfinished business aside temporarily for the consideration of these two bills.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the bill that has been before the Senate is not yet finished.

Mr. SMOOT. We can finish that to-morrow morning in the morning hour.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have been on it this morning, and I think it would be vastly better to go right on with that bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will insist on going on with the unfinished business. There seems to be some objection.

Mr. KING. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that I desire to submit a few additional remarks if the bill which the Senator from Georgia has in charge is placed before the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I see it will lead to considerable debate yet.

Mr. KING. I think so.

Mr. OVERMAN. Therefore I do not feel justified in yielding any further.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am quite anxious, as is the War Department, to get the bill I referred to acted on. It was my understanding that when the bill the Senator from North Carolina stands sponsor for was made the unfinished business he would lay it aside in order to finish the war measures. I am not sure the Record will sustain me, but there was a general understanding between the Senator and me that that course would be pursued.

Mr. OVERMAN. But there seems to be some objection. I would be very glad to yield to the Senator this afternoon, or to yield to him to-morrow, but there is some objection to taking up the bills now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will not insist on it.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] withdraws his request for the consideration of the bill which has been before the Senate, I will have no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall not insist on it.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall ask to-morrow that the bills may be disposed of.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of Senate bill 4185 with the amendments made this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 211).

Mr. SIMMONS. I submit a conference report upon Senate bill 3714, the so-called War Finance Corporation bill. I will state to the Senate that the House struck out all the Senate bill except the enacting clause and rewrote the bill with certain amendments. The conferees treated that as one amendment, so that we simply amend that one amendment. It would require the reading of the whole bill as amended. I will not ask for the reading of it now, but I will ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. PENROSE. Why not have it read now? It is a very important bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well, I have no objection, and on the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is the ranking minority member of the committee, I ask that the conference report be read.

Mr. PENROSE. I do not insist upon having the report read if the chairman of the committee does not consider it necessary, but clearly this is a bill of the highest importance, and it seems to me it ought not to be treated in a slipshod way.

Mr. SIMMONS. I had supposed that after we took up the conference report for consideration it would be read, but I see no objection to reading it now if the Senator from Pennsylvania desires.

Mr. STONE. It could be printed in the Record.

Mr. PENROSE. It will take only a few minutes to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read the conference report.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, 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 amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the House, insert the following:

TITLE I.—WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

That the Secretary of the Treasury and four additional persons (who shall be the directors first appointed as hereinafter provided), are hereby created a body corporate and politic in deed and in law by the name, style, and title of the "War Finance Corporation" (herein called the Corporation), and shall have succession for a period of 10 years: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Corporation exercise any of the powers conferred by this act, except such as are incidental to the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, after six months after the termination of the war, the date of such termination to be fixed by proclamation of the President of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the capital stock of the Corporation shall be \$500,000,000, all of which shall be subscribed by the United States of America, and such subscription shall be subject to call upon the vote of three-fifths of the board of directors of the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at such time or times as may be deemed advisable; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose of making payment upon such subscription when and as called. Receipts for payments by the United States of America for or on account of such stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be evidence of stock ownership.

SEC. 3. That the management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be chairman of the board, and four other persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association, in which he is directly or indirectly interested; and each director shall devote his time, not otherwise required by the business of the United States, principally to the business of the Corporation. Before entering upon his duties, each of the four directors so appointed, and each officer, shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed to prevent the appointment as a director of the Corporation of any officer or employee under the United States or of a director of a Federal reserve bank.

Of the four directors so appointed, the President of the United States shall designate two to serve for two years, and two for four years; and thereafter each director so appointed shall serve for four years. Whenever a vacancy shall occur among the directors so appointed, the person appointed director to fill an such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired term of the member whose place he is selected to fill. Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States. Three members of the board of directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 4. That the four directors of the Corporation appointed as hereinbefore provided shall receive annual salaries, payable monthly, of \$12,000. Any director receiving from the United States any salary or compensation for services shall not receive as salary from the Corporation any amount which, together with any salary or compensation received from the United States, would make the total amount paid to him by the United States and by the Corporation exceed \$12,000.

SEC. 5. That the principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors.

SEC. 6. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to purchase or lease and hold or dispose of such real estate as may be necessary for the prosecution of its business; to sue and be sued; to complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to appoint, by its board of directors, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as are necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, to define their duties, require bonds of them and fix the penalties thereof, and to dismiss at pleasure such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, by-laws regulating the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the privileges granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed, and prescribing the powers and duties of its officers and agents.

SEC. 7. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized to make advances, upon such terms, not inconsistent herewith, as it may prescribe, for periods not exceeding five years from the respective dates of such advances:

(1) To any bank, banker, or trust company, in the United States, which shall have made after April 6, 1917, and which shall have outstanding, any loan or loans to any person, firm, corporation, or association, conducting an established and going business in the United States, whose operations shall be necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and evidenced by a note or notes, but no such advance shall exceed 75 per cent of the face value of such loan or loans; and

(2) To any bank, banker, or trust company in the United States which shall have rendered financial assistance, directly or indirectly, to any such person, firm, corporation, or association by the purchase after April 6, 1917, of its bonds or other obligations, but no such advance shall exceed 75 per cent of the value of such bonds or other obligations at the time of such advance, as estimated and determined by the board of directors of the Corporation.

All advances shall be made upon the promissory note or notes of such bank, banker, or trust company, secured by the notes, bonds, or other obligations, which are the basis of any such advance by the Corporation, together with all the securities, if any, which such bank, banker, or trust company may hold as collateral for such notes, bonds, or other obligations.

The Corporation shall, however, have power to make advances: (a) up to 100 per cent of the face value of any such loan made by any such bank, banker, or trust company to any such person, firm, corporation, or association, and (b) up to 100 per cent of the value at the time of any such advance (as estimated and determined by the board of directors of the Corporation) of such bonds or other obligations by the purchase of which financial assistance shall have been rendered to such person, firm, corporation, or association: *Provided*, That every such advance shall be secured in the manner described in the preceding part of this section, and in addition thereto by collateral security, to be furnished by the bank, banker, or trust company, of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors, of a value, at the time of such advance (as estimated and determined by the board of directors of the Corporation), equal to at least 33 per cent of the amount advanced by the Corporation. The Corporation shall retain power to require additional security at any time.

SEC. 8. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized to make advances from time to time, upon such terms, not inconsistent herewith, as it may prescribe, for periods not exceeding one year, to any savings bank, banking institution, or trust company in the United States, which receives savings deposits, or to any building and loan association in the United States, on the promissory note or notes of the borrowing institution, whenever the Corporation shall deem such advances to be necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war or important in the public interest: *Provided*, That such note or notes shall be secured by the pledge of securities of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors of the Corporation, the value of which, at the time of such advance (as estimated and determined by the board of directors of the Corporation) shall be equal in amount to at least 133 per cent of the amount of such advance. The rate of interest charged on any such advance shall not be less than 1 per cent per annum in excess of the rate of discount for 90-day commercial paper prevailing at the time of such advance at the Federal reserve bank of the district in which the borrowing institution is located, but such rate of interest shall in no case be greater than the average rate receivable by the borrowing institution on its loans and investments made during the six months prior to the date of the advance, except that where the average rate so receivable by the borrowing institution is less than such rate of discount for 90-day commercial paper the rate of interest on such advance shall be equal to such rate of discount. The Corporation shall retain power to require additional security at any time.

SEC. 9. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized, in exceptional cases, to make advances directly to any person, firm, corporation, or association, conducting an established and going business in the United States, whose operations shall be necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war (but only for the purpose of conducting such business in the United States and only when in the opinion of the board of directors of the Corporation such person, firm, corporation, or

association is unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or from the general public), for periods not exceeding five years from the respective dates of such advances, upon such terms, and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the board of directors of the Corporation. In no case shall the aggregate amount of the advances made under this section exceed at any one time an amount equal to 12½ per cent of the sum of (1) the authorized capital stock of the Corporation plus (2) the aggregate amount of bonds of the Corporation authorized to be outstanding at any one time when the capital stock is fully paid in. Every such advance shall be secured by adequate security of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors of a value at the time of such advance (as estimated and determined by the board of directors), equal to (except in case of an advance made to a railroad in the possession and control of the President, for the purpose of making additions, betterments, or road extensions to such railroad) at least 125 per cent of the amount advanced by the Corporation. The Corporation shall retain power to require additional security at any time. The rate of interest charged on any such advance shall not be less than 1 per cent per annum in excess of the rate of discount for 90-day commercial paper prevailing at the time of such advance at the Federal reserve bank of the district in which the borrower is located.

SEC. 10. That in no case shall the aggregate amount of the advances made under this title to any one person, firm, corporation, or association exceed at any one time an amount equal to 10 per cent of the authorized capital stock of the Corporation, but this section shall not apply in the case of an advance made to a railroad in the possession and control of the President for the purpose of making additions, betterments, or road extensions to such railroad.

SEC. 11. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized to subscribe for, acquire, and own, buy, sell, and deal in bonds and obligations of the United States issued or converted after September 24, 1917, to such extent as the board of directors, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may from time to time determine.

SEC. 12. That the Corporation shall be empowered and authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time its bonds in an amount aggregating not more than six times its paid-in capital, such bonds to mature not less than one year nor more than five years from the respective dates of issue, and to bear such rate or rates of interest, and may be redeemable before maturity at the option of the Corporation, as may be determined by the board of directors, but such rate or rates of interest shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bonds shall have a first and paramount floating charge on all the assets of the Corporation, and the Corporation shall not at any time mortgage or pledge any of its assets. Such bonds may be issued at not less than par in payment of any advances authorized by this title, or may be offered for sale publicly or to any individual, firm, corporation, or association, at such price or prices, as the board of directors, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may determine.

Upon such terms not inconsistent herewith as may be determined from time to time by the board of directors, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at or before the issue thereof, any of such bonds may be issued payable in any foreign money or foreign moneys, or issued payable at the option of the respective holders thereof either in dollars or in any foreign money or foreign moneys at such fixed rate of exchange as may be stated in any such bonds. For the purpose of determining the amount of bonds issued payable in any foreign money or foreign moneys the dollar equivalent 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 entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 27, 1894.

SEC. 13. That the Federal reserve banks shall be authorized, subject to the maturity limitations of the Federal reserve act and to regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, to discount the direct obligations of member banks secured by such bonds of the Corporation and to rediscount eligible paper secured by such bonds and indorsed by a member bank. No discount or rediscount under this section shall be granted at a less interest charge than 1 per cent per annum above the prevailing rates for eligible commercial paper of corresponding maturity.

Any Federal reserve bank may, with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, use any obligation or paper so acquired for any purpose for which it is authorized to use obligations

or paper secured by bonds or notes of the United States not bearing the circulation privilege: *Provided, however,* That whenever Federal reserve notes are issued against the security of such obligations or paper the Federal Reserve Board may make a special interest charge on such notes, which, in the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board, need not be applicable to other Federal reserve notes which may from time to time be issued and outstanding. All provisions of law, not inconsistent herewith, in respect to the acquisition by any Federal reserve bank of obligations or paper secured by such bonds or notes of the United States, and in respect to Federal reserve notes issued against the security of such obligations or paper, shall extend, in so far as applicable, to the acquisition of obligations or paper secured by the bonds of the Corporation and to the Federal reserve notes issued against the security of such obligations or paper.

SEC. 14. That the Corporation shall not exercise any of the powers granted by this title or perform any business except such as is incidental and necessarily preliminary to its organization until it has been authorized by the President of the United States to commence business under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 15. That all net earnings of the Corporation not required for its operations shall be accumulated as a reserve fund until such time as the Corporation liquidates under the terms of this title. Such reserve fund shall, upon the direction of the board of directors, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be invested in bonds and obligations of the United States, issued or converted after September 24, 1917, or upon like direction and approval may be deposited in member banks of the Federal Reserve System, or in any of the Federal reserve banks, or be used from time to time, as well as any other funds of the Corporation, in the purchase or redemption of any bonds issued by the Corporation. The Federal reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries for and as fiscal agents of the Corporation in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Beginning six months after the termination of the war, the date of such termination to be fixed by a proclamation of the President of the United States, the directors of the Corporation shall proceed to liquidate its assets and to wind up its affairs, but the directors of the Corporation, in their discretion, may, from time to time, prior to such date, sell and dispose of any securities or other property acquired by the Corporation. Any balance remaining after the payment of all its debts shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved.

SEC. 16. That any and all bonds issued by the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority, except (a) estate or inheritance taxes, and (b) graduated additional income taxes, commonly known as surtaxes, and excess-profits and war-profits taxes, now or hereafter imposed by the United States, upon the income or profits of individuals, partnerships, corporations, or associations. The interest on an amount of such bonds the principal of which does not exceed in the aggregate \$5,000, owned by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, shall be exempt from the taxes referred to in clause (b). The Corporation, including its franchise and the capital and reserve or surplus thereof, and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, county, or municipal taxes to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 17. That the United States shall not be liable for the payment of any bond or other obligation or the interest thereon issued or incurred by the Corporation, nor shall it incur any liability in respect of any act or omission of the Corporation.

SEC. 18. That whoever (1) makes any statement, knowing it to be false, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any other person, firm, corporation, or association any advance under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

Whoever willfully overvalues any security by which any such advance is secured shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any bond, coupon, or paper in imitation of or purporting to be in imitation of a bond or coupon issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited bond, coupon, or paper purport-

ing to be issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely made, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any such bond, coupon, or paper; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes as true any falsely altered or spurious bond, coupon, or paper issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, or credits thereof, or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer of the Corporation, (a) makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of the Corporation, or (b) without authority from the directors draws any order or assigns any note, bond, draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to direct and use the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department to detect, arrest, and deliver into custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction any person committing any of the offenses punishable under this section.

SEC. 19. That the Corporation shall file quarterly reports with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, stating as of the first day of each month of the quarter just ended (1) the total amount of capital paid in, (2) the total amount of bonds issued, (3) the total amount of bonds outstanding, (4) the total amount of advances made under each of sections 7, 8, and 9, (5) a list of the classes and amount of securities taken under each of such sections, (6) the total amount of advances outstanding under each of sections 7, 8, and 9, and (7) such other information as may be hereafter required by either House of Congress.

The Corporation shall make a report to Congress on the first day of each regular session, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures.

SEC. 20. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby amended so as to read as follows: "Sec. 5202. No national banking association shall at any time be indebted, or in any way liable, to an amount exceeding the amount of its capital stock at such time actually paid in and remaining undiminished by losses or otherwise, except on account of demands of the nature following:

"First. Notes of circulation.

"Second. Moneys deposited with or collected by the association.

"Third. Bills of exchange or drafts drawn against money actually on deposit to the credit of the association, or due thereto.

"Fourth. Liabilities to the stockholders of the association for dividends and reserve profits.

"Fifth. Liabilities incurred under the provisions of the Federal reserve act.

"Sixth. Liabilities incurred under the provisions of the War Finance Corporation act."

TITLE II.—CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE.

SEC. 200. That there is hereby created a committee to be known as the "Capital Issues Committee," hereinafter called the Committee, and to be composed of seven members to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At least three of the members shall be members of the Federal Reserve Board.

No member, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Committee shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interest of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested. Before entering upon his duties, each member and officer shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed to prevent the appointment as a member of the Committee of any officer or employee under the United States or of a director of a Federal reserve bank.

The terms during which the several members of the Committee shall respectively hold office shall be determined by the President of the United States, and the compensation of the several members of the Committee who are not members of the Federal Reserve Board shall be \$7,500 per annum, payable monthly, but if any such member receives any other compensation from any office or employment under the United States the amount so received shall be deducted from such salary, and if such other compensation is \$7,500 or more, such member shall receive no salary as a member of the Committee. Any member shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States,

The President shall designate one of the members as chairman, but any subsequent vacancy in the chairmanship shall be filled by the Committee. Four members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Sec. 201. That the committee may employ and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys, agents, and other employees as may be deemed necessary to conduct its business, who shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883 (vol. 22, U. S. Stats. L., p. 403), and amendments thereto or any rules or regulations made in pursuance thereof. No such officer, attorney, agent, or employee shall receive more compensation than persons performing services of like or similar character under the Federal Reserve Board.

Sec. 202. That all the expenses of the committee, including all necessary expenses for transportation incurred by the members or by its officers, attorneys, agents, or employees under its orders in making an investigation or upon official business in any other places than at their respective headquarters, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman.

The committee may rent suitable offices for its use and purchase such furniture, equipment, and supplies as may be necessary, but shall not expend more than \$10,000 annually for offices in the District of Columbia.

The principal office of the committee shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise all its powers at any other place. The committee may, by one or more of its members, or by such agents as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its duties in any part of the United States.

Sec. 203. That the committee may, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by it from time to time, investigate, pass upon, and determine whether it is compatible with the national interest that there should be sold or offered for sale or for subscription any issue, or any part of any issue, of securities hereafter issued by any person, firm, corporation, or association, the total or aggregate par or face value of which issue and any other securities issued by the same person, firm, corporation, or association since the passage of this act is in excess of \$100,000. Shares of stock of any corporation or association without nominal or par value shall for the purpose of this section be deemed to be of the par value of \$100 each. Any securities which upon the date of the passage of this act are in the possession or control of the corporation, association, or obligor issuing the same shall be deemed to have been issued after the passage of this act within the meaning hereof.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize such committee to pass upon (1) any borrowing by any person, firm, corporation, or association in the ordinary course of business as distinguished from borrowing for capital purposes, (2) the renewing or refunding of indebtedness existing at the time of the passage of this act, (3) the resale of any securities the sale or offering of which the committee has determined to be compatible with the national interest, (4) any securities issued by any railroad corporation the property of which may be in the possession and control of the President of the United States, or (5) any bonds issued by the War Finance Corporation.

Nothing done or omitted by the committee hereunder shall be construed as carrying the approval of the committee or of the United States of the legality, validity, worth, or security of any securities.

Sec. 204. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$200,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the committee, including the payment of the salaries and rents herein authorized.

Sec. 205. That the committee shall make a report to Congress on the first day of each regular session, including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures, and also including the names of all officers and employees and the salary paid to each.

Sec. 206. That this title shall continue in effect until, but not after, the expiration of six months after the termination of the war, the date of such termination to be determined by a proclamation of the President of the United States, but the President may at any time by proclamation declare that this title is no longer necessary, and thereupon it shall cease to be in effect.

TITLE III.—MISCELLANEOUS.

Sec. 300. That whoever willfully violates any of the provisions of this act, except where a different penalty is provided in this act, shall, upon conviction in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both; and whoever

knowingly participates in any such violation, except where a different penalty is provided in this act, shall be punished by a like fine or imprisonment, or both.

Sec. 301. That no stamp tax shall be required or imposed upon a promissory note secured by the pledge of bonds or obligations of the United States issues after April 24, 1917, or secured by the pledge of a promissory note which itself is secured by the pledge of such bonds or obligations: *Provided*, That in either case the par value of such bonds or obligations shall equal the amount of such note.

Sec. 302. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, or, in case any court of competent jurisdiction shall adjudge to be invalid any provisions hereof in respect of any class or classes of securities, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, part, or subject matter of this act directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Sec. 303. That the term "securities," as used in this act, includes stocks, shares of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes, certificates of indebtedness, and other obligations.

Sec. 304. That the right to amend, alter, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Sec. 305. That the short title of this act shall be the "War Finance Corporation act."

Sec. 306. That all provisions of any act or acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Amend the title to read as follows: "An act to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

F. M. SIMMONS,
WM. J. STONE,
JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
BOIES PENROSE,
H. C. LODGE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,
HENRY T. RAINEY,
LINCOLN DIXON,
J. HAMPTON MOORE,
WILLIAM R. GREEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] does not object, I think it will take only a few minutes to dispose of this conference report. I should be glad if he would ask unanimous consent to have temporarily laid aside the bill which he has charge in order that we may take up for present consideration the conference report which has just been read.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, has stated, he had an understanding with me that I would allow him to take up certain military bills for which he desires consideration, but I think the conference report for which my colleague asks consideration is a very important one and ought to be adopted at once. I therefore desire to state that I shall yield to him and also to the Senator from Oregon, and that I shall call up the bill which I have in charge and ask that it be proceeded with regularly on to-morrow. I now ask unanimous consent that it be laid aside temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries, enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, after conference with a great many Members of the Senate, I feel confident that it is only necessary for me to make a very brief statement outlining the changes which have been made in the House substitute by the conferees. I shall therefore detain the Senate but a few minutes for that purpose.

As I stated when I presented the conference report, the House struck out all of the Senate bill except the enacting clause and rewrote the bill. I am advised that the House pursued this course because, in the judgment of the committee of that body having the bill in charge, it contained one provision, namely, the provision which imposes certain taxes upon the bonds of the corporation, which would affect the revenues of the Government. Naturally the House is more or less sensitive of any invasion of its right to originate legislation to raise revenues, and it was thought that by striking out all except the enacting clause and rewriting the bill, with such amendments as the House might see fit to make, this difficulty would be removed. That is the reason, as I understand it, why the usual course of specifically amending the Senate bill was not pursued in this instance. The action of the House in thus rewriting the bill made it necessary, when the matter came into conference, to treat the entire House substitute as one amendment, and to make such changes in that amendment as the conferees should agree upon. In other words, treating the House substitute as one amendment, we agree to it with various and sundry amendments, and the conference is the substitute as thus amended.

A great many changes were made by the House in the Senate bill, but most of them were of minor importance; some of them changes and corrections in phraseology, some transpositions, some for clarification and greater certainty of meaning without material change in substance. In addition to these minor amendments the House made quite a number of amendments of more or less importance, some of them materially changing important provisions of the Senate bill. The House also added several new sections dealing with matters not embraced in the Senate at all but altogether unobjectionable. One of these latter amendments authorizes the capital issues committee to rent suitable offices for its use and to purchase furniture, equipment, and supplies, as may be necessary, and appropriating money to pay the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the committee for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1918 and 1919. This was a proper amendment, although the purpose might have just as well been accomplished in one of the general appropriation bills.

Another amendment of this character was one providing that there shall be no stamp tax imposed upon promissory notes secured by these bonds or by liberty bonds. That, I think, is a very wise and necessary provision, because there has been a great deal of irritation heretofore in connection with advances on the liberty bonds on account of this tax.

As I stated, in addition to these minor amendments, the House substitute made a number of important changes in the Senate bill, some of which the conferees agreed to and disagreed to others. There was a manifest desire and effort on the part of the conferees to make a good bill without pride of opinion in the action of their respective Houses.

Now, Mr. President, in order not to take too much of the time of the Senate, I will state very briefly the more important amendments made by the conferees to the House substitute. The House substitute provided:

Not more than three of the five directors shall be members of the same political party.

The conferees struck that provision out of the bill. The House substitute provided:

And each director shall devote to the business of the Corporation all of his time not devoted to the business of the United States.

The conferees changed that provision, so that it reads as follows:

And each director shall devote his time, not otherwise required by the business of the United States, principally to the business of the Corporation.

In the savings-bank section of the substitute the conferees made an addition to the House provision, requiring that the rate of interest shall be not less than 1 per cent per annum in excess of the rate for 90-day commercial paper. The Senate had fixed this rate at one-half of 1 per cent; the House raised it to 1 per cent. The conferees retained the House rate of 1 per cent, but added the following:

But such rate of interest shall in no case be greater than the average rate receivable by the borrowing institution on its loans and investments made during the six months prior to the date of the advance, except that where the average rate so receivable by the borrowing institution is less than such rate of discount for 90-day commercial paper the rate of interest on such advance shall be equal to such rate of discount.

That was done, Mr. President, because it was contended before the conference, as it had been before the Senate committee, that in some instances, especially in New England, the savings banks sometimes loan at a less rate than the rate fixed by the Federal Reserve Board for commercial paper running for 90 days. I believe the rate in some of the districts to-day is as

high as 5 per cent, and it may go much higher than that. It was shown to us that in some instances savings banks loaned at a lower rate than that. The purpose of this provision was that the corporation might be permitted to charge whatever might be the average charged by the savings institution during the six months prior to the advance, provided that it was not less than the rate fixed by the Federal Reserve Board for 90-day commercial paper.

The House bill provided that the corporations could make these direct advances—that is, advances not through the medium of the banks provided for in section 9, known as the exception-cases clause—to such persons, firms, corporations, or associations only when they were unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or from the general public. It was said that that might sometimes entail delay in making loans that were of immediate necessity, especially in connection with the Government's war work; that the borrowing concern would have to try the banks, have to try the investment public, and would not be permitted to come to the corporation until they had tested these out. To avoid that difficulty, the conferees added the following:

When in the opinion of the board of directors of the Corporation such person, firm—

And so forth, were unable to obtain these advances through banking channels or the general public, thus leaving the determination of that question to the judgment of the board of directors.

The House bill provided that the aggregate amount of such advances should not exceed at any one time an amount equal to 16½ per cent of the sum of (1) the paid-in capital stock of the Corporation at such time, plus (2) the aggregate amount of bonds of the Corporation authorized to be outstanding at such time. It was very clearly shown to the committee that under this provision it might be possible that the Corporation in the beginning could not loan to all applicants an amount exceeding about \$60,000,000, a wholly inadequate sum. The conferees amended that section of the House bill so that it reads, in effect:

That the aggregate amount of such advances at one time shall not exceed an amount equal to 12½ per cent of (1) the total authorized capital, \$500,000,000, plus (2) the total amount of bonds authorized, that being six times the authorized capital.

So that under this direct-advance clause, spoken of, I believe, in the debates heretofore as the exceptional-cases clause, about which we had so much controversy both in the Senate and in the House, it will be impossible for the Corporation to loan an amount exceeding \$437,500,000.

The House bill provided that no direct advance should be made that are not secured by adequate security of such character as shall be prescribed by the board of directors, of a value at the time of such advance equal to at least 133 per cent of the amount advanced by the Corporation. The conferees changed this so as to allow advances to be made when the security offered shall, in the opinion of the directors, equal at least 125 per cent of such advance. Railroads under the control of the President are excepted from the 125 per cent requirement for advances made to them for the purpose of improvements, betterments, or extensions; but in the case of the railroads, as in other cases under this section, the security must be adequate, the question of adequacy being left to the determination of the board of directors.

The House bill provides that no advance, whether direct or indirect, in excess of 10 per cent of the authorized stock of the corporation shall be made to any one person, firm, corporation, or association. The conference excepted from this provision advances made to railroads in the possession and in the control of the President for the purpose of making additions, betterments, and road extensions. With that exception, the corporation will not be permitted under this amendment to loan to any one firm, corporation, or association an amount in excess of 10 per cent, which would be, of course, not more than \$50,000,000.

It was thought, Mr. President, that in the circumstances a railroad might require and it might be greatly to the interest of the Government that it should have, and have speedily, a larger sum of money than that; and for that it was thought expedient to exempt them from the 125 per cent requirement when the money to be advanced was to be specifically devoted and employed for betterments and extensions.

The House provided that bonds may be issued by the corporation to an amount aggregating not more than four times the paid-in capital stock, or \$2,000,000,000. The Senate bill provided for an issue of four billions of bonds. Both the House conferees and the Senate conferees were very much wedded to the action of their respective bodies, and we had a great deal

of trouble in getting together on this provision. Finally we did what is almost invariably done in such circumstances. We split the difference, so to speak, and fixed the amount of bonds that may be issued by the corporation at \$3,000,000,000.

The House bill provided that the bonds could not be sold at a price less than par. The conferees provided that the bonds could be sold at such prices as the board of directors, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, might prescribe. This was thought of great importance by the Secretary of the Treasury, as it might in some condition be an embarrassing handicap if the corporation was not permitted under any circumstances to sell these bonds except at face value.

The House bill contained the limitation that no discount or rediscount should be made by a Federal reserve bank of paper secured by the bonds of the corporation unless the member bank seeking the advance satisfied the Federal reserve bank that it had exhausted its commercial paper eligible for discount or rediscount under the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board. That is to say, that before a member bank, having made advances to these war industries, would be permitted to borrow on the security for those advances it would have to show affirmatively that it did not have in its portfolio, so to speak, eligible commercial paper upon which it might secure the loans it desired. The conferees eliminated that provision from the bill.

Mr. President, I think I have enumerated the changes of major importance made by the conferees in the House substitute. I will not detain the Senate to discuss the other changes, unless some Senator directs my attention to some change upon which he wishes an explanation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina two questions about section 203. I do not do it with any idea of opposing the conference report, for, as I understand, the section was not in dispute, although in its present form it may have been reenacted by the House; but I have had some inquiries with regard to it, and I think it would be helpful to the country if the Senator from North Carolina would now state his interpretation of this section. The section reads in this way:

That the Committee—

That is, the Capital Issues Committee—

may, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by it from time to time, investigate, pass upon, and determine whether it is compatible with the national interest that there should be sold or offered for sale or for subscription any issue, or any part of any issue, of securities hereafter issued by any person, firm, corporation, or association, the total or aggregate par or face value of which issue and any other securities issued by the same person, firm, corporation, or association since the passage of this act is in excess of \$100,000.

I assume that it is not intended to restrict the right of a State to issue securities in excess of \$100,000. I assume it because I can not conceive how the word "corporation" could properly apply to a political sovereignty of that kind; but I ask the Senator from North Carolina to state to the Senate and to the country whether it is the intent of the committee that municipal corporations—namely, cities, counties, school districts, and other public districts—are prohibited from issuing securities under this section?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator I will say that it was the view of the committee that so far as the State, the sovereign, was concerned, there could be no restrictions imposed upon its issuing bonds; but I think, on the other hand, so far as the local municipalities are concerned, such as the counties and the cities, probably they are among the chief agents that are issuing securities for the purpose of constructive work or improvements of a character that might well, in the interest of the public, in the circumstances which surround us, be postponed until after the war; and I think it is the expectation that this committee would, so far as the issues by these municipal corporations are concerned, take appropriate action as provided in the section to which the Senator refers. Of course, that action would be a mere expression of the opinion of the committee as to these securities; that is all. The committee has no power to prohibit their issue. It only has the power to investigate, and if as a result of its investigations it finds that the purpose of the issue is not emergent but one which could be as well postponed until after the war, it would find and express its opinion that the issue was not compatible with the public interest. I think that was the understanding of the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I doubt very much whether the language used will bring these public instrumentalities, such as cities and counties, and other public corporations of that character, within the terms of the statute; but I wanted very much to have the view of the Senator from North Carolina in order that they might accompany the enactment of the statute.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that I think the thought of the committee was—and we discussed this matter in the presence of the chairman of the present capital issues committee, the voluntary committee that is now organized in the Federal Reserve Board—I think his thought and the thought of the committee was that wherever an issue was thought to be necessary in the interests of health of the community or any other vital purpose of public concern, and that the improvement could not be postponed until after the war without serious injury to that community or public, they would interfere; but in case they felt that it could be postponed later without inflicting any special damage or serious injury to the community involved they would not be favorably disposed toward such an issue.

Mr. CUMMINS. That, Mr. President, would hardly reach the actual situation. The question is whether these public agencies will feel it necessary, being patriotic, to submit their issues to the Capital Issues Committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think there will be no trouble about that, because I understand that even now, with this committee operating only as a voluntary organization, it is almost impossible to float securities on the market unless they are favorably passed upon. The same rule is applied to securities issued by municipalities that apply to securities issued by individuals. Of course if any bank or any investor sees fit to disregard the advice of the Capital Issues Committee there is no punishment imposed and no prohibition.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator understand that there is no penalty attached for disobedience or disregard of the order?

Mr. SIMMONS. None.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is the Senator quite sure about that?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am quite sure about it.

Mr. CUMMINS. This section provides that the committee shall determine whether it is compatible with the national interest that the issue shall be made.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. And then section 300 provides that whoever willfully violates any of the provisions of this act, except where a different penalty is provided in this act, shall upon conviction, and so forth, be punished as provided. Now, when you take that in connection with the right of the committee to make rules and regulations and to determine whether or not a particular issue is compatible with the national interest, to me it is not quite clear that one who offers on the market these securities, after the adverse determination of the committee had been declared, is not violating the law.

Mr. SIMMONS. If there were a provision to the effect that the committee having decided that the issuance of these securities was not compatible with the public interest, anybody issuing them after that should be punished; if the bill contained a prohibition against the issue of these securities found by the committee to be incompatible with the public interest, then the position of the Senator, of course, would be correct. There is, however, no such provision. It merely says that this committee shall investigate and determine; but there is no declaration that anybody shall be bound by their determination, or that anybody shall be punished if he disregards their determination. It stops right there, and therefore there is no provision in the bill imposing a penalty for a disregard of the finding of the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is quite important to a good many communities to have that point perfectly clear. For instance, in my own city there is being organized at this time a trust company or a banking company known as the Fidelity Trust Co. It offers its stock, not on the general market, but to the citizens of that community; and they have been told, not officially, that if they offer their stock to the people of that community, and the committee here should take cognizance of the matter and determine that it was contrary to the public interest, anyone who participated in that enterprise would become a violator of the law.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I do not think any member of the committee placed that interpretation upon this provision; and personally I have no doubt in the world that the Senator's apprehensions are unfounded. The provision to which he refers is: "Anyone violating any of the provisions of this bill."

If there had been a provision prohibiting the issue after the committee had passed adversely upon it, then, of course, that would have brought the offender within the terms of the penal clause; but there is absolutely nothing in the bill, either in this section or in any other section, that requires or commands that any citizen of the country shall observe the findings of this board. The findings are merely persuasive. Their value depends upon

the effect which their findings shall have upon the investing public. If the investing public sees fit to disregard their findings, that is the end of the business.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, section 9, which is the penalty clause, is practically as it was adopted in the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is true. I think the Senator from Massachusetts, who is an honored member of the Finance Committee, and also is a member of the conference committee, will bear me out in the statement that not a member of the committee supposed that that section would cover the case to which the Senator from Iowa refers.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is safe to say that neither the conferees of the House nor the conferees of the Senate would have signed the report if they had supposed it would.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not wish to obstruct the passage of the bill. I merely wish to make a brief comment upon one clause of it.

I observe, on page 10, in section 302, a term which has been used with more or less frequency in the bills passing the Congress:

That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, or, in case any court of competent jurisdiction shall adjudge to be invalid any provisions hereof in respect of any class or classes of securities, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, part, or subject matter of this act directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

The effect of that language is an apparent concession that the courts have a right to declare invalid acts of Congress or parts of acts of Congress. I do not assent to that doctrine. I protest against that doctrine. While I shall make no point about this particular measure, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the power of courts to pass upon acts of Congress is a statutory power, not a constitutional power. They have no right to pass upon the validity of an act of Congress on the ground that it is unconstitutional. The only bodies in the United States that are charged with the right and the duty and the power of passing upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress are the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, whose Members have taken an oath to observe the Constitution of the United States. Congress, and Congress alone, has that right and has that power, and ought to exercise it.

I am not unaware of the fact that courts have in several instances declared acts of Congress unconstitutional; but they have never done so, perhaps with a single exception, where the court itself was not in error, and they have never done so without mischievous consequences following the action of the court. I shall not detain the Senate to enumerate these cases.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I know there are many lawyers in this country who will agree with the contention of the Senator from Oklahoma, the chief justice of my State, I think, does; but for many years, ever since the foundation of the Government, I might say, the Supreme Court of the United States has been exercising the right to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional, and we have to act upon the state of facts as it actually exists and not upon a state of facts that any individual or number of individuals think ought to be.

Mr. OWEN. It would be perfectly proper for Congress if they anticipated any attitude of that kind on behalf of the courts to put in this act a provision that no case in which the constitutionality of the act or any part of it was brought in question should be permitted to go before the court; that none of the statutory courts should be permitted to pass upon the question of constitutionality, and that no appeal should lie in any such instance to the Supreme Court of the United States. That would end it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not agree with the Senator that that would end it. I think we can not take away from the courts the jurisdiction they claim upon a question of that sort by legislative enactment. The only way you can possibly do it, in my judgment, is by amending the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is very much mistaken in regard to the matter of interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court itself. In the case of *McCardle*, in 1868, the Supreme Court decided by unanimous opinion that Congress had the power to withdraw from the court jurisdiction to pass upon the constitutionality of an act which was then pending before the court. It has sustained this interpretation in a number of other cases, as in *Wisart v. Dauchey*, 3 Dall. 321 (1796); *Dourousseau v. U. S.*, 6 Cranch., 307 (1810); *U. S. v. Gordon*, 7 Cranch., 287 (1813); *Daniels v. C., R. I. & P. R. R.*, 3 Wall., 250 (1865); *In re McCardle*, 7 Wall., 510 (1868); *Nat. Ex. Bk. v. Peters*, 144 U. S., 570 (1891); *Col. C. C. M. Co. v. Turck*, 150 U. S., 138 (1893).

I merely desire to put in the Record these observations, because I think the time has come when the people of the United States should not permit any court to invalidate an act of Congress. I think the Congress of the United States and the Senate of the United States owes it in their representative capacity to the people of the United States not to permit a court which is not subject to the control of the people of the United States to pass upon the validity of the statutes of the United States. That is a power which is in the Congress of the United States alone, and it ought to be exercised by the Congress of the United States alone.

The Senator says it has been the uniform practice since the foundation of the Government, or for over 100 years. I deny that. The only case of any importance up to 1856 was the case of slavery. In that case the Supreme Court held that slavery was a constitutional right, and it was one of the great factors that led us into a bloody Civil War, because at that time it was not understood that the opinion of the Supreme Court was a violation itself of the Constitution. It was not at that time understood how the Supreme Court could be controlled by congressional action. It was not at that time understood that there was a remedy in the hands of the people of the United States. Of course, we could not amend the Constitution of the United States with one-fourth of the States committed to slavery, and the moral question arose in which the Supreme Court held that slavery was a constitutional right. A moral question arose, and the only way by which it could be settled was by the States that did not assent to the opinion of the larger part of the country with regard to that question withdrawing from the Union. When they did, the question of the preservation of the Union arose. That question necessitated militarism, and the importance of the Union as a means of cooperative strength.

The Supreme Court, from the time of *Marbury* against *Madison*, at the beginning of the last century, did not repeat that error in a single case for over 50 years. It is only since the war that they have in a number of instances made the error, just as they declared the greenback law invalid, and there the Government of the United States was driven to the extraordinary remedy of putting additional members on the Supreme Court to have the court reverse itself, which was done by President Grant.

I merely rose to voice my protest against a tacit recognition of this false principle, that is all. I am content with that going into the Record.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate this afternoon, or during the consideration of this conference report, on one phase of the bill itself creating the War Finance Corporation. I did not intend to discuss the report itself, which I signed. The particular phase of the bill to which I had intended to address myself was discussed during the consideration of the bill some time ago in the Senate. It was then asserted on both sides of the Chamber that this Finance Corporation would be in effect a great central bank, and that the reserve banks would be little more than branches of that central organization. I had intended to state my views on that subject during the consideration of this report. I am in absolute and unreserved antagonism to any such position as that stated, and I was desirous of placing my view as clearly as I could in the Record that it might stand there as at least expressive of my attitude, even though it might accomplish no other end.

But, Mr. President, it looks now as if we may dispose of this conference report at once, and while in a sense I feel a personal disappointment in waiving my privilege of making the speech I intended and desired to make, I do so cheerfully, for I have always felt, as I do in this instance, that the passage of an important measure is of greater public moment than any speech it would be possible for me to make. I am gratified at the prospect of the immediate disposal of this measure, and out of the fear that if I ventured upon the discussion I had in mind it might provoke a controversy more or less prolonged, I refrain, and pocket that speech, as I have many others, that I might help to put forward the speedy conclusion of legislation in the public interest. I back away to the end that this important business may be promptly disposed of. The speech can better wait than the swift passage of the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF WAR—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, strike out all after the word "Senate," in line 10 of the engrossed bill, down to and including "year," in line 11 of said bill, and insert a period and the following: "The Assistant Secretary shall be entitled to a salary of \$5,000 per annum, payable monthly, and the Second Assistant Secretary and Third Assistant Secretary shall each be entitled to a salary of \$4,500 per annum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
F. E. WARREN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. H. DENT, JR.,
W. J. FIELDS,
D. R. ANTHONY, JR.,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4138) to amend certain sections of the 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.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KING. I should like to know what the bill is, anyway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, and read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 10, 13, 22, 24, 28, 31, 42, 51, 55, 69, 111, and 125 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, be, and the same hereby are, amended as hereinafter indicated in section 1 of this act:

Section 10, by striking out the word "farrier" wherever it occurs in said section and substituting therefor the words "stable sergeant"; changing the period at the end of the second paragraph of said section to a colon and adding the following: "And provided further, That any person who at the time of the approval of this act shall be and has been an officer of the Medical Reserve Corps, or contract surgeon, on active duty for 12 years subsequent to 1898 shall be eligible for appointment as first lieutenant in the Medical Corps, subject to examination: And provided further, That any officer so eligible who fails to pass the physical examination by reason of disability incurred in line of duty shall be retired with the pay and allowances of a first lieutenant of the Medical Corps"; and by striking out the eighth proviso of the third paragraph of said section.

Section 13 to read as follows:

"Sec. 13. The Signal Corps: The Signal Corps shall consist of 1 Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, 3 colonels, 8 lieutenant colonels, 10 majors, 30 captains, 75 first lieutenants; and the aviation section, which shall consist of 1 colonel, 1 lieutenant colonel, 8 majors, 24 captains, and 114 first lieutenants, who shall be selected from among officers of the Army at large of corresponding grades or from among officers of the grade below, exclusive of those serving by detail in staff corps or departments, who are qualified as military aviators, and shall be detailed to serve as aviation officers for periods of four years unless sooner relieved; and the provisions of section 27 of the act of Congress approved February 2, 1901, are hereby extended to apply to said aviation officers and to vacancies created in any arm, corps, or department of the Army by the detail of said officers therefrom; but nothing in said act or in any other law now in force shall be held to prevent the detail or redetail at any time, to fill a vacancy among the aviation officers authorized by this act, of any officer who, during prior service as an aviation officer of the aviation section, shall have become proficient in military aviation.

"Aviation officers may, when qualified therefor, be rated as junior military aviators or as military aviators, but no person shall be so rated until there shall have been issued to him a certificate to the effect that he is qualified for the rating, and no certificate shall be issued to any person until an aviation examining board, which shall be composed of three officers of experience in the aviation service and two medical officers, shall have examined him, under general regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War and published to the Army by the War Department, and shall have reported him to be qualified for the rating. No person shall receive the rating of military aviator until he shall have served creditably for three years as an aviation officer with the rating of a junior military aviator.

"Each aviation officer authorized by this act shall, while on duty that requires him to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, receive an increase of 25 per cent in the pay of his grade and length of service under his commission. Each duly qualified junior military aviator shall, while so serving, have the rank, pay, and allowances of one grade higher than that held by him under his commission if his rank under said commission be not higher than that of captain, and while on duty requiring him to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights he shall receive in addition an increase of 50 per cent in the pay of his grade and length of service under his commission. Each military aviator shall, while so serving, have the rank, pay and allowances of one grade higher than that held by him under his commission if his rank under said commission be not higher than that of captain, and while on duty requiring him to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights he shall receive in addition an increase of 75 per cent of the pay of his grade and length of service under his commission.

Mr. KING. I desire to inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge whether that increased compensation applies to those who are engaged in flying at the cantonments and fields here at home?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was not following the Secretary very closely.

Mr. KING. I do not have a copy of the bill before me, but it is the provision in which aviators receive additional compensation when engaged in aerial flights.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is exactly as the law provides. The bill has not changed the law at all. All of pages 4, 5, and 6, down to line 21, are the law as it is to-day. There is no change at all. The change which is made in that section which it is proposed to amend occurs on page 6, beginning at line 21, which provides that "enlisted men of the Signal Corps who are now qualified or who may hereafter qualify as expert military telegraphers shall receive \$5 a month," and so forth. That is the only change in the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed the reading, and read as follows:

"The provisions of the act March 2, 1913, allowing increase of pay and allowances to officers detailed by the Secretary of War on aviation duty, are hereby repealed. Hereafter married officers of the line of the Army shall be eligible equally with unmarried officers, and subject to the same conditions, for detail to aviation duty; and the Secretary of War shall have authority to cause as many enlisted men of the aviation section to be instructed in the art of flying as he may deem necessary; and hereafter the age of officers shall not be a bar to their first detail in the aviation section of the Signal Corps, and neither their age nor their rank shall be a bar to their subsequent details in said section; and when it shall be impracticable to obtain from the Army officers suitable for the aviation section of the Signal Corps in the number allowed by law the difference between that number and the number of suitable officers actually available for duty in said section may be made up by appointments in the grade of aviator, Signal Corps, and that grade is hereby created. The personnel of said grade shall be obtained from especially qualified civilians who shall be appointed and commissioned in said grade, but whenever any aviator shall have become unsatisfactory he shall be discharged from the Army as such aviator. The base pay of an aviator, Signal Corps, shall be \$150 per month, and he shall have the allowances of a master signal electrician and the same percentage of increase in pay for length of service as is allowed to a master signal electrician.

"The total enlisted strength of the Signal Corps shall be limited and fixed from time to time by the President in accordance with the needs of the Army, and shall consist of master signal electricians; sergeants, first class; sergeants; corporals; cooks; horseshoers; privates, first class; and privates; the number in each grade being fixed from time to time by the President. The numbers in the various grades shall not exceed the following percentages of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Signal Corps, namely: Master signal electricians, 2 per cent; sergeants, first class, 7 per cent; sergeants, 10 per cent; corporals, 20 per cent; privates, first class, 45 per cent; and privates, 16 per cent. Authority is hereby given the President to organize, in his discretion, such part of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Signal Corps into such number of companies, battalions, and aero squadrons as the necessities of the service may demand. Enlisted men of the Signal Corps who are now qualified, or who may hereafter qualify, as expert military telegraphers, shall receive \$5 a month; as first-class military telegraphers, \$3 a month; as military telegraphers, \$2 a month; all in addition to their pay, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, but no enlisted man shall receive at the same time additional pay for more than one of the classifications named."

Section 22 by striking out the period at the end thereof, substituting therefor a colon, and adding thereto the following: "Provided, That one of the enlisted men at each main recruiting station who has been detached for duty at such station under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 2, 1901, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a first sergeant of Infantry."

Section 24 by amending all that part of the second paragraph thereof down to the first proviso in said paragraph to read as follows:

"Vacancies in the grade of second lieutenant, however arising, in any fiscal year shall be filled by appointment in the following order:

(1) Of cadets graduated from the United States Military Academy during the preceding fiscal year for whom vacancies did not become available during the fiscal year in which they were graduated; (2) under the provisions of existing law of enlisted men, including officers of Philippine Scouts, between the ages of 21 and 34 years whose fitness for promotion shall have been determined by competitive examination; and of members, including officers, of the Organized Militia, the National Guard, or Naval Militia, between the ages of 21 and 34 years who have had at least 90 days' actual Federal military service during the calendar year 1916 or subsequent thereto and whose fitness for promotion shall have been determined by examination; (3) of commissioned officers of the National Guard between the ages of 21 and 27 years not otherwise provided for herein; (4) of members of the Officers' Reserve Corps between the ages of 21 and 27 years; (5) of such honor graduates between the ages of 21 and 27 years of distinguished colleges as are now or may hereafter be entitled to preference by general orders of the War Department; and (6) of candidates from civil life between the ages of 21 and 27 years; and the President is authorized to make the necessary rules and regulations to carry these provisions into effect"; by inserting after the second proviso thereof the following: "Provided further, That the President is hereby authorized to waive the maximum age limit prescribed by law for appointment as second lieutenant in the Regular Army in the case of any candidate for such appointment who has successfully completed or who may hereafter successfully complete the required examination for such appointment before arriving at the prescribed maximum age limit; but no appointment of any such candidate shall be made to any vacancy which did not exist upon the date he successfully completed the required examination for appointment; and persons appointed under the provisions of this proviso shall be appointed with the rank and

date of rank with which they would have been appointed if their appointment had not been prevented by reason of the maximum age limit prescribed by law."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest an amendment, at the end of line 7, to insert:

And by amending the last proviso of said section by substituting the word "colonel" for the word "major" therein.

I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On what page?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On page 9. It simply gives the rank of colonel to a retired officer instead of major, as the law now provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to without objection. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, as follows:

Section 28 to read as follows:

"Sec. 28. Pay of certain enlisted men: Hereafter the monthly pay of enlisted men of certain grades of the Army created in this act shall be as follows, namely: Quartermaster sergeant, senior grade, Quartermaster Corps; master hospital sergeant, Medical Department; master engineer, senior grade, Corps of Engineers; and band leader, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers, \$75; hospital sergeant, Medical Department; and master engineer, junior grade, Corps of Engineers, \$65; sergeant, first class, Medical Department, \$50; ordnance sergeant, Ordnance Department; quartermaster sergeant, Quartermaster Corps; sergeant, first class, Corps of Engineers; regimental supply sergeant, Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; battalion supply sergeant, Corps of Engineers and separate battalion of any arm or branch; and assistant engineer, Coast Artillery Corps, \$45; assistant band leader, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers, and sergeant bugler, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers, \$40; stable sergeant, Medical Department; musician, first class, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; supply sergeant, mess sergeant, and stable sergeant, Corps of Engineers; sergeant, Medical Department, \$36; supply sergeant, Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery; mess sergeant, Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery; cook, Medical Department and Ordnance Department; horse-shoer, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, Corps of Engineers, Signal Corps, and Medical Department; stable sergeant, Infantry and Cavalry; radio sergeant, Coast Artillery Corps; motor sergeant of any arm or branch; and musician, second class, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers, \$30; chief mechanic, Infantry and Cavalry; chauffeur, first class, of any arm or branch; musician, third class, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; corporal bugler, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; corporal, Medical Department, \$24; saddler, Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, Corps of Engineers, and Medical Department; bugler, first class, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; mechanic, Infantry, Cavalry, Field Artillery, and Medical Department; chauffeur of any arm or branch; and wagoner, Infantry, Field Artillery, and Corps of Engineers, \$21; assistant chauffeur of any arm or branch; bugler, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and Corps of Engineers; and private, first class, Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, Medical Department, and Ordnance Department, \$18; private, Medical Department and Ordnance Department, \$15.

"So much of the act approved July 24, 1917, as authorizes the grade of chauffeur, first class, with pay and allowances of a sergeant, first class, in the Signal Corps, and the grade of chauffeur with the pay and allowances of a sergeant in the Signal Corps, is hereby repealed, but nothing herein contained shall operate to reduce the pay or allowances of any soldier appointed to either of those grades prior to the date of the approval of this act, or to reduce the pay or allowances now authorized by law for any grade of enlisted men of the Army."

Section 31 by striking out the words "travel expenses and pay at the rate of their respective grades in the Regular Army during such periods of training," occurring in lines 9, 10, and 11, and substituting therefor the following: "From the date of their departure to place where ordered pay and allowances at the rate of their respective grades in the Regular Army, transportation, and reimbursement of cost of subsistence at such rate as may be fixed by the Secretary of War during travel from home to place where ordered and return to home, and subsistence in kind during period not in transit and while in service."

Section 42 by striking out the period at the end thereof, substituting therefor a colon, and adding the following: "Provided further, That upon the recommendation of the professor of military science and tactics of any such institution, the authorities thereof may discharge a member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps from such corps and from the necessity of completing the course of military training as prerequisite to graduation."

Section 51, by striking out the words "prior to the date of this act," in line 3 thereof, and substituting therefor the words "prior to July 1, 1919."

Section 55, by amending the fifth paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"Enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps shall receive the pay and allowances of their respective grades, but only when ordered into active service and from the date of their departure to place where ordered, transportation and reimbursement of cost of subsistence at such rate as may be fixed by the Secretary of War during travel from home to place where ordered and return home and subsistence in kind during period not in transit and while in service: *Provided*, That said enlisted men shall not be entitled to retirement or retirement pay: *Provided further*, That when any enlisted man of the Enlisted Reserve Corps shall be ordered to active service for purposes of instruction or training he may be paid at any time after the date such order shall become effective for the period from the date of leaving home to date of return thereto as determined in advance, both dates inclusive, and such payment, if otherwise correct, shall pass to the credit of the disbursing officer making the same."

Section 69, by striking out the period at the end thereof, substituting therefor a semicolon and adding thereafter the following: "Provided further, That in the Territory of Hawaii the National Guard may include citizens of the Philippine Islands."

Section 111, by inserting after the comma following the word "thereof," in the seventeenth line of said section, the following: "or, in grades above the rank of captain, from officers of the Regular Army."

Section 125, by striking out the period at the end thereof, substituting therefor a comma, and adding thereafter the following: "Provided, That hereafter, upon the discharge or furlough to the Reserve of an

enlisted man, all uniform outer clothing then in his possession, except such articles as he may be permitted to wear from the place of termination of his active service to his home, as authorized by this section, will be retained for military use; and within four months after such termination of his active service he shall return all uniform clothing, which he was so permitted to retain for wear to his home, by mail, under a franked label which shall be furnished him for the purpose, and in conformity with the instructions given him at the time of such termination of his active service; and in case he shall fail to return the same within such period, and in accordance with such instructions, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction, suffer the punishment prescribed by this section: *Provided further*, That upon the release from Federal service of an enlisted man of the National Guard called as such into the service of the United States, all uniform outer clothing then in his possession shall be taken up and accounted for as property issued to the National Guard of the State to which the enlisted man belongs, in the manner prescribed by section 67 of this act: *And provided further*, That when an enlisted man is discharged otherwise than honorably, all uniform outer clothing in his possession shall be retained for military use, and, when authorized by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, a suit of citizen's outer clothing to cost not exceeding \$15 may be issued to such enlisted man: *And provided further*, That officers and members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers may, regardless of the preceding provisions of this act, wear such uniform as the Secretary of War may authorize."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state that that completes the amendments to the national-defense act, and what will now be read by the Secretary is entirely new matter that has been suggested in this emergency as necessary by the War Department. I call the attention of the Senate to it so that Senators may understand that this is perfectly new matter.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill, as follows:

Sec. 2. That hereafter the number of privates, first class, in each arm of the line of the Army shall be, as nearly as practicable, 33 1/3 per cent of the total number of privates, first class, and privates in such arm.

Sec. 3. That the service of graduates of the Military Academy may be utilized during the months of June, July, August, and September of the year in which they graduate as instructors at the citizens' training camps, and their graduation leave may be taken at the termination of their services as instructors at these camps.

Sec. 4. That hereafter, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, authorized mounts of officers who die in the service may be transported at public expense from their last duty station to such places within the limits of the United States as may be the home of their families, or as may be designated by their legal representatives or executors, or such mount may be disposed of as directed by such representatives or executors.

Sec. 5. That hereafter, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, transportation at public expense may be provided for the baggage of civilian employees who die in the service from their last duty station to such places within the limits of the United States as may be the home of their families, or as may be designated by their legal representatives or executors.

Sec. 6. That hereafter mileage to officers of the Corps of Engineers, Signal Corps, Ordnance Department, and Quartermaster Corps, traveling on duty in connection with work under the appropriations pertaining to their respective departments, shall be paid from the appropriations for the work in connection with which the travel is performed.

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in time of war, upon request to the Secretary of War, to extend the period during which money accounts covering expenditures from appropriations for the Army may be transmitted to the Auditor for the War Department after their receipt in the War Department from 60 to 90 days.

Sec. 8. That in the interest of the national defense, and for the better protection of life and property on said waters, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and empowered to prescribe such regulations as he may deem best for the use and navigation of any portions or area of the navigable waters of the United States or waters under the jurisdiction of the United States endangered or likely to be endangered by Coast Artillery fire in target practice or otherwise, or by the proving operations of the Government ordnance proving ground at Sandy Hook, N. J., or at any Government ordnance proving ground that may be established elsewhere on or near such waters, and of any portion or area of said waters occupied by submarine mines, mine fields, submarine cables, or other material and accessories pertaining to seacoast fortifications, or by any plant or facility engaged in the execution of any public project of river and harbor improvement; and the said Secretary shall have like power to regulate the transportation of explosives upon any of said waters: *Provided*, That the authority hereby conferred shall be so exercised as not unreasonably to interfere with or restrict the food-fishing industry, and the regulations prescribed in pursuance hereof shall provide for the use of such waters by food fishermen operating under permits granted by the War Department.

To enforce the regulations prescribed pursuant to this section, the Secretary of War may detail any public vessel in the service of the War Department, or, upon the request of the Secretary of War, the head of any other department may enforce, and the head of any such department is hereby authorized to enforce, such regulations by means of any public vessel of such department.

The regulations made by the Secretary of War pursuant to this section shall be posted in conspicuous and appropriate places, designated by him, for the information of the public; and every person who and every corporation which shall willfully violate any regulation made by the said Secretary pursuant to this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500, or by imprisonment (in the case of a natural person) not exceeding six months, in the discretion of the court.

Offenses against the provisions of this section, or any regulation made pursuant thereto, committed in any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States where there is no court having general jurisdiction of crimes against the United States, shall be cognizable in any court of such place or Territory having original jurisdiction of criminal cases in the place or Territory in which the offense has been committed, with the same right of appeal in all cases as is given in other criminal cases where imprisonment not exceeding six months forms a part of the penalty, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts and such courts shall exercise the same for such pur-

poses; and in case any such offense be committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of any court having jurisdiction thereof, the offense shall be deemed and held to have been committed within the jurisdiction in which the offender may be found or into which he is first brought, and shall be tried by the court having jurisdiction thereof.

SEC. 9. That, in case of actual or threatened hostilities, any proceeds received from the operation of a public utility, in connection with engineer operations in the field overseas, shall be available for the purpose of such utility until the close of the fiscal year following that in which the proceeds are received, and a detailed report of such proceeds and application thereof shall be rendered to Congress on forms conforming as far as practicable to those used by American companies in reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission: *Provided*, That the provision of the act of March 23, 1910, making moneys arising from the disposition of serviceable quartermaster material available for the purposes of the appropriation throughout the fiscal year following that in which the disposition was effected, is hereby extended to apply to material supplied to the Army by the Engineer Department.

SEC. 10. That when any retired officer of the Army is, in the discretion of the President, employed on active duty and assigned to duty in an arm, corps, department, or organization, he shall, for all purposes except promotion, be considered an officer of such arm, corps, department, or organization while so serving, and shall be an extra number therein.

SEC. 11. That hereafter separate battalions, squadrons, or like units of any arm, corps, or department shall consist of such numbers and grades of commissioned officers and enlisted men as the President may prescribe.

SEC. 12. That there are hereby created in the Army the grades of corporal bugler and bugler, first class; and hereafter for each battalion and squadron headquarters of units in which the grade of bugler is now authorized, there shall be one corporal bugler, and for each company, battery, troop, or organization in which the grade of bugler is now authorized there shall be one bugler, first class.

SEC. 13. That there are hereby created in the Army the grades of motor sergeant, chauffeur, first class, chauffeur, and assistant chauffeur in each arm or branch thereof, and appointments made therein shall be in such numbers and for such organizations as the President may in orders from time to time direct and designate; and there are also hereby created the grades of battalion supply sergeant, separate battalion of any arm or branch; and chief mechanic, Infantry and Cavalry.

SEC. 14. That during the present war the President be, and he hereby is, authorized to enlist for service in the offices of the War Department or under its control or on detached service under its jurisdiction men outside the draft ages, and for the same purpose to draft men within such ages, who have been disqualified by minor physical defects for active service in the Army; to establish regulations under which such enlistments may be made, and to fix the pay and allowances of men so enlisted or drafted, which said pay and allowances shall not exceed those of enlisted men of the Regular Army.

SEC. 15. That the President is authorized to appoint, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to commission to the grade of captain in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, John Q. A. Brett, who was appointed to the grade of first lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps pursuant to the act of August 29, 1916, and who had over 31 years' service as pay clerk, United States Army.

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

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT EUREKA, UTAH.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator for a moment.

Mr. KING. I report, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, without amendment, the bill (S. 3384) to amend the public building act approved March 4, 1913, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It is a very brief bill, and its passage will save the Government money instead of taking money from the Treasury. I desire to add only a word in explanation of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah, has the bill for which he asks consideration been reported and is it on the calendar?

Mr. KING. The bill is not yet on the calendar, but it has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SMOOT. Did my colleague ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. KING. Yes. The reason I am asking for the immediate consideration of the bill is this: There is an action pending in court to condemn a site for a public building, and it is being held up awaiting the passage of this measure. Some time ago an appropriation was made for the construction of a public building at Eureka, Utah. Under the eminent statute of the State suit was brought in the United States Court for the District of Utah. Under the general law of Congress the Federal Government, when it acquires a building site, must obtain the fee to the land. A title less perfect can not be accepted. In the town of Eureka most of the buildings occupied by the people have been erected upon ground the surface of which only is owned by the owners of the buildings. The town is situated upon mineral lands, and beneath the town are rich mineral deposits. The mineral rights are owned by one or more corporations engaged in mining. In the present case the owner of the ground beneath the surface is perfectly willing to give to the Government for a nominal consideration such title as may be necessary, except title to the minerals lying beneath the surface upon which the building will be erected.

As stated, the owners of buildings within the town have only the surface rights, but they are content with such title. Costly buildings are erected under those conditions. It would cost the Government a good many thousand dollars to condemn the mineral rights and obtain a fee-simple title. The mineral deposits are 600 or 700 feet beneath the surface. Of course, the amount that it would cost the Government is problematical, but it might extend into thousands of dollars. As stated, the residents of the town are satisfied with surface rights, and the Government is willing to accept a title less than the general law requires. The representatives of the Treasury Department are satisfied with this bill, and it has been reported from the committee. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to accept a title which reserves or excepts all ores or minerals on the lands obtained for a building site, with the right of mining the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes that the provision of the public-building act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat., 876), which authorizes the acquisition of a suitable site, etc., at Eureka, Utah, be amended so as to add the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, accept a title which reserves or excepts all ores or minerals on the lands, with the right of mining the same.

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

MILITARY SERVICE OF SUBJECTS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 136, providing for the registration for military service of the subjects or citizens residing in the United States of a foreign country, and so forth.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 136) providing for the registration for military service of the subjects or citizens residing in the United States of a foreign country with whose Government the United States has concluded or hereafter concludes a convention or agreement consenting to such aliens being drafted into the military forces of the United States 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," and all amendments thereto.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President may by proclamation set a day or days and place or places for the registration for military service of male aliens within designated ages residing within the United States who are citizens or subjects of a foreign country with whose Government the United States has concluded or hereafter concludes a convention or agreement in accordance with the terms of which its citizens or subjects within designated ages, residing within the United States, become under certain conditions liable to be drafted into the military service of the United States; that upon proclamation by the President stating the time and place of such registration it shall be the duty of any such alien, unless exempted from registration by the terms of the President's proclamation, to present himself for and submit to registration under the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," and all amendments thereto, and he shall thereupon be registered in the same manner as those previously registered under the terms of said act; and every such alien shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of said act and this joint resolution upon the publication by the President of any such proclamation, and any such alien who shall willfully fail or refuse to present himself for registration or to submit thereto shall be subject to all the provisions and liable to all the penalties provided in said act or any amendment thereto.

SEC. 2. That any such alien, when registered, shall be and remain liable to military service in the forces of the United States and subject to draft under the provisions of said act and all amendments thereto, and subject to such regulations as the President may have prescribed or may prescribe under the terms thereof, unless during the period specified in the convention or agreement concluded with the country whereof he is a citizen or subject and designated in the President's proclamation, he shall have enlisted or enrolled in the military forces of his own country or returned to his own country for the purpose of enlisting or enrolling in its military forces, or unless the country whereof he is a citizen or subject, through its diplomatic representatives, in accordance with the terms of the convention or agreement concluded between the United States and such foreign country, shall issue to such alien a certificate of exemption from military service.

SEC. 3. That any such alien, after the expiration of the time fixed by the President's proclamation within which he may enlist or enroll in the military forces of his own country, return to his own country for the purpose of military service, or be exempted through the diplomatic representative of the country whereof he is a citizen or subject, shall be and remain subject in all respects to the terms, provisions, liabilities, and penalties of said act and all amendments thereto, except as modified by the terms of the convention or agreement concluded between the United States and the country whereof such alien is a citizen or subject, and shall be subject to such regulations as the President may have prescribed or may prescribe under the terms of said act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon involving a construction, if he will give it, of the language of section 2 of this joint resolution, which reads:

That any such alien, when registered, shall be and remain liable to military service in the forces of the United States and subject to draft under the provisions of said act and all amendments thereto—

And so forth.

Under that language is it contemplated to confine this only to aliens between the ages of 21 and 31?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course, that would be, I think limited by the terms of the treaty. I understand that this joint resolution mainly provides for the enrollment and registration of aliens and that the treaty which is now in discussion between the foreign embassies and our own is to regulate the age limit. I do not understand that this is intended to keep foreign subjects within the same draft age as does our act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, if that is the case—I wanted to feel quite certain about it—there is no objection whatever to it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No. My understanding of it is that this merely provides for registration and enrollment, while the treaty provisions will regulate the age limit.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, two treaties with Great Britain and Canada have been sent here arranging for the drafting of friendly aliens. Of course, the treaties are reciprocal. Legislation will be required to carry out the provisions of the treaties. Those treaties were held up by the President because there were some changes in phraseology which seemed desirable. Everyone is entirely agreed as to the necessity of the treaties; but, Mr. President, I, for one, have not been able to give this joint resolution careful consideration. The questions involved in the treaties have taken the time of the Foreign Relations Committee during several sessions. The committee also has been consulting with the Secretary of State in regard to the terms of the treaties. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. STONE] is not here, and I therefore wish very much that this joint resolution could be allowed to be delayed long enough to give us an opportunity to examine it, because it ought to harmonize with the treaties, and I am unable to say from one hasty reading whether or not it does. I wish it could be allowed to go over until we are a little better satisfied as to that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have no objection in the world to having the joint resolution go over; but when it was up for consideration here some time ago I hesitated to press it because the Foreign Relations Committee was considering the pending treaties; but after passing it over in order that it might be considered in that connection, I took the matter up again with the Judge Advocate General's office, and I was advised by the Judge Advocate General that the treaties would not conflict in any of their terms with any of the provisions of the joint resolution; in other words, it was simply that the treaty provisions were to be followed in the enforcement of the law. However, if the Senator from Massachusetts prefers to have the joint resolution go over, I shall consent to that.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the treaty provisions are not yet agreed upon, but we have the benefit of advice from the War Department on the treaties. I do not wish to criticize anybody, but they seem to leave something to be desired in the way of phraseology.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will ask if the Senator desires that the joint resolution shall go over?

Mr. LODGE. Especially I ask it as the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, is not present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will go over.

ACQUIREMENT OF REAL ESTATE FOR GOVERNMENT USE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 3802.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3802) authorizing appropriations made for the national security and defense, to be used for the purchase of real estate, or the use thereof, when such purpose is not specifically stated in said appropriations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, after this bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs I received a letter from the chairman of the Shipping Board suggesting certain amendments to the bill. It was out of the control of the committee and on the calendar of the Senate at that time, and therefore I am going to take the liberty of suggesting the amendments and asking that there be read a letter from the chairman of the Shipping Board to explain the purposes of the

bill and amendments, and also a letter from the assistant general counsel of the Shipping Board. I think it might be well, Mr. President, to read the bill and the two letters, so that they may be considered in connection with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 3802) authorizing appropriations made for the national security and defense, to be used for the purchase of real estate, or the use thereof, when such purpose is not specifically stated in said appropriations, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases where appropriations have heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, made for the expenditures of any department, corps, or bureau incurred in connection with the national security and defense, and in the administration thereof for the purpose specified therein it becomes necessary, in the opinion of the head of such department, corps, or bureau, to acquire real estate, or some right, title, or interest therein, and any buildings and improvements thereon, it shall be lawful to acquire the same by purchase, lease, donation, or condemnation, or by any other means provided by law for such acquisition, and out of the appropriations aforesaid to meet the expenses of such acquisition, including the purchase price, or rent, of the land, and the buildings and improvements thereon, or the damages allowed to the owner or owners as compensation therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letters referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION,
Washington, March 11, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAMBERLAIN: It has been brought to my attention that S. 3802, introduced by you, has been reported back to the Senate with the recommendation that it be passed. The conditions which that bill apparently seeks to remedy have on numerous occasions and are now confronting this corporation, and, under our present laws, we have no authority to remedy them. There are frequent instances where persons, owning land adjacent to shipyards where vessels are being constructed by us for the United States, which land is essential for the construction of vessels, put upon such land values not only fictitious but prohibitory. Just at the present time there are three such cases:

In one a contractor desires a spur track from a railroad to his shipyard. The railroad is willing to put in this spur at its own cost, and the contractor is willing to pay a reasonable sum for the right of way. The owner of this particular piece of property is asking from three to four thousand dollars per acre for his land when other property of the same character in the immediate vicinity has recently sold at from five to eight hundred dollars per acre.

In another a shipyard desires a right of way for its employees across a piece of land adjoining the shipyard. The owner of this land declines to grant such right of way at any figure.

In the third case a small piece of land adjoining a shipyard is desired to facilitate the launching of vessels; in fact, it is essential. The owner of that land holds it at a price out of all reason when compared with other land in the immediate vicinity.

With a view of giving this corporation the authority to aid contractors in such instances, I have taken the liberty of preparing an amendment to S. 3802, which will, I believe, accomplish the desired result and will not alter the purposes of the bill as drawn. It provides that real estate or the temporary use thereof may be requisitioned. It will, I think, be quite evident to you that the power of condemnation is not sufficient in these times of emergency when immediate action is necessary. If, to get the use of a piece of land, it is necessary to go through condemnation proceedings it is altogether probable that the need for such land will cease to exist by the time such proceedings are completed. The amendment provides that where land or the use thereof is requisitioned the payment of just compensation shall be made to the owner, with the right to appeal to the courts in the event the compensation awarded is deemed insufficient by the owner.

I hope very much that you will approve this amendment and, if you do, that you will give it your support.

Sincerely, yours,

EDWARD N. HURLEY, President.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION,
Washington, March 26, 1918.

Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAMBERLAIN: Referring to our telephone conversation of this date and Mr. Hurley's letter of March 11:

There are now a half dozen or more instances in which this corporation is being called upon to pay exorbitant prices for real estate essential for shipbuilding purposes. If we had the power to requisition the temporary use of such property or the property itself and pay just compensation for it, it would save the Government not only a considerable sum of money, but would expedite the shipping program in several instances. The desirability of the proposed amendment to S. 3802 has been brought to my attention so forcefully in these concrete cases that I can not help but feel it is of extreme importance to the Government. I hope, therefore, that you will not allow it to be overlooked.

In the event you have misplaced the bill as it is proposed to be amended, I inclose an additional copy. Should you desire to be informed with regard to the particular instances indicating the importance of this matter, I will be more than pleased to call upon you at any time agreeable to you.

Sincerely, yours,

WILLIAM H. WHITE, Jr.,
Assistant General Counsel.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments stated.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. With the Senator's permission, I will say I have not yet submitted the amendments. I wanted to

have the letters first read, and then to submit the amendments which have been proposed.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I can state the amendments generally, and then I will send them to the Secretary's desk. The Shipping Board desires to have the title of the bill amended by inserting after the word "purchase," in the second line of the title, the words "condemnation or requisition"; to insert in line 4, after the word "any," the words "board, corporation"; and in line 8, after the word "such," to insert the words "board, corporation." The amendment extends the provisions of the bill to cover such organizations. Also after the words "it shall be lawful to," to insert "requisition the same, including the requisitioning of the temporary use thereof, or to"; and in line 6, page 2, after the word "thereon," to insert the words "or just compensation therefor."

Then there is an amendment to be known as section 2, which has been proposed to the bill and which I will ask the Secretary to read. It extends the provisions of the bill quite largely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That whenever any real estate or some right, title, or interest therein, or any buildings and improvements thereon, are acquired by requisition or condemnation hereunder, the said board, corporation, department, corps, or bureau shall determine and make just compensation therefor, 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 the said 75 per cent will make such amount as will be just compensation for the property or interest therein so taken, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code.

And whenever any said board, corporation, department, corps, or bureau shall requisition any property or rights, or upon the filing of a petition for condemnation hereunder, immediate possession may be taken by the said board, corporation, department, corps, or bureau, of such real estate, buildings, or improvements thereon to the extent of the interests to be acquired therein, and the same may be immediately occupied and used, and the provision of section 355 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, 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 land acquired hereunder.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I would not hesitate for a moment to grant the Government all the power necessary for the proper organization of the military forces and their supply during this war; I would not hesitate to give the broadest powers of condemnation, but I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that this bill is not confined to the period of the war; it is in the nature of permanent legislation; and, if it passes, any department of the Government, after receiving from Congress an appropriation for any purpose whatsoever, can go out and without let or hindrance condemn anything in sight and pay for it under the appropriation, if it is all appropriate or related to it. I do not think that the Congress should indulge in legislation of that kind. It is a pretty broad power to confer even in time of war.

May I call the attention of the Senate to one embarrassing instance that came up in connection with the power of condemnation as exercised by the War Department? I refer to the famous case of Kent Island. Whether it was the influence of Congress or of the Representatives from the State of Maryland, who prevented the condemnation and seizure of that large tract of territory, inhabited by a considerable number of people who, with their ancestors, had lived there for 200 years, I am not entirely certain; but it was the voice of somebody in Congress, and perhaps of Congress itself, that prevented that thing which a great many of us thought was an outrage.

This bill apparently would give unlimited power to each and every department of the Government once it received an appropriation to purchase ammunition or to undertake any governmental function whether in connection with the war or not—and it may be entirely removed from the war—the right to go out and condemn property. I repeat, that I do not think the Congress should indulge in legislation of that character.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator's suggestion is a good one. I think the authority ought to be confined to the period of the war, if the bill does not do that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would be glad if the Senator would suggest an amendment to provide that the bill shall be effective only during the period of the war.

Now, let me say to the Senator that this bill came to us from the War Department as it was read at first without the amendments. I think the bill as it came to us from the War Department was ineffective, because it did not provide for any distinct or special method of condemnation or payment in case of con-

demnation. It was the Shipping Board that sent up the suggestion to add section 2, which gave that power. I think the amendment is a wholesome one and ought to be adopted, if the bill itself is enacted into law, but I hope the Senator will suggest an amendment limiting the duration of the proposed law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say first that I have no objection to the second section, which the Senator from Oregon proposes as an amendment to the bill, because it provides some kind of phraseology, at least, under which these powers should be exercised; but I should think that, on line 3, page 1, after the word "That," the very first word of the bill, it would be wise to insert the words "during the present war." I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to have those words added, so far as I can assent to the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But even with the adoption of that amendment, I will confess to the Senator from Oregon that I am a little nervous about this kind of legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, after the word "That," it is proposed to insert the words "during the present war."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 4, after the word "any," it is proposed to insert the words "board, corporation"; in line 8, after the word "such," to insert the words "board, corporation"; on page 2, line 1, before the word "acquire," to insert the words "requisition the same, including the requisitioning of the temporary use thereof, or to"; and in line 6, after the word "thereon," to insert "or just compensation therefor."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to the fact that section 2, which is proposed as an amendment, provides:

And whenever any said board, corporation, department, corps, or bureau shall requisition any property or rights, or upon the filing of a petition for condemnation hereunder, immediate possession may be taken by the said board, corporation, department, corps, or bureau, of such real estate, buildings, or improvements thereon to the extent of the interests to be acquired therein, and the same may be immediately occupied and used, and the provision of section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

Then there is a proviso which reads:

Provided, That no public money shall be expended upon such lands until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title.

The first portion of the amendment authorizes the immediate possession and use, while the second proviso is to the effect that the land can not be used for new buildings or any money expended until complete title has been obtained. Now, there might be many instances where the Government might desire land for a cantonment or land for a shipyard, and there might be the interest of heirs of deceased persons which it would require months, and possibly even years, to extinguish. It seems to me that under this provision we are simply depriving the Government of the right to the immediate use which is granted in the previous portion of the same amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think that does not prohibit the immediate use of it. It simply requires that before making final, full settlement that they shall have title.

Mr. McCUMBER. No, Mr. President; it does not say that the money shall not be paid until final settlement. It says that no money shall be expended upon the premises by the Government until the title secured is made perfect. The language is:

Provided, 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.

Now, it does seem to me that that ought to be out. The Government ought to be entitled to take possession of that land immediately, if it needs it, no matter what the title is, and extinguish the title, and pay the final amount due whenever the adverse title of anyone shall have been extinguished.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It was the purpose of the bill to allow possession to be taken, but not for the land to be paid for until the title had been approved. While I did not confer with the Shipping Board about the matter, I think it possible that that was intended to protect the Government in case there was a defective title and some minor board was undertaking to acquire title. It required the highest law officer of the Government to pass on the title before final payment was made. I think under

the provisions of the bill, however, notwithstanding that clause, the Government could still take possession.

Mr. McCUMBER. This allows the Government to take possession; but I again want to make clear to the Senator that it is not a question of possession. This amendment prohibits the Government from expending any money—

Mr. WARREN. Erecting buildings.

Mr. McCUMBER. Erecting buildings, or expending any money upon the land, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title. If it were limited simply to the matter of paying for the land, of course it would meet what the Senator says was the intention.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me call the Senator's attention to section 355 of the Revised Statutes. That section provides as follows:

No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building, or any kind whatever, 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 or site may be to such purchase has been given—

And so forth.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is all right in times of peace, and that was applicable in times of peace; but the very purpose of this bill is to authorize the Government to take immediate possession of the land and to erect thereon such buildings as the Government may need, and that whole provision in the law would prevent the Government from doing so if it is reenacted into this legislation. I insist, Mr. President, that that ought to go out.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is very much merit in the contention of the Senator. I should be glad to have him suggest an amendment that would do that. I concede that it might be susceptible of the construction that the Senator insists upon, and that the Government might take the land and still not be able to use it under the restriction contained in the proposed amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it seems to me the only amendment that we need is to strike out the provision after the word "used," namely:

and the provision of section 355 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, 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 same is located has been given—

I see, Mr. President, that I have been laboring under a false impression, because I notice at the end of the section this provision—

shall be, and the same are hereby, suspended as to all land acquired hereunder.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That was the purpose of the bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. I had not read that completely over. I simply heard the reading by the Secretary of that portion, and it did not seem to me to be applicable; but as I read the balance of this, I certainly think that it is suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I said a moment ago to the Senator from Oregon (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) that I still was a little nervous about this kind of legislation. I call his attention to this language:

That during the present war in all cases where appropriations have heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, made for the expenditures of any department, corps, or bureau incurred in connection with the national security and defense—

That expression, "incurred in connection with the national security and defense," is one which can be construed with the greatest degree of elasticity. That might be construed to grant to the Fuel Administration, for instance, the right to use any appropriation made by it in connection with the condemnation of real estate or the condemnation of coal mines on the ground that that was connected with the national security and defense. It might also be used by the Food Administration and construed by them so as to grant them the same power to condemn real estate of any kind, character, or description, or requisition it, on the ground that it was in the interest of the national security and defense; and one might go on for some time and conjure up the possibilities of this act under that rather loose language. Pretty nearly everybody working for the Government, whether he be working in the Fish Commission or in the Post Office Department, has an idea that he is working for the national security and defense; and if he can take advantage of such language, if it is possible to stretch the meaning of that language, he will do it.

I am wondering if the Senator from Oregon and other Senators present would not be just as well satisfied with this if we

confined this rather extensive power to the War Department, the Navy Department, the United States Shipping Board, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation? They are the departments of the Government that are actually engaged in waging the war, and using materials and property in making their preparations.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks the bill as drawn would cover a case like this: If one of the departments of the Government had received an appropriation of \$10,000,000, and in that appropriation it specifically states that \$100,000 could be spent for the purpose of purchasing real estate, and instead of spending the \$100,000 for real estate they had spent over half the \$10,000,000, would this bill cover such a case? I ask the question because it says "appropriations heretofore or hereafter made."

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would legalize the expenditure of \$5,000,000, whereas it was the original intention of the Congress to spend only \$100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if information that I have received is correct, the case that I have cited is not nearly as bad as cases that have really existed. The ones that I have heard of not only cover hundreds of thousands of dollars, but they cover millions and millions of dollars, and when I first heard the bill read I was fearful that the object of this bill is to cover all such cases where appropriations have been made in a lump sum and specific language has been used appropriating a limited amount of that appropriation for the purchase of lands. If this bill passes, I am fearful that if all of such appropriations had been used for the purchase of lands the same would be legalized.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield while I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KING. Under the case just instanced by the Senator from Utah, would the auditor having the proper control or audit of that appropriation pass a warrant drawn for more than the \$100,000 authorized?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the difficulty the departments are facing is the one that the Senator has suggested. I may be mistaken about this bill, but it does seem to me that the language is so broad that it would, if passed, authorize the payment of the money whether it had been directly appropriated for that purpose or not, just so long as the expenditure is within the amount of the original appropriation to the department.

Mr. KING. It occurs to me that if an appropriation were made for a specific amount and a specific purpose and those having charge of the appropriation exceeded it, as indicated by the Senator from Utah, and particularly exceeded it in such a manner as to double, treble, and perhaps quadruple or more the appropriations, they ought to be removed from public office. They ought to be impeached if they can not be removed in any other way, because that is such a flagrant offense, such a flagrant violation of public duty, that no man ought to be permitted to hold office who, with a specific appropriation of \$100,000, would spend a million or more.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course I will say to my colleague that it is a violation of existing law, but the existing law is violated by every department of this Government every year as to the expenditure of money that has not been appropriated and then requests are made for deficiencies, and it has been violated so often that no notice is taken of it by Congress. But that is not the case to which I had reference. I do not say that the information that I received yesterday is correct; I have not had the time to look it up; but I was told only yesterday that legislation would be asked for covering just such cases as I have mentioned, and when this was read from the desk, not having examined it, I wondered whether this legislation was not for that identical purpose, because it specifically refers to appropriations heretofore made for specific purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I concede to the Senator from New York that the authority given in this bill is very, very broad, and I am inclined to agree with the statement of the Senator from Utah that it will be measurably retroactive in its effect, and possibly will validate expenditures that have been made; but I have not much fear of the law being used to the injury of the Government in this emergency. As a matter of fact, I would not want to sponsor the bill at any other time than this; but I agree with the Senator from New York that that ought to be limited to the Army, to the Navy, and to the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and not let it go out and be utilized by all of the little boards in the country for any purposes for which they might want to utilize it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. KING. Would not the Senator be willing to go further, and add to it an amendment to this effect:

Provided, That this shall not be construed to legalize any expenditure heretofore made for which there was no authorization by Congress.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would be perfectly willing to have that go in, Mr. President. I think it ought to be in. If there is any purpose to validate illegal acts or extravagant acts which were not authorized by the statute, it ought to be guarded against in this measure; and I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it would be better if my colleague used the words "or any appropriation made directly therefor." In other words, it would be better to have it so that it would not apply to any purpose other than those that were directly appropriated for, so that the purchase of land could not be made unless it was directly appropriated for.

Mr. KING. If I apprehend the meaning of my colleague, I think his suggestion is a good one, and it would meet with my approval.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I move to amend the bill by striking out, on lines 4 and 5, these words:

Any department, corps, or bureau incurred in connection with the national security and defense—

And substituting therefor the following words:

The War Department, the Navy Department, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation—

So that it will read:

That during the present war in all cases where appropriations have heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, made for the expenditures of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and in the administration thereof—

And so forth. Is that satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am satisfied to have that done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon a question, purely for information. To what do the words in the seventh line, "for the purpose specified," refer? Do those words refer to the purpose specified in the appropriation, or do they refer to the words "national security and defense"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My opinion is that they refer to the words used in the appropriation act; but I will admit to the Senator that it is very difficult to say offhand.

Mr. CUMMINS. If they refer to the words of the appropriation act, or the object of the appropriation act, I think they would be unobjectionable; but if they refer to the phrase "national security and defense"—

Mr. WADSWORTH. That has been stricken out. I took particular pains to have that stricken out when the amendment which I have just offered was adopted.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not the words "national security and defense"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUMMINS. What words were substituted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. "The War Department, the Navy Department, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation."

Mr. CUMMINS. Without any qualification for any purpose whatever?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Their only purpose is the national security and defense, and that is implied. I do not want those words, "national security and defense," applied to all the departments of the United States Government. By inserting the words "during the present war," I think the intent of this act will be quite clear.

Mr. CUMMINS. How does it read, then, after the adoption of the amendment of the Senator?

Mr. WADSWORTH (reading)—

That during the present war in all cases where appropriations have heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, made for the expenditures of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and in the administration thereof for the purpose specified therein—

That is, in the appropriation—

It becomes necessary, in the opinion of the head of such department—

And so forth.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that would cure it—

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was my opinion.

Mr. CUMMINS (continuing). Although I thought before, and I think still, that if the words "national security and defense" remained in the statute the purpose would be referable to those words instead of the appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. That is what I did not want.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, at the end of the section, I move to insert the following:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be deemed to legalize any expenditure heretofore made by any of said departments unless there shall have been made a specific appropriation therefor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I accept the amendment so far as I can, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of section 1, the following:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be deemed to legalize any expenditure heretofore made by any of said departments unless there shall have been made a specific appropriation therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to have to bring this same matter to the attention of the Senate again; but before my amendment was offered, limiting the act to the War and Navy Departments and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, another amendment had been offered, inserting the words "board, corporation." That must be corrected in order to conform with the language which my amendment inserted in the bill. I therefore ask that the bill be further amended by striking out of the former amendment the words "board, corps, or bureau," so that it shall only refer to the department or corporation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That amendment will have to be made in one or two places, I think.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that, Mr. President, to make it conform to the first amendment of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The SECRETARY. It is also proposed to amend the title so as to agree with the body of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

MEDALS FOR SERVICE ON MEXICAN BORDER.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is very much interested in Senate bill 3874, and I request that it be taken up for consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3874) providing medals for certain persons.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "device," to insert "and ribbon"; in line 6, after the words "of the," to strike out "Regular Army and the"; in line 10, after the word "border," to strike out "or with the American expeditionary forces in Mexico"; in line 11, after the word "sixteen," to strike out "to" and insert "and"; on page 2, line 1, after the words "nineteen hundred and," to strike out "eighteen, inclusive" and insert "seventeen, and who are not eligible to receive the Mexican-service badge heretofore authorized by the President"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to procure a bronze medal, with suitable device and ribbon, to be presented to each of several officers and enlisted men and families of such as may be dead, of the National Guard, who, under the orders of the President of the United States, served not less than four months in the service of the United States on the Mexican border in the years 1916 and 1917, and who are not eligible to receive the Mexican-service badge heretofore authorized by the President; *Provided*, That such medals shall not be issued to men who have, subsequent to such service, been dishonorably discharged from the service, or deserted.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying this act into effect.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out all after the word "served" down to and including the words "United States" in line 9, in the following words:

Not less than four months in the service of the United States.

So that, if amended, it will read:

Who, under the orders of the President of the United States, served on the Mexican border.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the object of this amendment is to permit the medal and ribbon to go to those members of the National Guard who were ordered away from the Mexican border during the excitement incident to the consideration of the Adanson bill in Congress before the expiration of four months of service. Senators may remember that it was expected at that time that labor disturbances might occur in the crowded railroad centers, and it was thought best to have troops where they could be readily utilized. This medal and ribbon goes to the 80,000 National Guard troops who served on the border, and, as I understand, represented every State in the Union. It gives them the recognition to which it seems to me they are entitled. I think these men who left their homes and their businesses and offered their services to their country ought to receive this consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask that the bill be read, and also the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The bill is entitled "A bill providing medals for certain purposes." As amended the bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to procure a bronze medal, with suitable device and ribbon, to be presented to each of the several officers and enlisted men, and families of such as may be dead, of the National Guard who, under the orders of the President of the United States, served—

At that point the proposed amendment of the Senator from New York occurs, striking out the words "not less than four months in the service of the United States," so that it will read: who, under the orders of the President of the United States, served on the Mexican border in the years 1916 and 1917, and who are not eligible to receive the Mexican service badge heretofore authorized by the President: *Provided*, That such medals shall not be issued to men who have, subsequent to such service, been dishonorably discharged from the service, or deserted.

Sec. 2. That the sum of \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying this act into effect.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to see these boys receive a ribbon, but it seems to me that would be sufficient. We ought not to cheapen the medals we give. We shall have to give medals for heroism and bravery. If we are going to cheapen the medal like this, what is the medal worth?

I do not like such legislation as this. I wish it would go over, and let us consider this matter when we are further along in the war. If we give a bronze medal and a piece of ribbon just because a man might have been on the Mexican border, where is it going to lead to? What kind of medals are you going to give for heroism and bravery in the case of the boys that go abroad? If you give a bronze medal just for a man going down on the Mexican border, it cheapens it. That is the point I make. I do not think we ought to cheapen it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was going to ask, if medals are to be given to everybody who was on the Mexican border through that summer, what is to be given to the men who, probably to-day or to-morrow, will be flung on the German lines in the counterattack? What are they to have? Is there to be no distinction?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the War Department has awarded a medal to those men who crossed over into Mexico under Pershing. They were all of the Regular Army, but the members of the National Guard received no recognition.

Mr. LODGE. There were some men in the Regular Army who were ambushed and killed, if I remember rightly.

Mr. CALDER. But there were some 30,000 other Regular soldiers who rendered no more important service than the National Guard troops on the border.

Mr. LODGE. Did they all receive bronze medals?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will not the Senator let the bill go over? The question of medals ought to be taken up and considered later. If we take up this bill now, we distinguish Mexican border service from the war abroad. Let the whole matter be taken up together in one great, comprehensive bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I may say, in connection with what the Senator from North Carolina has said, that the Senate has passed a bill covering the whole ground of medals of honor which can only be bestowed in case of winning in actual battle. It also contains a provision for a distinguished-service medal. That bill has been favorably reported by the House and is on the calendar.

The President, evidently impatiently awaiting action upon that bill, I am unofficially informed, had a measure drawn up—a military order—which covered medals of honor and distinguished-service medals, and also a distinguished-service cross; but, attention being called to the present law as to the

medal of honor, the order went out to issue a distinguished-service decoration in the way of a cross and another one in the way of a ribbon and medal. Those are for the Army generally, for a soldier who distinguishes himself in various ways but not to the extent that would entitle him under the law to receive the old medal of honor, which can be accorded only for exceptional gallantry in battle in the face of the enemy and at the risk of a soldier's life while performing some act not required in the line of regular duty of an enlisted man or officer. I am informed that lately another order has been promulgated bestowing medals or ribbons or service stripes, or some such decoration upon all the soldiers who served in the late Mexican expedition over the line in Mexico.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to see some ribbon or some mark of honor bestowed, but why give a medal?

Mr. CALDER. Since this bill was introduced I have learned that the War Department has accorded medals with ribbon to men who served on the Mexican border and were fortunate enough to be taken into the Pershing expedition which went into Mexico.

Mr. OVERMAN. They have already been given medals?

Mr. CALDER. A ribbon and medal has been given to the Regular troops that went over the border into Mexico with Gen. Pershing.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is cheapening the whole thing.

Mr. CALDER. I think not. I think it is a just recognition of the many thousands of National Guardsmen who left their homes from all the States of the Union and went to the border and served there, some of them as long as a year, at \$15 a month. Most of them left their business at a great loss, and it is a recognition of the service rendered. These men were all ready to risk their lives if called upon. I hope the Senator will not object to the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. If they give a medal and a ribbon to the men who went across the line, I do not see why a soldier who stayed on this side should not receive it. The only point is that we are cheapening the matter of giving medals. I think acts of gallantry ought to be honored and some little mark, like a ribbon, might be given in this case. Some of those men were across the border for only three days.

Mr. CALDER. In fact, no one served there for less than two months, and I will say to the Senator there were several regiments from his own State.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know.

Mr. CALDER. However, I do not offer that as an inducement to have the Senator's approval of the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. We had three or four thousand soldiers there from my State. Still I think they ought to be satisfied if they get a ribbon. As to giving them a medal, I do not think they would ask for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is quite late in the afternoon, and I understand an executive session is desired, but I wish, if possible, to get consideration of Senate bill 3783. If any Senator objects to its consideration at this time I shall not press it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is the bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

I wish to say that it is general legislation, and it proposes to increase the pensions of those who served in the Civil War and in the Mexican War 90 days to a flat rate of \$30 per month. We have already granted the widows \$25 a month, and many of the soldiers are receiving \$16.50, \$22.50, and \$25.50. The bill provides a flat rate of \$30, with an increase, based upon length of service, where the soldier is over 72 years of age, beginning with \$30, and increasing to \$32, \$35, \$38, and \$40.

I wish to say to the Senator there was not a vote against the bill by the Members present when it was under consideration by the committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I ask the Senator if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is not opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know. I can not say; but if the Senator thinks so I shall not press it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think the Senator from Georgia is opposed to the bill, and he is absent.

Mr. SMOOT. With that suggestion I shall not ask for consideration of the bill now, but I wish to give notice that at the very earliest opportunity I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill for consideration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1918.

CONSULS.

CLASS 3.

Fred D. Fisher, of Oregon, now a consul general of class 4, to be a consul of class 3 of the United States of America.

CLASS 4.

Marion Letcher, of Georgia, now a consul general of class 5, to be a consul general of class 4 of the United States of America.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Norman R. Hamilton, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va. (Reappointment.)

Joseph H. Lyons, of Mobile, Ala., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala., in place of Percy W. Maer, whose term of office expired by limitation March 8, 1918.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

John Clark Knox, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York, vice Martin T. Manton, appointed circuit judge.

Joseph C. Hutcheson, jr., of Houston, Tex., to be United States district judge, southern district of Texas, vice Waller T. Burns, deceased.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

William Woodburn, of Reno, Nev., to be United States attorney, district of Nevada. A reappointment, his term expiring April 6, 1918.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Maurice Splain, of the District of Columbia, to be United States marshal, District of Columbia. A reappointment, his term having expired.

John L. Terrell, of Fort Worth, Tex., to be United States marshal, northern district of Texas, vice William J. McDonald, deceased.

William Osborne, of Charleston, W. Va., to be United States marshal, southern district of West Virginia. A reappointment, his term having expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CHAPLAIN.

Chaplain Edward F. Brophy, Coast Artillery Corps, to be chaplain with the rank of captain from March 3, 1918, after seven years' service.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Harry R. McKellar, Medical Corps, to be major from January 15, 1918.

To be majors with rank from March 28, 1918.

Capt. Edgar E. Hume, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Harry L. Arnold, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Walcott Denison, Medical Corps.
 Capt. James E. Ash, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Calvin H. Goddard, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Bascom L. Wilson, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Clarence P. Baxter, Medical Corps.
 Capt. John E. Walker, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Henry F. Lincoln, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Edgar A. Bocoek, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Willis P. Baker, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Henry L. Krafft, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Paul R. Hawley, Medical Corps.
 Capt. John Dibble, Medical Corps.
 Capt. George C. Dunham, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Joseph M. Greer, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Joseph de R. Moreno, Medical Corps.

Capt. Robert B. Hill, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Arthur M. Alden, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Gouverneur V. Emerson, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Louis J. Regan, Medical Corps.
 Capt. William A. Haggins, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Shannon L. Van Valzah, Medical Corps.
 Capt. William O. H. Prosser, Medical Corps.
 Capt. George C. Beach, jr., Medical Corps.
 Capt. Jesse I. Sloat, Medical Corps.
 Capt. David N. W. Grant, Medical Corps.
 Capt. James S. Simmons, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Cyrus B. Wood, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Charles LeBaron, jr., Medical Corps.
 Capt. Alvin J. Bayley, Medical Corps.
 Capt. John F. Corby, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Prescott S. Tucker, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Roy M. Fortier, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Roy E. Fox, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Herbert DeW. Porterfield, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Dean F. Winn, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Alva B. McKie, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Albert W. Kenner, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Robert E. Parrish, Medical Corps.
 Capt. William L. Edmundson, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Cary R. Pollock, Medical Corps.
 Capt. James F. Roohan, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Emery B. Neff, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Arturo Carbonell, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Edward A. Coates, jr., Medical Corps.
 Capt. William R. Klingensmith, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Leroy T. Howard, Medical Corps.
 Capt. James A. Bethea, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Asa M. Lehman, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Harrison J. McGhee, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Thomas L. Gore, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Oramel H. Stanley, Medical Corps.
 Capt. S. Munson Corbett, Medical Corps.
 Capt. William C. Thomas, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Samuel R. Norris, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Benjamin Norris, Medical Corps.

To be captains with rank from March 28, 1918.

First Lieut. Edgar E. Hume, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harry L. Arnold, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Walcott Denison, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James E. Ash, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Calvin H. Goddard, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Bascom L. Wilson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Clarence P. Baxter, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John E. Walker, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry F. Lincoln, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edgar A. Bocoek, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Willis P. Baker, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry L. Krafft, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul R. Hawley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John Dibble, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George C. Dunham, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph M. Greer, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph de R. Moreno, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert B. Hill, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur M. Alden, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Gouverneur V. Emerson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Louis J. Regan, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William A. Haggins, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Shannon L. Van Valzah, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William O. H. Prosser, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George C. Beach, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Jesse I. Sloat, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. David N. W. Grant, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James S. Simmons, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Cyrus B. Wood, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles LeBaron, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Alvin J. Bayley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John F. Corby, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Prescott S. Tucker, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy M. Fortier, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy E. Fox, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Herbert DeW. Porterfield, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Dean F. Winn, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Alva B. McKie, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Albert W. Kenner, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert E. Parrish, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William L. Edmundson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Cary R. Pollock, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James F. Roohan, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Emery B. Neff, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Arturo Carbonell, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward A. Coates, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William R. Klingensmith, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Leroy T. Howard, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James A. Bethea, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Asa M. Lehman, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harrison J. McGhee, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Thomas L. Gore, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Oramel H. Stanley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. S. Munson Corbett, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William C. Thomas, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Samuel R. Norris, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Benjamin Norris, Medical Corps.

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonels with rank from February 6, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Frank R. McCoy, Cavalry.
 Lieut. Col. Willard H. McCornack, Cavalry (Signal Corps).
 Lieut. Col. Guy V. Henry, Cavalry.

To be colonel with rank from February 7, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Wallace B. Scales, Cavalry.

To be colonels with rank from February 13, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Conrad S. Babcock, Cavalry (Inspector General's Department).

Lieut. Col. Rush S. Wells, Cavalry.

To be colonel with rank from February 16, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Robert R. Wallach, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from August 5, 1917.

Maj. Rush S. Wells, Cavalry.
 Maj. Robert R. Wallach, Cavalry.
 Maj. Lewis W. Cass, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 7, 1918.

Maj. Henry J. McKenney, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 13, 1918.

Maj. Casper W. Cole, Cavalry.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 16, 1918.

Maj. Frank T. McNarney, Cavalry.

To be majors with rank from August 5, 1917.

Capt. Lewis W. Cass, Cavalry.
 Capt. Henry J. McKenney, Cavalry.
 Capt. Casper W. Cole, Cavalry.
 Capt. Frank T. McNarney, Cavalry.

To be majors with rank from February 7, 1918.

Capt. Henry D. F. Munnikhuysen, Cavalry (Quartermaster Corps).

Capt. Archibald T. Colley, Cavalry.

To be major with rank from February 16, 1918.

Capt. Hugh H. McGee, Cavalry.

To be major with rank from February 28, 1918.

Capt. Joseph Plassmeyer, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from January 26, 1918.

First Lieut. Harry Foster, Cavalry (Signal Corps).

To be captain with rank from February 4, 1918.

First Lieut. Alexander C. Strecker, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from February 5, 1918.

First Lieut. Dwight Hughes, jr., Cavalry.

To be captains with rank from February 6, 1918.

First Lieut. William R. Stickman, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Lloyd W. Biggs, Cavalry.

To be captains with rank from February 7, 1918.

First Lieut. Wilkie C. Burt, Cavalry.

First Lieut. Harry L. Sommerhauser, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from February 14, 1918.

First Lieut. Harold E. Dickinson, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from February 16, 1918.

First Lieut. Adrian B. C. Smith, Cavalry.

To be captain with rank from February 28, 1918.

First Lieut. Rufus S. Ramey, Cavalry.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Burton C. Andrus from March 1, 1918.
 Second Lieut. Harold E. Lewis from March 1, 1918.
 Second Lieut. Newell P. Weed from March 18, 1918.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels with rank from January 26, 1918.

Lieut. Col. John H. Hughes.
 Lieut. Col. George W. Helms.
 Lieut. Col. Rufus E. Longan.
 Lieut. Col. Edward A. Roche.

To be colonel with rank from February 1, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Dichmann.

To be colonels with rank from February 6, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Halstead Dorey.
 Lieut. Col. George F. Baltzell.
 Lieut. Col. Edgar T. Conley.
 Lieut. Col. Charles H. Bridges.
 Lieut. Col. John Robertson.

To be colonels with rank from February 7, 1918.

Lieut. Col. James V. Heidt.
 Lieut. Col. Patrick H. Mullaney.

To be colonels with rank from February 8, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Monroe C. Kerth.
 Lieut. Col. Lambert W. Jordan, jr.

To be colonels with rank from February 9, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Harvey W. Miller.
 Lieut. Col. Daniel G. Berry.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 26, 1918.

Maj. William W. Bessell.
 Maj. Frank C. Burnett.
 Maj. Collin H. Ball.
 Maj. A. Owen Seaman.
 Maj. Clifford U. Leonori.
 Maj. Benjamin H. Pope.
 Maj. Julian L. Dodge.
 Maj. Herman Glade.
 Maj. Frank S. Bowen.
 Maj. Robert H. Peck.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 1, 1918.

Maj. Ward Dabney.
 Maj. William W. Taylor, jr.
 Maj. Russell C. Hand.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 6, 1918.

Maj. George A. Herbst.
 Maj. Phillip J. Lauber.
 Maj. Thomas M. Hunter.
 Maj. Elverton E. Fuller.
 Maj. William S. Neely.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 7, 1918.

Maj. Frank H. Adams.
 Maj. George C. Lewis.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 8, 1918.

Maj. William H. Patterson.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 9, 1918.

Maj. Leonard J. Mygatt.
 Maj. Elliott M. Norton.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from March 7, 1918.

Maj. Roscoe H. Hearn.
 Maj. Morris M. Keck.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from March 11, 1918.

Maj. Auswell E. Deitsch.
 Maj. Joseph C. Kay.
 Maj. Walter C. Jones.
 Maj. La Vergne L. Gregg.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 23, 1918.

Maj. Fred W. Bugbee.

To be major with rank from August 5, 1917.

Capt. Fred W. Bugbee.

To be major with rank from January 26, 1918.

Capt. Chester A. Shephard, additional officer.

To be majors with rank from January 23, 1918.

Capt. Ernest L. Pell.
 Capt. Joseph C. Hatie.
 Capt. John W. Simons, jr.
 Capt. Edward G. Taylor.
 Capt. Alfred H. Erck.
 Capt. Fred P. Jacobs.
 Capt. Walter S. Greacen.

To be majors with rank from January 24, 1918.

Capt. Homer H. Slaughter.
 Capt. Henry C. K. Muhlenberg.
 Capt. John F. Curry.
 Capt. James E. Chaney.
 Capt. William J. Fitzmaurice.
 Capt. Owen R. Meredith.
 Capt. James C. Williams.
 Capt. Robert E. O'Brien.
 Capt. Simon B. Buckner, jr.
 Capt. Charles H. Honesteel.
 Capt. Robert H. Fletcher, jr.
 Capt. Frederick A. Barker.

To be major with rank from January 25, 1918.

Capt. Agard H. Bailey.

To be majors with rank from January 26, 1918.

Capt. George C. Bowen.
 Capt. John H. Hester.
 Capt. Franklin L. Whitley.
 Capt. Alfred H. Hobley.
 Capt. Arthur J. Hanlon.
 Capt. Olin O. Ellis.
 Capt. Elmer C. Desobry.
 Capt. Emile V. Cutrer.
 Capt. Harry B. Crea.
 Capt. G. Barrett Glover, jr.
 Capt. Henry J. Weeks.
 Capt. Roy A. Hill.
 Capt. Arthur E. Bouton.
 Capt. Enoch B. Garey.

To be majors with rank from February 1, 1918.

Capt. Leonard H. Drennan.
 Capt. Charles K. Nelsen.
 Capt. John H. Muncaster.

To be majors with rank from February 6, 1918.

Capt. Theodore K. Spencer.
 Capt. Charles D. Hartman.
 Capt. Edgar S. Miller.

To be majors with rank from February 7, 1918.

Capt. Thomas C. Lonergan.
 Capt. Albert L. Sneed.
 Capt. Lester D. Baker.

To be majors with rank from February 8, 1918.

Capt. Walter R. Weaver.
 Capt. Alva Lee.

To be major with rank from February 9, 1918.

Capt. Roy W. Winton.

To be majors with rank from February 14, 1918.

Capt. Frederick C. Phelps.
 Capt. James L. Frink.
 Capt. Edmund R. Andrews.
 Capt. Henry J. Damm.
 Capt. Max R. Wainer.
 Capt. Robert H. Willis, jr.
 Capt. Charles E. Coates.
 Capt. Martin C. Shallenberger.

To be major with rank from March 2, 1918.

Capt. William B. Loughborough.

To be majors with rank from March 7, 1918.

Capt. James W. Peyton.
 Capt. Oral E. Clark.

To be majors with rank from March 11, 1918.

Capt. Robert Coker.
 Capt. William F. Hoey, jr.

To be majors with rank from December 22, 1917.

Capt. Alexander W. Maish.
 Capt. William J. McCaughey.

To be major with rank from January 8, 1918.

Capt. Eugene R. Householder.

To be majors with rank from January 9, 1918.

Capt. Eugene Santschl, jr.
 Capt. William A. Ganoe.
 Capt. Elmer F. Rice.

To be majors with rank from January 10, 1918.

Capt. Benjamin F. Castle.
 Capt. John W. Lang.

To be majors with rank from January 15, 1918.

Capt. George T. Everett.
 Capt. Henry H. Arnold.
 Capt. Walter R. Wheeler.

To be majors with rank from January 18, 1918.

Capt. Barton K. Yount.
 Capt. Denham B. Crafton.

To be major with rank from January 21, 1918.

Capt. William E. Selbie.

To be majors with rank from January 22, 1918.

Capt. John L. Jenkins.
 Capt. Charles H. White.
 Capt. Alvin G. Gutensohn.
 Capt. Stanley L. James.
 Capt. John S. Sullivan.
 Capt. Bruce B. Buttler.
 Capt. Evan E. Lewis.
 Capt. Paul A. Larned.
 Capt. James H. Laubach.
 Capt. George R. Harrison.
 Capt. Ralph W. Dusenbury.
 Capt. Thomas C. Spencer.

To be majors with rank from January 23, 1918.

Capt. Fauntley M. Miller.
 Capt. Ray C. Hill.
 Capt. Patrick J. Morrissey.
 Capt. Thomas M. R. Herron.
 Capt. John D. Reardan.

The above-named officers were nominated to the Senate February 13, 1918, and were confirmed February 16, 1918. This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting error in dates of rank.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be colonel with rank from January 5, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Joseph H. Earle, Corps of Engineers.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 14, 1918.

Maj. Gilbert Van B. Wilkes, Corps of Engineers.

To be major with rank from February 16, 1918.

Capt. Mason J. Young, Corps of Engineers.

To be major with rank from February 18, 1918.

Capt. Layson E. Atkins, Corps of Engineers.

To be major with rank from February 26, 1918.

Capt. George Mayo, Corps of Engineers.

To be major with rank from March 11, 1918.

Capt. Paul T. Bock, Corps of Engineers.

To be major with rank from March 19, 1918.

Capt. Arthur P. von Deesten, Corps of Engineers.

To be captain with rank from October 4, 1917.

First Lieut. Simon Medine, Corps of Engineers.

To be captains with rank from October 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Samuel L. Kuhn, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Louis Graham, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Roy McCutchen, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. William Lohmeyer, jr., Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. William A. Clark, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Aubrey H. Bond, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Hubert W. Collins, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Harold J. McDonald, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Maurice P. van Buren, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Frederick S. H. Smith, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Frank B. Hastie, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Harold Van V. Fay, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Oscar R. Peterson, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Thomas K. Meloy, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Robert Adams Love, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Bennet H. Bowley, jr., Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Robert D. Ingalls, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. William L. G. Mackenzie, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Walter L. Medding, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Warren A. Lyon, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Roger W. Parkhurst, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Albert C. Lieber, jr., Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Robert K. Munroe, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. James A. Bjerregaard, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Eugene F. Gaebler, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. William C. Atwater, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Henry E. Strout, jr., Corps of Engineers.

First Lieut. John A. Strang, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. George E. Robinson, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Frank C. Rogers, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Philip N. Cristal, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Clifford H. Springer, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Edward P. Morton, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. Langley S. Homer, Corps of Engineers.
 First Lieut. George J. Nold, Corps of Engineers.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CHAPLAIN.

Rev. Raymond Joseph Fox, of Wisconsin, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant from March 23, 1918.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

First Lieut. Sydney Sigfried Schochet, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 10, 1918.
 Capt. Alan Callender Sutton, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 11, 1918.
 First Lieut. Guy Alvin Caldwell, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 12, 1918.
 First Lieut. Edward Peter Heller, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 13, 1918.
 First Lieut. John Edward Williams, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 14, 1918.
 First Lieut. Charles Hansford Brownlee, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 15, 1918.
 Capt. Rollan Walter Kraft, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 16, 1918.
 First Lieut. John Alfred White, 2d, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 17, 1918.
 First Lieutenant Norman St. George Vann, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 18, 1918.
 First Lieut. William Crawford White, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 19, 1918.
 First Lieut. Wooster Hassell House, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 20, 1918.
 First Lieut. Kenneth Dayton Allison Allen, Medical Reserve Corps, from March 21, 1918.
 First Lieut. George Randolph Harris, jr., Medical Reserve Corps, from March 22, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

First Sergt. Francis S. Kieren to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 24th day of July, 1917.
 Second Lieut. Frank B. Wilbur, National Naval Volunteers, Marine Corps Branch, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 18th day of March, 1918.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1918.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Herman Odesky, to be aid, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Andrew J. King to be collector of customs, district No. 33, Great Falls, Mont.
 Joseph H. Lyons, to be collector of customs, collection district No. 19, Mobile, Ala.

POSTMASTER.

FLORIDA.

Israel F. Titus, Lynn Haven.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 1, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Out of the depths, with all the fervor of soul, we cry unto Thee, O God, our Heavenly Father, with undiminished faith in the overruling of Thy power.

We thank Thee for the cheering news which comes to us from the front; and we pray that our arms may continue their fervor and strike a decisive blow, which shall bring peace to a weary, warring world; that the effusion of blood may cease, and all men be permitted, under Thy providence, to follow the pursuits of peace and enjoy the fruits of liberty, truth, justice, and righteousness, to the glory and honor of Thy Holy Name, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 30, 1918, was read and approved.

RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT BY TEXAS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a communication from Governor Hobby, of Texas, announcing the ratification by that State of the prohibition amendment. It is not necessary that this communication be read. It will be filed in the archives of the House.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 8696), disagree to all of the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I think the House ought to have an opportunity to examine these amendments. If the gentleman will defer this till to-morrow, I think there will be no difficulty.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the bill with the Senate amendments was printed on Friday last. Members have had two days in which to examine these amendments. I really wanted to get this bill into conference on Saturday. The time is running along here, and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, it usually takes longer to get this Indian appropriation bill out of conference than any other appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think there will be any difficulty about getting it into conference to-morrow morning.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. At the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin I withheld any effort to get this bill into conference on Saturday in order that he might have time to go over the Senate amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me, this morning some of the gentleman's colleagues called at my office and took up quite a little of my time about some Indian affairs. Otherwise I would have completed my examination of the amendments. I ask that this bill go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Can we not send it to conference this afternoon?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

STEAMSHIP "CALDERA."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2469) to authorize the change of the name of the steamship *Caldera* to *A. T. Kinney*. This bill passed the Senate in September last and was reported favorably from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It will take only a moment to pass it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed upon application of the owner, the Kinney Steamship Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, to change the name of the steamer Caldera, official No. 204864, to A. T. Kinney.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 9054), disagree to 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, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say to the Members of the House and to the gentleman from South Carolina that I have no desire to delay the consideration of this bill. On the other hand, I would like to expedite its consideration. I do think that the question involved in the amendment put on the bill in the Senate about the guaranteed price of wheat is of very great importance from whatever viewpoint it is considered. When this matter was up on Saturday the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]

seemed to be fair and reasonable about it; and all I want is that there shall be a reasonable time for discussion of that proposition, and also that we shall have an opportunity to vote directly on that. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman from South Carolina or to ask any assurance that it is not proper for him to give; and, assuming that what he said on Friday and Saturday will be the basis on which he will act, I shall not object this morning.

Mr. LEVER. I assure the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House will have an opportunity to vote on this proposition, and that a reasonable time for discussion will be had, as far as I am able to control the latter part of it.

Mr. GILLETT. Has the bill been reported from the committee?

Mr. LEVER. No; the bill is on the Speaker's table.

Mr. GILLETT. I thought it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. No; it is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cancels the reference. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 10265.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, has an order been made displacing the Unanimous-Consent Calendar for this Monday?

The SPEAKER. Last Friday the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] got a unanimous-consent order that this housing bill should be a continuing order. Now, if we get through with this housing bill at any time to-day, the Chair will order the taking up of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 10265.

The question being taken, Mr. WALSH demanded a division.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Does not the House automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the order of the House made on Friday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. Originally it resolved itself in that way, but not now. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 0.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10265.

The CHAIRMAN. When the bill was last under consideration the gentleman from Florida had 28 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Tennessee 23 minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is hardly necessary for me to talk for any considerable length of time this morning about this measure, and were it not for the fact that I am a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which reported this bill, I would not take up the time of this committee in impressing my views upon it.

I wish to say, however, that this is a most important war measure. The bill as it stands appropriates the sum of \$50,000,000 for the purpose of building houses and dormitories around various factory districts in the United States where the United States is now engaged in manufacturing munitions for use in this war.

As I understand it, the bill authorizes in some instances the transportation of men from the cities out to these munition plants. In other words, the bill authorizes the taking care of these men who are called to the various places to work, either by housing them in permanent houses or in dormitories and in other instances furnishing transportation. I think that the membership of this House is fully cognizant of the conditions surrounding these great manufacturing institutions which have been hurriedly thrown together for the purpose of manufacturing munitions of war, and I believe the membership of the House realizes that this bill will have to become a law in order to carry out the purposes of the War Department.

But there are some other things connected with the bill. For instance, there will be an amendment offered on the floor of the House by the committee asking that this appropriation be increased from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000, an increase of

\$10,000,000; and this amount of money is to be used, as I understand it, for the purpose of building dormitories and houses in the city of Washington to take care of Government clerks brought here for work incident to the war.

The president of the Civil Service Commission appeared before our committee and stated that owing to the congested condition of the city at this time it was absolutely impossible to keep clerks here in the city of Washington after they were brought here, for the reason that the rents charged for board and rooms are so high that they could not live on their salaries and that they would stay here but a short time and then go home.

I believe that this amendment should be voted into the bill, for I believe it is a long step toward taking care of the profiteering about which we have heard so much complaint on the floor of the House in the last few weeks. I for one am not only going to support this bill but I am going to support this amendment, and I believe it is absolutely necessary as a war measure.

There is another thing, that while I believe the bill will pass I would like to call the attention of the Committee on Labor to. The Committee on Labor is called on under this bill to administer the expenditure of this vast sum of money. There has been a lot of complaint over the country, especially out in my country, from the fact that our people are called upon to leave business and work, labor night and day, to put the liberty loans and other war matters across, and then when there was to be an expenditure of money in the manufacturing of munitions of war, or the doing of any other war work, the manufacturing interests of the Middle West, although fully equipped to do so, have not been treated like the manufacturing interests of other parts of the country have been.

Now, if we are wanting to keep up the high degree of loyalty and patriotism in the country which now exists, it is only fair for us to see to it that the people who put up their money out in the country and far away from the seacoast have the same opportunity, when they can do it, to engage in the manufacturing of these war munitions and in these building operations that they do in other parts of the country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have the same interest in this bill that all patriotic Americans have, in that it is essentially a measure for the proper prosecution of this war. I have a special interest in it because this bill will affect the lives and well-being of thousands of men, women, and children in my district.

All of you, or many of you, know that the city of Bridgeport, Conn., is one of the great munitions centers in this country. That city in the census of 1910 had a population of 102,000 and in 1917 a population of 152,000, an increase of 50 per cent. Twenty-five or thirty thousand of these people have come into that city within the last two years. It is perfectly evident that any such influx of people constituting so large a proportion of the total population of a city must tend to great congestion and greatly overtax the housing facilities, the trolley facilities, the market facilities, and all other social facilities of a city. Bridgeport has for years been a prosperous manufacturing city, and is a self-reliant and well-governed city. Accordingly, as soon as this situation developed, the manufacturers individually and through housing associations and manufacturing associations started in to meet it. They raised several million dollars by stock subscriptions and by loans from the banks. They took care of, I suppose, approximately half of the additional population, and in normal times would have cared for all, but, as we all know, it has now come to a point where they can get neither men nor money nor materials without Government cooperation. Hence the necessity for this bill. That is patent to everyone, and I should not have taken up your time to argue on that general proposition because it is so self-evident, but there are one or two provisions in the bill that relate especially, I think, to certain manufacturing cities like Bridgeport, which should receive the attention of the committee.

I believe that the committee which reports this bill, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, has some amendments which cover these propositions, and I would like to ask the attention of the committee especially to paragraph (d) on page 2 of the first section of the bill and the report which relates to it. Paragraph (d) provides that the Secretary of Labor can use this money to aid in providing, equipping, managing, and maintaining houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and so forth, by loan or otherwise, to such person or persons as he may determine. In the report of the committee this reference is made to that section:

The bill provides—where, in the judgment of the Secretary of Labor, that is feasible—for the loan of money to persons for the construction of these houses, the committee being of the opinion that in proper cases, with the money properly secured, loans will be preferable to construction and ownership by the Government.

I think in that conclusion the great majority of this House will concur. Then the report says further:

The bill provides that houses erected by the Government shall, whenever the same is practicable, be of a temporary character, the idea of the committee being that where new plants have been established away from any permanent community it would not be wise to build permanent structures, as the same in all probability will be abandoned after the war is ended.

I suppose that may be true, and probably is true in many cases, but I must say it rather hurts my economic notions to start in to build houses with the idea that they are going to be torn down. That would especially be true in connection with any city like Bridgeport. Anyone knows who has had anything to do with social work in manufacturing cities that the housing problem is one of the great and constant problems. That is especially true of Bridgeport, and I may say it is true of every city of corresponding character. Therefore I hope that when the committee reports this amendment, which they propose, it will apply to the next section or to the end of the section, which says:

Provided, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character whenever it is practicable so to construct them.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it would be better to make this sentence read just the other way; that is, that they shall be of a permanent character whenever it is practicable so to construct them.

And it is clear also that in a city like Bridgeport any construction of this character should be done in connection with the builders and contractors of the city itself. They know the local conditions; they know the workmen and where best to get materials. If it should be possible to build these buildings in partnership with these contractors, that, in my opinion, would be the ideal way, so that the citizens of Bridgeport would own the buildings when they are completed, subject only to a lien to the Government for such money as it might loan. In that case you would be sure of efficiency and sure of economy, because the contractor could not spend any Government money without spending his own at the same time. The contractor would be building in a community which he knows and which knows him and in which he would have to live after the buildings are completed. And then at the end of the war these buildings would be a permanent addition to the facilities of Bridgeport and they would be owned by people interested in Bridgeport and not by the Government. It is clearly undesirable that after the war is over the Government of the United States should be competing with private owners.

I am sure that it is the intent of the committee, and I hope that the act will be so administered that the general principles which I have laid down will govern, namely, permanency in construction and also economy in construction gained by cooperation between the Government and local contractors.

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

By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. MERRITT to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, of all the bills that have come before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds since I have been a member of it, I believe the one now before the House has had the most thoroughgoing and fullest consideration that I have ever seen exercised by that committee. The proposition to enter into a building plan for the housing of Government employees is a new enterprise for this country, and, first of all, the committee inquired specifically of the Secretary of Labor whether this step contemplated a permanent housing plan for Government employees. He emphatically said that it did not; that it was not the purpose to inaugurate such a permanent system, gave strong reasons therefor, and therein, I think, met with the approval of all of the members of the committee.

The situation confronting the Government at this time is one of unusual complexity. We have coming into Washington thousands of Government employees. They are sorely needed; in turn they need healthy living room; and in this connection we made inquiry as to the reports frequently circulated that many large houses in Washington are being occupied by a very few people, who refuse to offer any accommodation to the clerks that are coming here to help serve their country in the successful prosecution of this war. It was reported in

one instance that a woman living practically alone in Washington has a house of 18 rooms and when she was appealed to by a local committee to set apart a few of these rooms for the occupancy of Government employees she flatly refused to comply with the request. There are many, many instances of this kind, not only here but elsewhere in the country where war work is being done. A part of the money that is authorized in this bill is to be used for the purpose of making surveys in cities like Washington, and I mean by surveys that a thorough canvass of all of the housing possibilities in such cities will be made, recorded, and, if need be, requisitioned, and thereby it is hoped that a great saving will be made of the money authorized in this appropriation.

It may be found by the Secretary of Labor that in many of the munition-making cities where employees are needed housing can be found by commandeering quarters and using them until the end of the war; and it is the consensus of opinion of the committee that if the boys going to the front are making these sacrifices, and if the people of the country are furnishing the means for the prosecution of this war, it is certainly up to the people who own large houses in munition manufacturing centers to make some provision and some sacrifice to the end that employees in Government work may be taken care of in a reasonably satisfactory way.

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

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is possible now to commandeer such a house as the one the gentleman spoke of, where there were 16 available rooms not used?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not so understand it. I understand it can be commandeered for office purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will it be possible if this bill is passed to then do it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; requisitioned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That authority is carried in this bill?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; in lines 10 and 11 of first page.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to especially call attention of the House to the precautionary features of this bill—the safeguarding of the Public Treasury and at the same time the expeditious plan of providing housing for Government employees. The Department of Labor is delegated to take charge of this important work. This is done at the suggestion of other departments of the Government and on approval of the President, I understand, as the Department of Labor is really the clearing house for all labor matters, and housing for Government laborers is so closely allied with the efficiency and the availability of labor that this function of proper and efficient housing belongs to that branch of the Government having to do with the diversified interests of labor in its relation to Government activities at this time of imperative need. But while we have delegated to the Secretary of Labor the management of this proposed housing enterprise, we have, in section 6 of this bill, provided that Congress shall know at the opening of each session just what has been done in the way of building, and, in detail, what expenditures have been made for. We also provide that this housing plan is only for temporary and emergency purposes, and that some of this authorization may be loaned to communities to build houses; some of it may be used for temporary dormitories; some of it for building permanent housing, to be sold at the end of the war; some of it for paying for improvements for requisitioned housing; and some of it for providing local passenger transportation from shops and offices, where Government work is done, to near-by cities, where good housing is available.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has been diligent in applying safe business methods in the preparation of this legislation and at the same time arranged it so the greatest possible speed can be made in the undertaking, which is an important war-time necessity.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman think it necessary even then to provide overhead expenses of over \$300,000 in order to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, the gentleman is not prepared to say because there are no means of ascertaining what these needs may be. The heads of the departments who appeared before the committee said that they were at sea as to just what these expenses might be. They might be less and they might be more than possibly could be estimated because—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not oppose this bill, because those charged primarily with the responsibility of conducting this war say that its enactment is indispensable to certain victory over our enemies. At the same time I can not refrain from expressing my doubts as to the wisdom of the policy involved. Sometimes when considering these vast and apparently reckless measures, I have wondered if Shakespeare did not have a prophetic vision of this fateful hour when he wrote:

Oh, judgment, thou art down to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason.

I bow to the judgment of those who ought to know the situation better than I do, but I must confess that I have grave doubts as to the justice and expediency of so vast an enterprise. Perhaps I shall be criticized for it, but my heart and conscience compel me to say that I regret to see these millions of the hard-earned money of the people expended to furnish comfortable homes for those who are to labor at good wages and without being subjected to the dangers of war, while our boys, who are getting a mere pittance and sending part of that to the loved ones at home, are eating out of tin pans, sleeping in tents, wading through the grime and mud of the trenches and the battle fields, and baring their bodies to the deadly missiles of the Hun barbarians. It may be one of those inevitable sacrifices that must be made sometimes for the cause of liberty, but I must express the doubt that is in my mind as to whether the verdict of history will sustain it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Not at this point. I will later, if possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is most unfortunate that there are some people who are ever ready to impugn the motives of those who presume to criticize things that are done in connection with the conduct of the war. In my humble judgment those who do not permit the menace of being charged with pro-Germanism to deter them from just and helpful criticism, and who have the courage to say what they think, are in reality the most patriotic of public servants. I have a brother-in-law and three nephews who are already over there somewhere. I do not know where they are, but I do know that their highest ambition is to serve our country and to die if need be in its cause, and I know, too, that there is not a drop of blood in the veins of the families to which they belong that would not be proudly shed, if necessary, for the preservation of the Nation's honor and liberty [applause], and I think it would be monstrous to question my motives if in the execution of the high public trust which the people of my district have placed in my hands I should question the wisdom of some measure that may be proposed or seek to point out a better way. No one's contempt for the Kaiser can exceed mine. I look upon him as an egotistical, debased, blood-thirsty, sacrilegious monster, the seven-headed beast rising up out of the sea, as foretold in the prophecies of Holy Writ, and when I think of the unspeakable outrages that he has caused to be perpetrated, of the women who have been debauched and the children who have been mutilated and sacrificed at his behest, of the rape of peaceful Belgium, of the torpedo that sank the *Lusitania*, and the other things he did that forced us into the war, of all of the atrocities committed by drunken Prussian libertines, of the crimes that he has committed against the civilization of the world, of the anguish and agony he has brought upon my own people and the balance of the human race, of his blatant claim of partnership with the Supreme Ruler, while he is violating every law, both sacred and profane, I sometimes fear that my hatred of him goes beyond the uttermost limits of the religion of the Holy Bible in which I so devoutly believe. Surely the God of our fathers has ordained that there will be enacted over again the scene of the rich man and Lazarus, when the Kaiser, sizzling in fire and brimstone, will call on some of his victims for a drop of water to cool his parching tongue.

GERMAN INSCRIPTIONS AND BOOKS.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I feel, when I think of all these things, that I would like to see every monument or inscription in this country that recognizes the German Kaiser as a civilized and Christian ruler demolished and effaced, and I know that my contempt for the so-called German kultur, as exemplified in this war, is such that I would like to see a bonfire made of

every book in our schools and libraries that teaches it. [Applause.]

Feeling as I do toward him, no one can justly accuse me of siding our enemies merely for the reason that I seek to point out evils which, if remedied, would, in my judgment, strengthen our country in this struggle, or because I conscientiously opposed conscription and favored the volunteer system, or because I believe and am willing to say that I think commercial greed helped to get us into this war, and, so believing, that I regard it as our duty to conscript the money of the rich as well as the bodies of the poor to help us win it; or because I favored the adoption of the McLemore resolution warning our citizens to keep off belligerent ships which I thought at the time would decrease the danger of our getting into the war; or because as an American citizen I object to things that I think ought not to be done. As well might it be contended that President Lincoln was disloyal to the Union because he did not agree with all that was done by those who were associated with him in defending it, and because he did not hesitate to displace any subordinate who did not measure up to the standard he required. It will be recalled that he even put a man of opposite political faith in his Cabinet because he thought the Union cause would be better served thereby—an example worthy the emulation of our present Chief Executive. I can not be justly criticized because I express my sympathy for the anguished families of the boys who have gone to the colors and seek to better their condition. As well might President Wilson be so arraigned because he has spoken words of sympathy even for the poor and struggling masses in Germany, who are suffering because of the errors of those in control of their Government.

Now, I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman feel that the time will surely come when the people will demand a reckoning for unnecessary expenditures?

Mr. LANGLEY. I thank my good friend for the suggestion. Of course they will demand a reckoning, and that was one of the thoughts in my mind when the gentleman interrupted me a few moments ago. You and I may not live to see it, but the day of reckoning will surely come. The people of our country are patient, self-sacrificing, and patriotic to a degree that, in my judgment, will challenge the admiration of generations yet unborn, and yet I fear that there is a disposition to be too reckless in these hasty and exciting times, when billions mean no more than millions used to mean to the average legislative mind. I think I know what is in the minds and hearts of the people on this question. It will not do, gentlemen, to gamble with the people's money. [Applause.]

I voted for the war resolution because I felt that the step, momentous as it was to us, was necessary in order to preserve the honor of our country and maintain its high status among the nations of the world and to guard and protect its future welfare. I have also been voting for these stupendous and staggering appropriations and tax bills and bond issues and for the grant of unprecedented powers to the Executive because I was persuaded to believe that they were essential to the winning of the war. Those who were charged by the supreme law of the land with the responsibility of conducting the war said so, and I felt it my duty as a patriotic American citizen to accept their word and give them my loyal support, which I have been doing, and shall continue to do, but I do not think it is my duty as a Member of the American Congress to do so blindly and without using my own best judgment as to what is right and what is wrong. If we have seemed to do so thus far, I can only plead in extenuation, so far as I am personally concerned, my most earnest desire to stand by the legally constituted authorities of our Government in this great crisis to the very limit of my judgment and conscience.

Mr. Chairman, I am a partisan in times of peace, and while I do not abandon my political convictions in time of war with a foreign foe, I think it is unpardonable to inject politics into our deliberations upon these war measures. I doubt if the political wrangle in another body has elevated the American Congress in public opinion, and I am quite sure that the partisan interference in pending local political struggles from a still higher source has not had a tendency to help make the world safer for democracy. [Applause.] As I have said before in this body, I believe that when the impartial historian writes the history of our participation in this war he will record an example of tolerance, patience, and patriotism on the part of the Republicans of the country, both in and out of Congress, that is unparalleled in the political history of the world. I am not going to mar that record by talking politics now. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I can not resist the temptation to say that I hope, for the sake of the honor of our country and of a great political organization which has rendered much patriotic service at times, that the same historian will not be compelled, in the interest of

truth and justice, to write another chapter recording that in these times of national stress and peril there were those who played the biggest and deepest game of politics that was ever staged since parties were first organized in this country.

Gentlemen, my fellow colleagues, let us be fair and square with each other, and above all let us not deceive ourselves. I wish to impress you above all things with the fact that I have naught in my heart but the highest regard and esteem for each and every one of you, and I could not forgive myself if I felt that I had said anything to-day, or since the beginning of my service here, which was intended to wound or do injustice to a single one of you. I am proud of the honor of serving in this great body, composed, without exception, of honorable, earnest public servants, and I wish for the good of the country that there was not a citizen in this land who has a less understanding and appreciation than I have of your integrity, your faithfulness, and loyalty to the country. I believe that, with a few exceptions, the people do so understand and appreciate this membership. We are all human beings, all citizens of a great Republic, temporarily entrusted with honor and power by the people whence springs all power of government in a democracy. Our service here, as well as our lives, must end in the not distant future. We are all devoted alike to the cause of our country and are earnestly desirous of performing our high duty with credit to ourselves and our people who have honored us. Hope and fear, joy and sorrow, good luck and bad, affect us all just as they do the balance of our fellow beings. Let us all rise above the motives engendered by selfish ends and meet these new duties and responsibilities with that true, patriotic spirit born of self-sacrifice, doing unto others as we would have others do unto us. [Applause.]

The President has said that the hand of God is upon the nations of the world. For aught we know God in his infinite wisdom may have permitted this catastrophe to come upon us in order to teach us some great lessons of human life that we need to learn, or having learned have forgotten, for I firmly believe that out of it all will come a truer conception of the real brotherhood of mankind. I believe that this war, terrible as it is, will teach us many needful, invaluable lessons. It will teach us economy, self-sacrifice, and tolerance. It will teach us how much we have been favored by God's merciful providence. It will teach us the importance of the development of the matchless resources He has given us and their proper conservation and uses. Above all, it will give us a better understanding of how the poor and needy of our land live, the privations they endure, and the importance to them of wise and protective legislation. It will teach those who, by inheritance or other good fortune, are able to live by purchasing the products of the labor of others; how much they owe to those who tread the slippery decks of the cars by night and by day; who till the soil on the hillsides, in the valleys, and upon the plains; who toil in the darkness and dangers of the mines and amid the whirl of the spindles and the wheels; to those whose hands and faces scorch and burn before the seething, blazing fires of the furnaces; to those who stand upon their tired feet during the long, weary hours on the street cars, in the blacksmith shops, the lunch and dining rooms and kitchens, in Government buildings, and elsewhere; to those who rack their brains and strain their muscles to give the best that is in them to the service of our Government; and to those who suffer and bleed and die in rallying to its colors—to all this grand army of nature's noblemen who earn their bread in the sweat of their faces and who, amid trials, worries, and tribulations eke out an existence for themselves and their dependents—it will, I say, teach that other class of our more fortunate citizens how much they owe to these their humbler brothers and sisters. It will put more of the milk of human kindness in many callous hearts. And all this will make better legislators, better judges, and better executives, bringing us all, poor and rich alike, closer together, giving us a wider application of the precepts of the Christian religion, thus guaranteeing real liberty, equal rights, and justice to all mankind, the underlying thought of which is so beautifully expressed in the following anonymous lines:

Did you give him a lift? He's a brother of man,
And bearing about all the burden he can.
Did you give him a smile? He was downcast and blue,
And the smile would have helped him battle it through.
Did you give him your hand? He was slipping downhill;
And the world, so he fancied, was using him ill.
Did you give him a word? Did you show him the road?
Or, did you just let him go with his load?
Do you know what it means to be losing the fight,
When a lift in time might set everything right?
Do you know what it means—just the clasp of the hand—
When a man's borne about all a man ought to stand?
Do you know what it means—why the quivering lip?
Why the half-suppressed sob, and the scalding tears drip?
Were you a brother of his when the time came of need?
Did you offer to help him, or didn't you heed?

[Applause.]

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman kindly yield right there for a moment? I have been trying to get some information from this general debate by sitting and listening. I understand it is the purpose of the committee to offer an amendment to increase this appropriation in the sum of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of housing Government employees here in the District. I would like the gentleman, if he will discuss it, being a member of the committee, to state as to what plan shall be put in operation for the expenditure of this. Whether there shall be buildings rented or new ones built, and if new ones are to be built, how they are to be conducted, and the gentleman's idea as to whether or not, if there are to be buildings erected, they will be on the idea of dormitories, such as are built for students at colleges, and only those go there who are compelled to do so?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to answer that question before I consume the five minutes allotted me, if I can. When the committee began the consideration of this bill I confess I had very grave doubts as to its wisdom. It presents a scheme of legislation to which I have always been opposed and may launch us upon a sea of end of which nobody can foretell; but during the hearings upon this measure I radically changed my view. We were confronted with testimony which could not be questioned, convincing us of the great and urgent necessity for legislation along this line. It was made clear to the committee that at many places where munitions and arms and other supplies for the Army are being manufactured that there is a scarcity of labor, due in many cases to the fact that houses could not be obtained for the workmen to live in, and that it is absolutely and imperatively necessary at certain points to build houses in order to mobilize experienced and skilled workmen at those places to facilitate and expedite the manufacture of those things which are essential and necessary in war, and having accepted that view we then at once accepted the principle of this legislation with utter disregard to the precedent we may be setting.

I state frankly I am not afraid of a precedent when our country is at war. I think I can safely say that no man on the committee in normal times, under normal conditions, would stand for this legislation, but the morning papers tell us that thousands of American citizens to-day, at this very hour, are on the firing line in France, and we know it is necessary to supply those soldiers as well as the allied soldiers with supplies and equipment, and therefore I for one am heartily in favor of this legislation, believing that it will tend to give strength and success to our Army.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I will yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Perhaps the gentleman does not care to go into this phase of the matter, but I would like to know where they got the figures for the \$50,000,000 required. I have gone through the hearings and I do not find that any one has made a definite calculation.

Mr. RUCKER. I will state to the gentleman briefly that the Secretary of Labor recommended those figures as being approximately correct as far as we can now tell, but I will say frankly that no one has undertaken to say that \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000, as the bill will probably be amended to read, will accomplish the purpose. Fifty million dollars is all that can be spent now. Hereafter there may be other legislation along this line; I hope not, but I fear further legislation along this line may be necessary. Let me say to the membership of this committee that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was not indifferent to the fact but we are greatly concerned at present about the manner in which contracts for Federal buildings have been made and which led to wasteful prodigality in expenditures, but in this bill we have sought diligently to safeguard the expenditure of every dollar of public money authorized by this bill, and if it is not safeguarded, so far as I am concerned, I say to you that I will welcome any suggestion from any source which will more carefully and thoroughly safeguard this expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit as evidence of existing public sentiment in Tennessee in this present crisis the following telegram and ask to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the telegram.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. T. W. SIMS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Citizens of McKenzie and community, in patriotic meeting assembled, unanimously urge national legislation drafting into the service of the Government everybody, regardless of age, and all resources during the war.

C. F. YOUNG,
JAMES A. ROBBINS,
Committee.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if that would include Brother SIMS?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill, as I have for all measures that have come before the House in the last year having to do with our better equipment for carrying on the war. It seems to me the item in the committee's report, which says that it is for the housing of industrial workers who are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense during the existing war, is the real purport of the bill. The report also says that the committee desire to express the opinion that the only justification for the proposed legislation is the condition confronting our country, as shown in the hearings. It is exactly on that basis, it seems to me, that we can consistently support this measure. I do feel, however, that there should be attention called to the fact of the amendment which the committee says it intends to introduce, namely, for \$10,000,000 additional money for a housing proposition in the District. I have made inquiry as to the number of employees in the District actually residing here at the present time, who seems to me to have to do probably with war measures, but who could better be located elsewhere than in the District of Columbia and avoid some of this extravagant expenditure of \$10,000,000.

Any Member of this House can see the enormous outlay for building going on here now. We are spoiling our parks, taking up beautiful shrubbery and trees, and going to extravagant expenditures for locations here. I agree fully with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in his statement on Friday last as to conditions in the expenditure of this enormous sum for overhead charges. But I want to refer specifically to the boards which have no occasion to be in Washington and the number of employees that they have. I have obtained the following figures by inquiry of each bureau to which I refer.

The Food Administration has in its employment here in Washington 1,834. The center, Mr. Chairman, of food measures and distribution in this country is certainly in Chicago. And why the Food Administration should have its headquarters in this city is beyond me to understand.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have only a brief time, and I prefer not to do so.

Mr. LITTLE. It is a very brief question.

Mr. TREADWAY. The Fuel Administration is employing here in Washington 700 persons. The center of fuel distribution of the country is Pittsburgh. Why is the Fuel Administration located in Washington?

The Emergency Fleet Corporation is employing 1,381. The Shipping Board is employing 145. The center of the maritime interests of the country is in New York. Why are not those employees taken to New York, the center of the shipping interests of the country? There are employed by the Committee on Public Information here in Washington 325 persons. From recent exposures the title is wrong, it should be called the Committee on Public Misinformation. Another body of this Congress looked into the matter of the usefulness of the Committee on Public Information last week, and I refer the Members of the House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to the need of the continuance of these employees in Washington. The misinformation that the public is receiving through the so-called Committee on Public Information will fill a very large volume, not only of printed matter but of photographs. So that we find of these very few commissions—there are several others—a total here in Washington of 4,385 employees on the pay roll, for whom we are asked, in order that these may remain here, to appropriate \$10,000,000 in order to secure better housing facilities in the District of Columbia. Those that are called here, Mr. Chairman, for the direct purposes of the Government we should provide for, but there are at least 4,000 of the employees to whom I have referred that can very well be spared from the city of Washington, making room for 4,000 other employees who may

be needed here. I fully agree with the attitude of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in the extravagance of the appropriation contained in this bill, particularly in the amendment. [Applause.] Let the boards and commissions not needed here make room for the new employees who may be needed before we appropriate such an enormous sum for additional housing accommodations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, how does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 10.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, there is no question as to the time and the necessity for this absolutely important legislation. Perhaps Congress has been amiss in not providing for these activities before this late day, but this measure was originally referred to the Committee on Labor, and afterwards transferred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. If we are to have the highest amount of efficiency from our munition and other industrial workers, we must provide healthy and satisfactory accommodations for their living. If we are to obtain the full capacity of our manufacturing and munition plants, we must be prepared to have not only a day force but a three-shift force in all of them before we attain that maximum of output which will be absolutely essential to the success of our Army and Navy.

Now a great many of the men who are connected with these plants are finding unsatisfactory conditions, no provision for their families, and no modern, up-to-date, healthy, sanitary houses or quarters even for the single men. So that if we secure and hold laboring men it is absolutely essential we must provide for them what humanity demands and what reason and common sense dictate. These activities run into the hundreds, and this great army of munition and industrial workers into countless thousands. The hearings disclose the fact that in four of these plants alone 5,000 houses are needed, not counting hundreds of other similar plants scattered over more than 20 States of the Republic.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the gentleman think that for some of this housing proposition there could be some relief obtained by distributing these contracts more to smaller firms throughout the country, that could take care of the people to the extent that they need them?

Mr. AUSTIN. The chairman of the housing committee for the Council of National Defense, Mr. Otto M. Eidlitz, of New York City, presented this matter pretty thoroughly before the committee, and the assurance given to the committee was that the policy would be pursued in line with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]; and the committee intends to offer an amendment to this bill providing for competitive bidding in connection with the construction of these houses.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not in connection with shipbuilding that the greatest need of housing exists at the present time?

Mr. AUSTIN. That has been provided for by an appropriation of \$50,000,000. But take, for instance, the Bethlehem plant.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask the gentleman one more question along that line.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman knows that my time is limited.

Mr. SNELL. All right.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Bethlehem plant requires 2,000 houses, to cost in the neighborhood, perhaps, of \$9,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Bridgeport plant requires 1,500 houses; the Fore River (Mass.) plant needs 500 houses; Erie, Pa., a thousand houses; and Norfolk and Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia, must provide for 9,000 employees.

Now, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. By what authority and by whom was this man Eidlitz appointed chairman of this commission?

Mr. AUSTIN. As I understand it, the President of the United States telegraphed or wrote to Mr. Eidlitz to come to Washington. I want to say in all fairness that I have carefully investigated Mr. Eidlitz, and no man stands higher for

honesty and integrity and competency than Mr. Eidlitz. I think the Government of the United States would be extremely fortunate if there were more men of his type and character looking after the affairs of this Government. As far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to intrust this entire proposition to the care and keeping of such a man and would feel sure that there would be faithful and honest administration if it were controlled and supervised and directed by Mr. Eidlitz, of New York City.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly some essential and important provisions of the bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] who presented the rule under which we are operating, went as fully as possible during his limited discussion of the rule into the merits of this bill. The chairman of the committee and others who have followed have gone so fully over the subject matter that it leaves but little to be said.

Now, I want, in the first place, to combat the idea advanced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] during the discussion of the rule in regard to the \$300,000 that will be spent for the purpose of administering this business. It was found upon investigation by the heads of the different departments that if each department had to control the particular housing matters germane to that department there would be duplication of work, congestion, and increased expense. Therefore at least three of the heads of the departments got together—those that were mainly interested in the housing proposition—and under the sanction and advice of the President it was agreed between the Secretary of Navy, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of War that this all ought to be concentrated under one head; and as this proposition of housing was mainly a labor proposition, it was thought that the Secretary of Labor should supervise it and that that department was the one in which it should be lodged. Therefore it was so agreed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this work will extend from the Lakes to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I do not remember offhand as to the number of these enterprises that have sprung up all over the country, enterprises that are making munitions, arms, ammunition, clothing, and various other things to aid us in winning this war, but they are diversified and numerous. It would simply be impossible to concentrate that work under the office of the Supervising Architect, with the multifarious duties that it has to perform already.

Now, we provide that the genius and intelligence of the Supervising Architect's Office may be utilized, including its employees—inspectors and others. Wherever it is possible to do so the board is to use the Supervising Architect's Office.

In regard to the amount of \$300,000, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] tries to make a mountain out of a molehill with respect to that, and yet when you consider that starting off with a minimum of \$60,000,000 of expenditure, considering that men have to go all over the United States in looking after these matters, it seems to me that it will be one of the most economically administered concerns of perhaps any bureau or board or commission now operating under this Government. If it is held down to \$300,000, as was stated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN]—and I agree with him in this belief—it would be cheaply administered. If we undertook to administer this through the different departments we would find that the extra expense would amount to more than \$300,000 before the work could be finished.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that I have I am not going to discuss the necessity for this legislation. Men from all over the country came before us and showed the congested conditions at these great munitions plants and other governmental activities. I remember, when I addressed the Committee on Rules in favor of the rule, my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] referred to the fact, as I recall it now, that an industry in his district that a year or two ago employed only 300 or 400 men is now employing 4,000 or 5,000 men. These men have to be sheltered. It was stated by the secretary of the Federation of Labor, Mr. Morrison, that some of the strikes—

not all, but some—throughout the country were due to inadequate housing facilities. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is a war exigency and a war emergency, and something must be done, and done right away.

Complaints are coming up all over the country as to the delays that have been brought about in the building of ships, in the manufacture of munitions, in the construction of guns, in the production of clothing for the soldiers. All of those things, in some part at least, are due to inadequacy of labor, and that inadequacy of labor is due, in some degree at least, to inadequate housing for men desiring work.

Mr. Chairman, if anybody has the idea that the Government is going to build these houses and let the employees have them rent free, he is mistaken—that is not the case. It is expected that they will pay a reasonable rent, just as they would if they rented the houses from private enterprises or private individuals.

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

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I wish to ask the gentleman if this housing will stop those "turning over" conditions of labor?

Mr. BURNETT. Exactly. That was one point that was stressed by gentlemen who appeared before the committee, who stated that that condition is a very serious condition, and that that would be improved.

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

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the town where I happen to live the city hall has been made over for Government activities, a hundred men living in the hall. Is it not probable that that commission would want housing to be built for those Government employees, and the same in all the towns, so that \$50,000,000 will be spread out as thin as a wafer?

Mr. BURNETT. I think not. It will be \$60,000,000 if the amendment that will be proposed by Chairman CLARK is adopted; but a member of the committee, Mr. CANTRELL, who is also a member of the Committee on Rules, stated frankly to you the other day that it is not his opinion that \$60,000,000 will be the maximum amount that will be reached.

As was said by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL], in speaking to the rule, it was stated before the committee that England has already expended \$700,000,000 for housing purposes. Now, whether we like it or not, if we are really in favor of the earnest and rapid prosecution of this war, something must be done in order to relieve these acute conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, may I have about three minutes more, by unanimous consent, just to call attention to the conditions in Washington. I did not know the time was running so fast.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, in the first consideration of this bill the committee decided that they would not undertake to consider the housing question in Washington, but it was brought to our attention that the situation was so urgent that we decided there ought not to be two bites to the cherry, but that the whole business ought to be cared for in one bill. It was shown to us that we will have 18,593 more Government employees between March 1 of this year and July 1, and we will have, in addition to that, 12,982 more between July 1 and December 31, making 31,575 in all, and all that the housing committees can see in sight or any prospect of is housing for 14,600 of these employees, which would be more than 4,000 less than those who will be here between now and the first of July and over 20,000 less than those who will come by December 31. For that reason we believed something should be done at once. The committee believe, further, that the building and opening of these houses for Government employees at moderate rents will of itself to a great extent neutralize the profiteering of those cormorants here who have been feeding upon those who come here to serve the Government.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Was the matter discussed in the committee, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] a moment ago, of taking some of these departments to the cities where they belong?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not know that it was, but that would be impracticable. The gentleman and I have to spend a third of our time in running down to these different bureaus and getting

information from the Food Bureau and the other departments; and how impracticable it would be if these bureaus, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], instead of being in Washington, were scattered all over the country. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, one of the troubles of Congressmen in matters of legislation to-day is that the buildings which house the Government activities even in the city of Washington are not near enough together; that we have to run all over the city to get to these various bureaus and transact our business. I believe it would be utterly impracticable to adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The CHAIRMAN. All time allotted to the general debate has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first section of the bill may be read by paragraphs for amendment and the remainder of the bill read by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the first section of the bill be read by paragraphs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. That general consent can not be given in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend by inserting, after the word "families," in line 7, page 1, the following: "and employees of the United States whose duties require them to reside in the District of Columbia, and their families."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I prefer that the gentleman should make his point of order, if he intends to make it. I do not want to take up time in discussing it.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman has offered this amendment to take care of the situation in Washington, I presume?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. I desire to bring to the attention of the Chair the fact that this measure is general in its character, and the paragraph of the bill which has just been read is the paragraph which sets forth the purpose of this legislation, which is to take care of "housing, transportation, and community facilities for industrial workers engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense." Now, as I understand, the amendment of the gentleman from Florida—

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Is it the gentleman's opinion that employees of the navy yard, for instance, in the District of Columbia, would come under this bill as it now stands?

Mr. WALSH. I assume that they might. As I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Florida, it is to take care of the employees of the Government who may be located here in the District of Columbia and who are not connected with industries essential to the war, and it is not limited to those who are connected with the activities of the Government essential to the national defense. In other words, extra employees in other branches of the Government that have nothing to do with the war activities of the Government could be taken care of under this amendment. I submit that under the rules of the House a provision general in its character as to the territory to which it must apply, but for a specific purpose as to the particular class of activities or persons to which it should apply, can

not be amended under a clause such as the gentleman from Florida has offered as an amendment, making it applicable to a specific section or particular part of the general territory of the United States, and that the amendment is not germane, because it makes a specific provision in a restricted area for particular classes under a measure which is designed to take care of a general territory—namely, the entire country—and for particular classes of people engaged upon a particular work. The whole tenor of the measure, as reported by the committee and the report which they have offered, in the hearings which have been held, so far as I have been able to gather it, is to take care of housing requirements in cities and towns where industries are being conducted or work is being carried on in connection with industries that are essential to the national defense.

It is in connection with the munition plants, I think, in connection with the building of torpedo boats, and in connection with other activities that are being carried on as a result of the contracts or arrangements that have been made or entered into between the Government and private individuals in the nature of corporations or partnerships.

Now, this amendment does not contemplate that class of activity, but relates solely to the District of Columbia, and applies in the District of Columbia only to those employees that have been brought here or who have come here in the various departments. Many of the departments, I will admit, have direct supervision over these industries and war activities, but the employees are not the employees of the people carrying on the activities, but are the Government employees; they are not industrial workers, although they may be industrious workers. In my judgment, it is not in order to amend a measure taking care of the needs of the various activities scattered throughout the country by this amendment; in other words, the amendment is not germane as it is offered by the gentleman from Florida.

It is not germane inasmuch as it is seeking to put another class of beneficiaries who are not related, according to the terms of the measure, which the committee has reported, to the beneficiaries that it has sought to take care of by this legislation, namely, the employees of private corporations or partnerships working on Government activities as the result of agreement or contract. I maintain that you can not put into that legislation the employees of the Government, those who are employed directly by the Government in another class of work. Therefore I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not unless the Chair has some doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but the Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to argue the question, I want to say that this bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to provide housing facilities—

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Chair to say that he was ready to rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but he is glad to hear the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not care to say anything now.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. This is an important measure for the committee and for the public.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will not hurry it along by any such interruption as that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word. This is a very important question. As the Chair knows, and as every Member of the House knows, this committee has no information whatever as to the form of the amendment that has been tentatively agreed upon by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which they seek to offer, to provide housing facilities for the departmental employees in the District. The House is fully advised of the measure presented to the House for consideration by the rule of the Committee on Rules. That rule did not make in order any amendment suggested by the gentleman from Florida, unless that amendment is within the general rules of the House under parliamentary procedure.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is not contending that an amendment is not in order under the rule?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. This amendment is a committee amendment and was agreed upon in committee as fully as was the measure.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not take any such ridiculous position as that in an argument on a point of order.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Was it not contemplated in the bill as originally drawn that it should include the housing of Government employees in the Government shipyards as well as other employees?

Mr. STAFFORD. I could not go to that extent; I can only read the bill as it is. As far as the housing of employees in the shipping industry is concerned, we provided for them in the bill S. 3389, which has since been approved and is now the law of the land.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the bill itself provide for the housing of Government employees who are employed in the Government shipyards as well as for those employed by private capital?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not been able to find any such language as would grant the Secretary of Labor the right to provide housing for Government employees.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is not the language general—"for such industrial workers as are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense"? Does not that mean, necessarily, whether they are employees of the Government or private companies?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think perhaps you might make an argument that an amendment would be germane along lines indicated by the gentleman from New York, but that is not the question before the committee.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. There is certainly a wide distinction between industrial workers and Government clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I am glad the gentleman from Illinois has anticipated my argument by that suggestion. The bill in its purpose is defined in its first paragraph, which we are now considering. It has only one general purpose, and that is to provide housing facilities, local transportation, and other facilities for such industrial workers as are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense. That is a class to which this paragraph is confined. It is limited to provide these facilities for such industrial workers as are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense. I respectfully submit that this bill must be considered as having one purpose, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], and that is to provide facilities for whom? "For such industrial workers as are connected or engaged in industries essential to the national defense." If such is its purpose, and, scanning the other paragraphs of the bill, you will find nothing in the subsequent sections that contravenes that purpose, I respectfully contend that an amendment like that offered by the gentleman from Florida providing for housing facilities of an entirely different character, namely, employees of the United States whose duties require them to rent in the District of Columbia—departmental employees—is of a class entirely different and not related at all to the subject matter as carried in the bill.

It comes, therefore, within the established precedents of this House that where a bill is limited to one subject matter an amendment related to another subject matter, even though it be related, is not germane, and therefore not in order. The fundamental reason for that is to protect the House, so that amendments will not be proposed upon the floor of the House that are not germane, so that the membership may not be taken by surprise. There is no one here who knows anything so far as an argument in the form of a report is concerned on the amendment as presented by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that refers to the need of public buildings in the District for housing departmental clerks. I am not arguing upon the merits of the proposition. Personally, I believe that there is need for it, but I say, for safeguarding the interests of the committee, it is absolutely necessary that we should limit these amendments to those that are germane. As the Chair knows, under parliamentary law any amendment may be in order, but the rules of the House limit the general parliamentary law which will permit any amendment to be offered, so that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. There are many precedents that are found on page 345 of the Manual which hold that two subjects are not necessarily germane because they are related. Of course, there is some relation here, but if the Chair goes back to the philosophy of the rule of germaneness he will see that in this case the very essence requires that the House should be advised in advance of the nature of the legislation that is going to be presented for consideration, and the Chair knows the House has not been advised in any way by the report from the committee having jurisdiction of this matter as to the reasons for a tentative recommendation providing \$10,000,000 additional for the housing of

departmental clerks in the city of Washington. I can refer to the various precedents upholding that general statement under subdivision (d) of Rule XVI, to which I have referred:

To a proposition for the appointment of a selective committee to investigate a certain subject an amendment proposing an inquiry of the Executive on that subject was held not to be germane.

To a bill granting a right of way to a railroad an amendment providing for the purchase of the railroad was held not to be germane.

To a provision for the erection of a building for a mint an amendment to change the coinage laws was held not to be germane.

And I go back to my fundamental position and shall then close the argument—and I regard this as a very serious question, because this committee is entitled when a subject different in its character is presented for its consideration to have the report in the form of an argument presented to the attention of the committee in advance so that it may be able to determine its merits and vote intelligently upon it.

I go back to the fundamental proposition which can not be controverted as it is presented and as every person must read it. This bill is limited to one subject and one subject matter alone. It provides for certain facilities, namely, housing, local transportation, and other community facilities. For whom? For one general class and only one. For industrial workers such as are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense. There may be any germane amendment touching the character of those facilities providing for these industrial workers who are engaged in industries that are essential to the national defense, but you can not include housing facilities for departmental workers who are not industrial workers engaged in industries connected with the national defense. It needs no argument, Mr. Chairman, to say that that is entirely distinct and apart, not related to the one provision of this bill, namely, facilities for industrial workers.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. REED. It is in order always to strike out words, is it not?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. REED. And if the gentleman would strike out four words from line 4 he would have it read "for such workers as are connected with and essential to," and he would accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the question before the House. There has been serious question by parliamentarians whether you could, even by striking out, accomplish by indirection what you can not accomplish by direction.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], it was that the amendment proposed by the committee could not be adopted and was not germane for the reason that the amendment would change the character of the employees to be accommodated; that instead of being employees of private companies or individuals it would make the law provide for including employees of the United States. The language is broad enough as it is to include such employees, so that argument, it seems to me, has no solid foundation.

In answer to the first argument presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] we should go first to the title of the bill, and we find that the title, while it is not a part of the bill, bears on the purposes of the bill, and is always to be taken into consideration, and that title is—

To authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

Let us now go to the bill itself and see what we find. The bill says that it provides for "industrial" workers who are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense. Let us see whom that would include. Who are industrial workers? What does "industrial workers" mean? "Industrial" means relating to either manufacturing or commercial production. That, whether right or not, is the dictionary definition. Let us see what that means as enlarged by the amendment. We have here in Washington, for instance, the Ordnance Department, and what do these men who are employed here do? Their work relates to both manufacturing and commercial production. Take the aeroplane department. What do the workers here in the aeroplane activities do? They tend to promote production, both by manufacturing and by distribution. The same may be said to be true of the shipbuilding industry and of each and every industry if you go over the entire list.

So I say in the first place we have language broad enough to include all workers who are employed by the Government or privately employed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. And next I say that these workers—in one moment—are engaged in industrial pursuits within the strict dictionary definition. It is as essential to have the office force, it is just as essential to the clerical department, it is just as essential to have all those who work here as it is to have those who are in the field, and those who are here tend to promote manufacturing and distributing, which is the commercial side of it. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida extends to employees of the United States whose duties require them to rent in the District of Columbia. Under that general phraseology I assume that would extend to employees connected with the Indian Service. Does the gentleman believe that those employees are in anywise related or connected with the industries connected with or essential to the national defense?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will answer that in this way: This congestion has not been caused by the employees who were in the city of Washington before the war. It has been caused wholly by the bringing in of additional Government employees for war purposes. In other words, as the original act recites, their services are connected with and essential to the national defense and they are brought here solely for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the amendment of the gentleman from Florida is so broad that it provides for employees who are in no wise connected with or essential to the national defense.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Would the gentleman contend that the employees mentioned in the amendment of the gentleman from Florida, if it were adopted, would then be included within the phraseology of industrial workers engaged in and essential to the national defense?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I say it seems to me the industrial worker, in the broad and liberal view, is not simply a man who is in a shop operating a lathe or a machine, but it can fairly take in a man whose work is just as essential to the carrying on of that industry.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If the amendment were adopted, it would include, I assume, some of the large force that has come here in connection with the publication of the Official Bulletin, some of these highly paid editorial special-article writers; the gentleman would agree that they would be included within the phraseology of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, I do not regard those as industries essential to the national defense.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am somewhat interested in the definition of the gentleman as to industries applying to this bill, and I was somewhat interested in his description of the men engaged, for instance, in the aviation section of the Signal Corps—

Mr. DEMPSEY. Such as spruce production.

Mr. McKENZIE (continuing). In the city of Washington.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Take the spruce-production division; that would be a fair example.

Mr. McKENZIE. But they happen to be out West.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, no; they have them here as well as out West. We send them from here to the West.

Mr. McKENZIE. What I wanted to ask the gentleman, because I think his judgment would be worth something, is, Would he classify as industrial workers the gentlemen engaged in the aviation section who wrote the headlines on the photographs of the flying machines which was disclosed in the Senate hearing a few days ago?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not want to classify them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I can get the attention of this committee so as to stop this eternal talk, I would ask leave to amend my amendment by adding after the word "Columbia" the following:

And whose services are essential to war needs.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask to have the amendment again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Maryland asks to have the amendment again reported. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by inserting after the word "Columbia," in the last line, the words "and whose services are essential to war needs," so that as amended the lines will read, "Insert after the word 'fam-

ilies,' in line 7, on page 1, the following language: 'and employees of the United States whose duties require them to reside in the District of Columbia and whose services are essential to war needs and their families.'"

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order to the amendment just reported.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that this amendment is not germane. The Chair believes that the philosophy of the rule prohibiting the introduction of amendments not germane to the subject is, as has been stated, to prevent two opposing propositions being incorporated in the same measure. However, there has been an unbroken series of precedents to uphold the principle that a general proposition may be amended by adding a specific proposition of the same class.

This bill provides for housing facilities and other community facilities for war needs at any place in the country. This amendment is a specific provision for the District of Columbia. Therefore, the Chair holds the amendment to be germane and overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is entitled to some information as to whether or not the committee intends to offer any further amendments so as to provide for housing facilities of the employees of the District.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The committee proposes to offer a number, and the gentleman can see them if he desires to do so. They are right here.

Mr. STAFFORD. And those amendments will be offered, I suppose, to the respective paragraphs.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not have them in the form of a bill so that the committee can examine them?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not. They are amendments agreed upon by the committee after the rule had been granted, and the committee did not feel at liberty to put them into the bill. So the committee decided that we would come upon the floor and offer them as committee amendments. There has been no occasion or opportunity to print them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the gentleman could have obtained permission to print them in the RECORD and indicate the places where they would be offered. Will the gentleman advise the committee whether any of the amendments seek to change the general character of authority in the way of buildings as provided in this bill for industrial workers?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not get the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking information as to whether those amendments seek in any way to change the general character of authority for buildings for departmental clerks and the authority as carried for industrial workers?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all. There is an amendment, I will say to the gentleman, which provides for the taking over of the Maltby Building and the block of houses below it, and any other residential property in the District of Columbia belonging to the Government which is suitable and not devoted to some other purpose. We also propose to amend it and make it more clear that the department is to construct temporary houses only in localities where the institution is liable to be suspended after the close of the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is, as far as the housing of these departmental clerks is concerned?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the bill there is a provision limiting the character of the buildings to that of a temporary character.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I say that we have amended that so as to make it clearer, or we propose to amend to make it clearer, than it is in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire, in that connection, whether the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has given any consideration to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Kentucky, that in providing housing facilities for departmental clerks we should undertake the erection of permanent structures in the nature of dormitories that could be utilized either for office purposes or for hotel purposes after the war and sold after the war to private concerns?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is the understanding of the persons who are to execute it. Of course, the committee could not put in the bill every minute detail of just what was to be done, but we have provided for the construction of permanent buildings at such places as might be thought advisable. And those who are to administer the law are given authority, if they see fit, to build dormitories or buildings of the character the gentleman indicates, and they have ample power in the bill to do so. In other words, we have left a very broad discretion with the administrators of the bill.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. WELLING. Your amendment provides not only for erecting the housing facilities for employees of the United States, but also for the families of the employees? Now, I do not refer to those in industrial pursuits, but to those who are employed here in the civil branch of the Government. Is that what is contemplated in the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is certainly meant that when they build a house a man's family is to occupy it with him if he rents it from the Government.

Mr. WELLING. You build the houses for the employees and their families as well?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes, sir; to be occupied by the employees and their families; certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman anticipate that an amendment would be in order, instead of appropriating \$60,000,000, making it \$160,000,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We intend to authorize an appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. I mean to authorize an appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman think that if you are going into the building of houses for the families of employees of a permanent nature in the District of Columbia that you will get out with two or three hundred millions of dollars?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state to the gentleman that the hearings indicated that before this program was finished it would cost from three hundred million to five hundred million dollars in the United States.

Mr. CANNON. And half of it or two-thirds of it in the city of Washington?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, there was no intimation as to how much would be spent here.

Mr. CANNON. This is a camel's nose, then?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Something like that; yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand the gentleman to state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], it was contemplated that this movement was going to cost the Government from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is the estimate of those who are charged with its execution.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to make an inquiry of the gentleman, so as to get his opinion. Unfortunately I could not hear his opening statement.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will be glad to answer anything I can.

Mr. BUTLER. My questions will not be hard ones.

Now, this bill provides for what is called local transportation. Do we understand from the provisions in this bill, if it becomes a law, the Government will have authority to acquire railroads?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That was meant to cover this situation, I will state to the gentleman. We understand that there are a number of cases where large plants are situated a few miles from a large city, connected by an electric line.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And there may be ample housing in the city. It was intended, in cases like that, that instead of building houses the Government, through the Secretary of Labor, would either assist the owners of the electric line to enlarge its facilities; or, if the owners did not give sufficient service, he was given the power to take the line over.

Mr. BUTLER. To house them near the works or else to haul them back and forth?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The bill, as it was originally introduced, did not contain the word "local," and fearing that it might be understood to extend, as suggested by the gentleman, so as to include all kinds of transportation by railroads all over the country, the committee inserted that language, which applies only to local transportation in the locality in question, in connection with the particular industries that will employ these people.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand the interpretation of the act must be reasonable. But suppose a workman lived as much as 10 miles away. Would that be considered local?

Mr. BURNETT. If it were necessary that they should live 10 miles away and should have transportation, it would be so construed; but it would not cover 100 miles or anything like that.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course you could not take them back and forth that distance.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It applies to places within easy reach of the work.

Mr. BURNETT. For the day's work, for the time they are to be employed.

Mr. BUTLER. And it is intended to relieve congestion in transportation as well?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is the very purpose of it.

Mr. BUTLER. The reason I asked that question is this: I know a situation in this country that ought to be relieved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that the gentleman may have a little more time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. The congestion occurs 4 or 5 miles from an immense plant manufacturing munitions for the Government. I asked the question in order to be satisfied in my own mind that the conditions would be relieved by the passage of this bill. The railroads there are not sufficient to transport these employees. Will it be within the power of the Government, if this bill becomes a law, to build temporary railroads from those plants? Will it enable the Government to build a railroad, say from Chester to Hog Island—an additional railroad?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. There are a great many small industrial plants all over the country which, on account of the slowing down of private work, have very little to do at the present time. These plants could do a certain amount of this Government work. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to distribute some of this work among the small plants, instead of trying to concentrate all the work in the big plants, where you are obliged to build housing facilities to accommodate the employees?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that they are doing that now by subletting contracts.

Mr. SNELL. I have been told by people in my own State that it is impossible to get contracts for anything to do, although they have the factories and machinery and expert men right there at home, who do not want to go away from home to work. I have especially in mind at the present time a small shipbuilding firm which built 10,000 tons of wooden ships last year and delivered them.

But the Government has now commandeered all their timber supply, so they can not continue their regular business with private corporations; and they wanted to get contracts from the Government to build wooden ships there, but they were informed by the Shipping Board here that they did not need that kind of contractors or plants. Those people have 170 ship carpenters at the present time, and they have available 300 carpenters that they can put to work right away. It would not cost a cent to house those men. They are willing to take the contracts at the prices offered. I would like to know why those firms can not get some small contracts for this work.

Mr. BARNHART. The fact of the matter is that while these Government contracts are let mostly to large contractors, much of the work is being done by subletting. I have in mind many plants in the district in which I live that have contracts, some for steel, under a Philadelphia contractor, and so forth. Some have doubled or quadrupled the capacity of their plants in order to meet the obligations of the contracts they have made with the main contractors, so that I know that contracts are being let to smaller factories that are trying to get them, but the Government looks to a few main contractors rather than many.

Mr. SNELL. But with so many of these small contractors out of work, I am against building houses until these outside places are filled up with such work as they are equipped to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SNELL. May the gentleman have three minutes more by unanimous consent? I would like to ask another question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. The information I am trying to get is why the man I am interested in can not get one of these contracts.

Mr. BARNHART. I can not answer that.

Mr. SNELL. Can anybody answer this question: Why this man, who has a shipbuilding yard up here, whose ways are lying idle, who has carpenters who know the wooden shipbuilding game, can not get a contract?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman should put his question to the Shipping Board and not to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not answer as to that, because the shipbuilding proposition is with the Urgency Fleet

Corporation and the Shipping Board. I do not know what their program is, or how they let their contracts, or anything of that kind. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the gentleman know that there is a shortage of shipbuilding contractors and a shortage of ship carpenters all over the country? We are appropriating money to provide housing to take care of them—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to see every shipbuilding plant running day and night to get out ships; but my friend ought to know that I do not know anything about it. I am not on the Shipping Board.

Mr. GILLETT. This affects the housing question. If there are shipyards which will house their own men, and which are willing to take contracts, and do not get them, it is very important to know it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts that we have already passed a bill here to provide for the housing of employees at shipyards.

Mr. GILLETT. That is true. That does not apply to this.

Mr. SNELL. But it would apply to the general proposition of housing, and my question is why a man who has everything ready, and who does not ask this Government to advance one cent, can not get a contract?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. My friend will have to ask the Shipping Board that question.

Mr. SNELL. I have asked them, and have received no answer from them. They agreed to write me a letter a week ago, but they have not done it, and I can not get any answer from them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope my friend will not charge me with that.

Mr. SNELL. I thought if I called attention to it on the floor of the House I might get a proper answer from the Shipping Board. That is the reason why I have made these remarks here.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment, which I should like to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WALDOW. After the words "District of Columbia" insert "and in the city of Buffalo, State of New York."

I only wish to state that under the ruling made by the Chair I believe my amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to offer an amendment, too.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "Columbia," in the committee amendment, insert the words "the city of Buffalo, State of New York."

Mr. WALDOW. I have no desire to make an argument, Mr. Chairman, except to say that under the ruling of the Chair I believe my amendment is germane.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to be heard on this.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida make the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, Mr. Chairman; but I want to say a word.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to be heard against the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW] is pending now.

Mr. MADDEN. They are both pending.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Who has the floor, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized to oppose the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this right now, and I want to say it with all the best feeling in the world: I have no pride of opinion in this bill. I have no possible personal interest in it of any character. If gentlemen want to make sport of a bill of this character on the floor of this House, and want to pursue tactics which are meant to delay and hobble the bill, that is their concern. If they see fit to do that, I think I should not complain. There are no civil employees, outside of industrial workers, who to any great extent have been brought into any of the cities of the country, face to face with a condition of congestion, except here at the capital. It seems to me that it is playing with a very serious proposition to attempt to amend it by sticking on Buffalo, Chicago, Brooklyn, and all the other cities in the land. The bill already provides for their congestion which, if it exists, is caused by the influx of workers at industrial plants and manu-

facturing establishments. Here is the capital of the Nation, where we are bringing thousands of employees whose work is absolutely necessary, and who are crowding this city beyond its limits. I stated a day or two ago that a lady in this city had told me that there are over 2,000 girls in Washington to-day who have only temporary abiding places, who have been taken in by good people temporarily until some arrangement could be made to permanently house them. We do not object to proper amendment of this bill. If it is not right, we are perfectly willing that it be made right to accomplish the important purpose which it is intended to accomplish; but I do protest against amendments being offered which can serve only to delay and impede it and to make it worse than it is to accomplish its purpose. We have done the best we could in drafting the bill, together with the amendments that we propose to offer, and we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment of any gentleman on this floor that will make this bill better answer its object; but I hope that the Committee of the Whole will vote down amendments that are offered to no purpose, or the effect of which will be not to improve the bill a particle, but only to hamstring it and to injure it.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. SNYDER. I agree with the gentleman that there should not be any delay in having this bill enacted, and I shall undoubtedly vote for it, but I should like to get this thought into the minds of gentlemen here: I have had many requests from construction contracting firms throughout the country, making complaint that they are unable to get an opportunity to bid upon any of this construction work. As I understand it, these buildings are to be built at the important parts of the country where great governmental activities are to take place or are now taking place.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Where there is congestion.

Mr. SNYDER. And it would seem to me that if something could be put into this measure that would make it possible for an ordinary well-equipped construction contractor somewhere within the locality to have an opportunity to bid on the job it would facilitate the purpose which the gentleman's committee are seeking to accomplish.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I see what the gentleman is after. I catch the gentleman's point. I want to say that the committee has an amendment which it will offer later on to cover that thing.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the hearings will disclose that the contractor who is to expend that \$50,000,000 or \$500,000,000 has already been appointed, or has appointed himself, a New York contractor.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in justice to that man; I knew nothing of him, never heard of him in my life until a few weeks ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, the committee is not responsible for it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. This gentleman from New York, Mr. Eidlitz, I knew nothing of; but when I understood that he had been selected by the Secretary of Labor as the administrator of this fund I did take occasion to investigate him, and I have not heard of a man but who has given him the highest reputation for honesty, for integrity, and for everything that goes to make up a real good, honest American citizen. I want to say further that Mr. Eidlitz is not getting a penny for his services, nor has he since he has been in the service of the Government. He has absolutely declined to allow his firm to make a contract for the Government for a penny's worth of work, although his firm has done millions of dollars worth of work every year.

Now, he is not going to do this work, but he is going to offer to the Government his great brain and his magnificent service to see to it that other contractors and material men do not rob the Government in carrying out this work.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to corroborate what the gentleman from Florida has said with reference to Mr. Eidlitz and say that I do not think there is a man in the State of New York, or anywhere else in the country, who bears a better reputation or in whom people have more confidence than they have in Mr. Eidlitz to carry on this work.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course we ought to do everything necessary to carry the war to a successful conclusion. That is the first proposition. If it involves the expenditure of money for housing people at different parts of the country, we ought to do that. That is a part of the war work, but there ought to be some means devised by which we who are called upon to appropriate the money should have some influence in

the distribution of the work that is necessary for the conduct of the war, so that we would not have to expend millions of dollars for housing where housing is not necessary if the work was distributed properly. That is the point. That is the criticism that is justified under this act, if it becomes an act.

My belief is that the contracts ought to be distributed fairly throughout the United States. I am speaking for no contractor. I do not care who gets the contract. I am not interested in any contractor. All I care is that the ordinary activities of the country should not be disturbed by the movement of men from one section of the United States to another, thus making it necessary by reason of that movement to appropriate millions of dollars to house the men in the place to which they have been sent, when the work could as well have been done where they were without moving them or spending a dollar for housing. That is the criticism. It is a criticism that is justified and ought to have some weight.

Now, the committee proposes to amend the bill by including the District of Columbia, to build houses to accommodate the clerks that have been brought here. Of course the clerks ought to be housed somewhere, but they have no business here. They ought not to have been brought here in the first place; it was not necessary. These activities could have been performed in other places in the United States and not disturb the equilibrium of conditions in the District of Columbia as it has been disturbed by putting all the activities in one place. Everybody knows that the District of Columbia has no accommodations for a vast horde of people such as have been brought here, and who ought not to have been brought here. In addition to what we are doing in this bill we have been called upon to build temporary offices costing millions of dollars to accommodate the clerks that are coming here, and we have rented every building that could be rented in the District of Columbia, at fabulous prices, enough in a single year to pay the cost of the improvements. Why do not we move some of these activities to other places where they will be in close proximity to the work they have to do. Take the Food Administration. What necessity is there for having it in Washington? None, whatever. It ought to be in some other place. If it were, we would not be spending millions of dollars to disturb the people of the United States as we are to-day. It is not too late to change; the administration ought to consider this, and do it now. It ought to do it now without waiting another minute. We have been spending money that we ought not to have spent, and we are going to spend more. In God's name why do not we stop it. Have we any influence? I doubt it. All we are useful for is to appropriate the money. The chairman of the committee comes here without information. He says he does not know how this appropriation is to be distributed, that he can not tell where the money is to be spent.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not want to do me an injustice.

Mr. MADDEN. I have just repeated what the gentleman said a few moments ago.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg the gentleman's pardon, with all due respect to him, I did not say that. I said that I did not know why the gentleman from New York could not get work for some persons.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said that he did not know why they did not make the proper distribution of war contracts, that he had not any influence, and that he ought not to be held accountable for that. Of course, I am not seeking to hold him accountable.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not say that. I said this, that I knew nothing about the general distribution of Government contracts. I do not haunt the departments following around Government contracts.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not interested in Government contracts. I am interested in the proper distribution of the activities of the Government, and I think we have a right to demand that they shall be properly distributed.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia ought not to be included in this. If, perchance, where we have great war activities, where artisans and mechanics are called from different sections of the country to places where they have no kind of living facilities, where they are building plants outside of a municipality, and they have got to build a town to meet the new conditions, well and good, we ought to spend the money to do that; but before we entered upon its expenditure

we ought to have given proper consideration to the conditions involved, and if we had—I say “we,” though I can not properly say “we”; I mean the administrative branch of the Government; they claim the right to make the distribution and to make the expenditure, and all that we are asked to do is to ratify what they have already decided to do—and if they had given proper consideration to these conditions we would not be confronted with the situation which exists to-day.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman said the District of Columbia ought not to be included in this bill, for the reason that the clerks ought not to have been brought here.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. But they are here.

Mr. MADDEN. They ought to be sent away from here and the activities moved to other places.

Mr. REAVIS. Would the keeping of the District of Columbia out of this bill send them away?

Mr. MADDEN. It might.

Mr. REAVIS. What are we going to do with them now that they are here?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know. What we ought to do is what is right and compel the administration responsible for the congestion everywhere to find a means by which to prevent and remove the conditions which call for the expenditure of unnecessary millions, because they did not have the foresight or vision or disposition, whatever it may be, to make the proper distribution at the proper time.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. By placing the District of Columbia in this bill, then the District of Columbia receives all of the benefits that are included later, including the purchase and leasing, and so on, of community facilities, whatever that may mean.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what that means.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It may mean sewers in a new town that is to be constructed or a public forum in the city of Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. If they receive anything at all they are entitled to receive what any other place receives.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Does not the gentleman think it is pretty good business judgment to distribute the contracts among the industries; first, along the Atlantic seaboard, because of the rapidity with which the manufactured product can be moved to the field of activity?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not.

Mr. HOWARD. Is it not the economical and businesslike thing to do?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so, because all the material required to complete the contracts must come from the interior of the country, and the congestion is caused by the accumulation of all the activities in a single place. There is no wisdom in it, because, my dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD], whom I love as I love no other man in the House, must realize that there are other sections of the United States that are called upon to pay the cost of the war. The great State of Illinois, for example, pays at least 10 per cent of all the expenditures of the Government of the United States, and I undertake to say without fear of successful contradiction that not one-half of one-quarter of 1 per cent of the activities of the war have been distributed to the State of Illinois.

Mr. HOWARD. Would the gentleman advise the movement of munitions, especially shrapnel and heavy artillery and things of that sort, from the city of Chicago to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. MADDEN. I would advise the manufacture of vital munitions at points where the danger of invasion from a foreign foe would be the least, and it is certainly not the least on the Atlantic seaboard. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman know that three years ago a board selected by the War Department recommended that no Government depot containing munitions of war be located east of the Alleghenies or west of the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. MADDEN. A very wise determination, but not successfully carried out. They evidently had nothing to do with the distribution of the work. They could conclude what was wise, but they did not have the power to carry it out. It was turned over to some interested party somewhere who had friends in the location that was most dangerous and where the activity ought not to have been conducted. And so we find ourselves with congestion here and with idle men there. In all the great

cities of the United States west of Fort Wayne everywhere there are idle men looking for employment and they can not find it, and yet we are moving men from these places to other places, where we are compelled to take millions of dollars out of the Treasury of the United States with which to find housing facilities for them. Oh, there is no wisdom in it, there is no justice in it, it ought not to be done, and if I had my way, if I had the power to change it, I would change it now. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], on the mention of the name of Mr. Eidlitz, of New York, answered, with some heat, that he believed in the honesty and integrity of Mr. Eidlitz. I take no issue with him on that question. I never saw Mr. Eidlitz, I do not know anything about him, but the point I make is this: Mr. Eidlitz has undertaken, without the action of Congress, to obligate the people of the United States to spend anywhere from fifty to five hundred million dollars, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have brought to the floor of the House authorization for the first \$50,000,000 of that amount. A few days ago \$50,000,000 was appropriated by Congress to be used by the Shipping Board for housing purposes.

Mr. PHELAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; I can not yield. When members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds appeared before the Committee on Rules to get this bill before the House all the argument that was made in behalf of housing facilities was made in the interest of the Shipping Board.

Mr. Eidlitz was mentioned as the authority by those who appeared before that committee. He was represented as a New York contractor working for nothing, but arranging for the United States Government to spend in building operations anywhere from fifty to five hundred million dollars; \$50,000,000 of that has been provided and \$50,000,000 more are asked for here and another \$10,000,000 will be offered as an amendment to this bill. In the name of the people who pay the bills, when will this saturnalia of reckless expenditure of public money stop? [Applause.] The expenditure of much of this is without the consent of Congress.

Mr. PHELAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No. All this is being done at the suggestion of Mr. Eidlitz, who is working for nothing. If many more such men give their services to the United States for nothing the Nation will soon be bankrupt.

A MEMBER. Is he a contractor?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He is a contractor; yes. The man who represented him before the Committee on Rules is a polished orator, who works upon the emotions and understands the art of persuasive oratory as few men understand it. Where did Mr. Eidlitz get the authority to outline and prepare an overhead organization, that is to cost the Government \$300,000 for the first year? It is said that this organization is now in operation. The gentleman from Florida shakes his head. Will the gentleman call up the Secretary of Labor and ask him if this organization is not already completed and if Mr. Eidlitz is not the author of it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, I shook my head because they are undoubtedly making arrangements—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is just what I said.

Mr. CLARK of Florida (continuing). In anticipation of this bill; but there is not a single human being on the pay roll in connection with this legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, they are working for nothing. Gentlemen who appeared before our committee are working for nothing, but their services will cost the people of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Igoe having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 30, 1918:

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

On April 1, 1918:

S. 389. An act to extend the time for cutting timber on the Coconino and Tusayan National Forests, Ariz.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the vigorous remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas, I would say that during the consideration of this bill by the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] and myself, from the very beginning, took the precaution to inquire very carefully into this whole matter as to who Mr. Eidlitz is, the general plan he has in mind, and from where this proposition comes. We readily ascertained that the proposition comes from the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense, of which Hon. Samuel Gompers is the chairman, L. A. Coolidge is the chairman of the committee on welfare work, and Philip Hiss is the chairman of the section on housing. During the hearing I asked Mr. Eidlitz to tell us frankly who and what he is. I have a letter from Mr. Hiss which goes into considerable detail as to this, and I think the record of the House ought to show just what was said as to who Mr. Eidlitz is. I do not know him—I never heard of him before this bill was under consideration—but this letter from Mr. Hiss gives interesting information. It says:

FEBRUARY 16, 1918.

HON. HENRY A. BARNHART,

Congressman from Indiana,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARNHART: In answer to the very proper question that you asked Mr. Eidlitz as to who he is and what expert knowledge he has on the subject, I take the liberty of placing before you the various positions of trust which he has occupied.

Mr. Eidlitz has for thirty-odd years been the means of keeping labor adjusted in New York, and no man is better able than he to understand the labor situation. He brings an exceptionally clear perception and sane judgment to this housing problem, which he has had under most intensive consideration for more than four months. You can depend absolutely upon his statements and suggestions. My valuation of his attainments is shared by the clearest-headed business men of this country.

Very sincerely, yours,

PHILIP HISS,

Chairman Section on Housing.

Attached to the letter is the following business-life biography of Mr. Otto M. Eidlitz:

Trustee of the Bank for Savings, New York; director of the Mutual Bank; director Colonial Fire Insurance Co.; appointed to the tenement house commission of New York City by Gov. Roosevelt in 1900; appointed member commission on workmen's compensation and unemployment of labor in New York State by Gov. Hughes in 1909—

That would indicate that the gentleman's politics could be in harmony with the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not necessarily. Republican governors appoint men without regard to their politics. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARNHART (reading)—

first chairman of the board of governors in the Building Trades Employers' Association; adjusted labor disputes for 33 years in the building industry; member of arbitration board of the New York Chamber of Commerce; member of the American Society of Civil Engineers; member of the American Society for Testing Materials; appointed one of the five members on the arbitration board representing the public in adjusting dispute between the 52 railroads east of the Mississippi River and of the locomotive engineers—appointment by Chief Justice White; member of the New York commission on heights of buildings and restrictions in zoning the city as to occupation; graduate Cornell University, 1881.

After I read this biography of Mr. Eidlitz, I changed my mind somewhat on the advisability of his appointment, because I believe he comes with the highest possible recommendations, and I believe, furthermore—for we had him before us hour after hour and plied him with all sorts of questions—that he is fully trustworthy and sincere in this undertaking—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Not now. And he asked that we protect this legislation in every way possible to make it perfectly secure for the United States Treasury, and under those conditions I changed my mind wholly favorable to the gentleman, although I thought at first, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] now indicates, that possibly he was a financial adventurer. Instead, I now believe that he is a whole-hearted, patriotic, honest, and competent business man and trustworthy American citizen. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This letter, however, does not disclose the authority that he has for obligating the Government to spend anywhere from \$50,000,000 to \$500,000,000.

Mr. BARNHART. But, Mr. Chairman, he has not so obligated the Government. He could not obligate the Government. He has no legislative authority whatever to do so.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He started with \$110,000,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one

of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 19.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That it being a duty peculiarly incumbent in a time of war humbly and devoutly to acknowledge our dependence on Almighty God and to implore His aid and protection, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to recommend a day of public humiliation, prayer, and fasting, to be observed by the people of the United States with religious solemnity and the offering of fervent supplications to Almighty God for the safety and welfare of our cause, His blessings on our arms, and a speedy restoration of an honorable and lasting peace to the nations of the earth.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2617. An act to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish; and

H. R. 10365. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Forsyth special road district of Taney County, Mo., to construct a bridge across White River at Forsyth, Mo.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. RUCKER and Mr. O'SHAUNESSY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I will not consume five minutes, I hope.

I merely want to say that I am surprised that when every message that flashes across the ocean warns us that American boys are this moment bleeding and dying for our country, gentlemen will stand here and discuss for an hour the character of the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Eidlitz, who is now connected with public affairs. I think it is time this waste of time should come to a stop. I, like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], at one time thought "this fellow" was probably "butting in," but I came in contact with the gentleman from New York. I interrogated him, I found that he is one of the large contractors of America and stands supremely high in the estimation of those who know him. I do not think it is a part of legislative function, duty, or privilege to stand here and denounce and criticize and refer in a contemptuous way to "this fellow," as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has done, referring to a gentleman who has won high place in the confidence of the American people, and who is to-day showing more patriotism, may I say, than is manifested by those of us who stand here and discuss his personality when our boys are dying in foreign lands. And I hope it will stop.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have listened patiently to the discussion centering around Mr. Eidlitz. First of all, I want to congratulate the committee on its efficient labors in the field which is presented to it, and I wish to express my gratification on the preparation of Mr. Eidlitz for the stupendous task before him. We have heard continually in the United States before and during the war of our lack of preparation, the fact that we lacked that prevision and foresight so necessary for efficient action. Here is presented the case of a man anticipating legislation by surrounding himself with an efficient force. Thank God that the time has come in America when we have some efficient men in bureaus dealing with the war's vast problems. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. It is a very wise provision to select a man who has knowledge of the subject. Personally I do not criticize that at all, but I am criticizing the policy.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman is opposed particularly to making appropriations for taking care of the people who now find themselves in Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am opposed to the method of distributing the activities and making this necessary.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that frequently method or policy changes with conditions. For instance, when a general goes into war the policy he has outlined for the conduct of the war is materially changed in one, two, or three days or a week thereafter, and he must be ready to do whatever is necessary. There is no question in the world that this Congress, when the proper facts are presented to it and when they see the necessity for a different distribution, will take those necessary steps.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one suggestion?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. In a minute.

I listened with interest to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MEMMITT], who came to us with facts concerning matters

within his personal knowledge, not vagaries or speculations. He tells of the city of Bridgeport, that has grown in leaps and bounds in population, its munitions factories growing day and night, and men coming there ready and willing to do the allotted work but finding no housing accommodations.

I read a couplet in a paper the other day, as follows:

Your work is good, your wages are fine;

But where shall we sleep and where shall we dine?

That is the situation in Bridgeport. It is the situation in Washington to-day. It is the situation wherever we pour a great amount of labor into any industry. And now that this situation confronts us, we ought to be ready to embrace this opportunity by making efficiency out of inefficiency and dispel the notion that we are not capable of great performances.

Mr. MADDEN. The point I wanted to impress upon the other gentlemen present is that we are doing all that and we must make preparation where it is necessary to house them, but we ought not to take people away from places and throw all the activities out of joint.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. You can not make every provision for changing circumstances and arrange to keep labor in one particular place. There is bound to be a shifting of labor and readjustments. The only thing is this, that we have got to do everything in our power to win the war. [Applause.]

I was gratified when Congress passed the bill to provide housing for the shipbuilders. Now, what did we find with the shipbuilders? We found them going to shipyards where there were no housing accommodations, and naturally they had to run away because they had to have houses in which to live; they had to have the common, ordinary facilities that go along with human life. And that necessity has been met. It is in the process now of construction.

Now, I will say that down in my State we have a condition where a number of men have been working in one of the Government munition plants. I speak of the torpedo station at Newport. Of course, the war has increased the capacity there. Thousands of men are there now where before there were hundreds. Now, we find they are without the proper accommodations with which to live. They have got to go a distance in order to enjoy them. I trust that under the provisions of this bill the needs of the torpedo-station employees will be fully cared for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALDOW. What is the regular order?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment to the amendment pending. There are two amendments before the committee, and the time has been exhausted upon both of them. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask that both of these amendments be reported, so that we may know what we are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee, moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, it seems that this discussion is circling around Mr. Eidlitz. Now, Mr. Eidlitz is not a self-seeking or self-appointed superintendent of this work. Mr. Eidlitz was written to by the President of the United States after the question of who would administer this fund was discussed in the Cabinet. He was selected as a man suitable and as a person they thought to be fitted for this work.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman what fund?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The fund that is now in this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There was no fund available. There was no fund then provided for.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, it is not a very far distance, when you are providing a large fund like this, to talk about the person who is going to administer it. Would you go to work and appropriate or ask an appropriation of \$50,000,000 and not have anybody to administer it, or know who would administer it? One would not contemplate any expenditure or improvement without considering who would do it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There was already an organization in the Government that has existed for years and which has expended hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. To-day the Army and Navy organization is spending millions of dollars in this city without

taking steps such as are taken by this bill. The organization that was and is in existence was the Department of Labor of the United States, one of the principal departments of the Government.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] thinks that these activities ought not to be centralized here in Washington. I can say to the gentleman that very little or none of this \$50,000,000 is going to be expended in the city of Washington for the making of munitions. Those expenditures are to be made at the great plants where we must make the powder and shot to whip from the face of the earth the worst vandals that ever lived. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. But we can not whip them in this House, can we?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We can help and make the appropriations that will whip them.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no Hun here that we can whip.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We must get up the organizations and provide the sinews to do it.

Mr. BUTLER. We can not fight them here.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We must get up a fighting spirit here and not talk about details that are not material.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Sometimes gentlemen speaking say "\$50,000,000" and sometimes they say "\$60,000,000." The gentleman himself says \$50,000,000. What is the amount that is proposed to be appropriated by this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Fifty million dollars is appropriated for this purpose, and an amendment will be introduced by the Committee on the District of Columbia for \$10,000,000 additional to construct buildings here to house the people that are coming to Washington to help win.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That amendment has not yet shown up?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That accounts for the variation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman says we ought not to talk about the details.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I said immaterial details.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That we ought not to attempt to save something of the hundreds of millions of dollars that are asked for and which are not intended to produce arms and ammunition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We do not talk enough about the material details. Everything should be subservient to the winning of this war—the manufacture of powder, bullets, ships, aeroplanes, and guns.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COX. I have not kept up with this legislation as I ought to have done. As to this \$50,000,000 appropriation in this bill, will any part of it be expended in Washington?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Not much. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will find that great steel plants and munition factories, like the Bethlehem Steel Co. and Hammond, Ind., lack workmen to run to their capacity or near it.

Mr. BURNETT. If the gentleman will permit, the navy-yard employees and other employees will come under that.

Mr. COX. I understand an amendment will be offered for \$10,000,000 to take care of the employees here, including navy-yard employees?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. What I mean is that there are numbers of men working out here in the navy yard, and if there are insufficient housing facilities for them they would come within the provisions of the \$50,000,000.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have further time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, in order to show the care with which this bill was considered in committee, I wish to say that Mr. Eidlitz himself took part in framing this bill, and consented to the proposition that this board should make reports telling what was done with this money at every session of Congress. That does not look like a man seeking self-interest. We put that provision in the bill. We heard the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], my colleague, recite a most scandalous condition in relation to the construction of buildings and cantonments in Mississippi. In this bill there is a provision by which contracts will be submitted to at least three competitive bidders, and they will not be let upon the cost-plus plan. Mr. Eidlitz said, "If I administer this work"—and he was not seeking the job—"I will use that office for the purpose of letting these contracts in competition, and I will not let these contracts upon the cost-plus plan." Does that look like self-interest or self-seeking?

If we are to go into this activity, if we are to supply these munition plants with labor, we must have these houses constructed. We can not get this war material unless we make it, and there is no telling how much we must make. How soon this war will end depends largely upon the energy we put into it. We are strong enough in material and man force to win this war alone, but we will win quicker if we realize and understand the enormity of our undertaking. The more we do and the sooner we do it the quicker we will get caught up with Germany, which has for 40 years been preparing. We have our soldiers "over there," and to-day they are singing the Star-Spangled Banner while marching toward the face of the enemy, and we will back them up here. I am pleased to see the sentiment here. They can rely upon the United States of America, their country and their home. While they are fighting we are working in unison with them and must do everything possible to aid them. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, of course everything that comes now comes in the name of "the boys in the trenches."

Certainly they are to be cared for, and cared for well. Sometimes I think that if we could be a little more practical and find out what the bills we consider mean, maybe the boys in the trenches would get along better than if we should merely be using language; it is action, not words, we desire. I want to understand about this bill.

Did I understand the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] to say that an amendment would be offered carrying \$10,000,000 for Washington, contemplating the erection, not of temporary buildings, but of permanent buildings in Washington, going beyond the war, for the employees, and that this is a mere camel's nose, and so on?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. CANNON. I have only five minutes. I may need more. I am trying to get information.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say that the idea of the committee was this, that it would be a waste of money to build temporary buildings in a community like this. We have a provision here to the effect that all these operations shall stop when the war ends, and that the Secretary shall have no further power, except to rent or dispose of these buildings. Our idea was that we could dispose of these buildings at a reasonable price to the employees.

Mr. CANNON. Does that refer to permanent buildings in the District?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, we are spending millions of dollars, to do what? To house in temporary buildings, down on the Mall and elsewhere all over the country, the clerical employees of the Government, these employees who work in the daytime. But now we are to construct permanent buildings. I understand the scheme to be to construct permanent buildings, with authority, if this bill passes with the gentleman's amendment, to build permanent houses in which the employees and their families are to live after the war.

Now, if I am right about that, I am against it. If temporary buildings will do for them to work in in the daytime, temporary for and during the war, they would be removed, or would they be removed, in peace times?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, I hope the gentleman did not understand me to say that these houses would be permanent for the employees to live in after the war was over. What was in the mind of the committee was that after the war was over these houses owned by the Government could be sold to employees of the Government who were going to remain here permanently—sold on long time at a low rate of interest.

Mr. CANNON. My colleague wanted to make a suggestion along this line?

Mr. MADDEN. I just wanted to say to my colleague that I presume the purpose of making these buildings permanent was not so much to continue to beautify the city of Washington or the District of Columbia as it was to find employment for the men who are engaged in the building trades who are now thrown out of work on account of the war; and that is a legitimate proposition.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Where did the gentleman get that idea?

Mr. MADDEN. I know they are all out of work—every one of them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want the gentleman to understand that this committee has not advanced any such idea as that.

Mr. MADDEN. The committee may not understand it, but it is as proper a thing to do to find employment for these men as it is to find employment for other men, or to find housing for other people.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We are not trying to find employment for anybody. We are trying to take care of those whom we have employed.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say again, if permanent buildings are contemplated, under a \$10,000,000 appropriation which is admitted to be for the purpose of housing employees in the city of Washington to work in these temporary buildings that we put up, that are to be removed when the war closes, then I am against it, because if they can work in the daytime in temporary buildings they can sleep in the nighttime in temporary buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman from Kentucky speaks, may we have these amendments reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the clerk will again report the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Amend by inserting, after the word "families," in line 7, on page 1, the following language: "And employees of the United States whose duties require them to reside in the District of Columbia, and whose services are essential to war needs, and their families."

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. WALDOW, of New York: Insert, after the word "Columbia" in the Clark amendment, the words "the city of Buffalo, State of New York."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, that an acute housing situation exists in parts of the country there can be no question in the minds of those who are well informed. As to why this condition exists there may be many theories. It is only fair to say that some of the congestion that has taken place by virtue of the placing of munition and war orders in one section of the country was forced, first, by the expansion in that character of business under orders from foreign countries before we were at war, and, second, by the immediate necessity for skilled labor along similar lines.

But whatever be the cause, and whether or not it can be prevented from being further accentuated in the future, there is now a pressing need of dealing with the housing problem in the country at large. There is also a similar need here in the District of Columbia, and that need could not be avoided by taking from the District of Columbia any of the activities that are now here. It is not practicable to put most of these activities elsewhere. The men in charge of them must be at the seat of Government, to be in consultation with men at the head of other activities, and to be subject to immediate touch with the President and with the heads of the regular departments of the Government, but there ought to be a different policy pursued touching how we shall take care of this situation in the country at large and in the District of Columbia; and it is for that purpose that I have taken the floor. We will of necessity have to depend in large measure upon the intelligent administration of this law as to matters outside of the District, because Congress can not gather the information or take the time to undertake to see to it in what particular cities and in what particular manner the congestion may be relieved. But touching the District of Columbia Congress has more information, more accurate information, and more knowledge of influences that operate in the District of Columbia than any commission will have or can have. Therefore I for one should be opposed to the insertion in this bill of the provision including the District of Columbia, unless I believed that this committee would, in its wisdom, see fit to restrict the power that is conferred so far as it relates to the District of Columbia.

When we finish the end of the first section I propose to offer the following amendment:

Provided further, That the powers herein authorized shall not be exercised in the housing of governmental employees in the District of Columbia except upon detailed estimates and appropriations for such purpose.

That will bring to the Appropriations Committee an estimate as to what is proposed to be done touching the housing of employees, and where it is proposed to be done in the District of Columbia. That will require the Committee on Appropriations in turn to bring to the Congress concrete proposals for the housing of such employees in the District of Columbia. The differences of opinion which have been expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

MADDEN] can then be thrashed out where they ought to be thrashed out, here on the floor, as to whether there shall be temporary or permanent buildings, as to whether they shall be on the Mall or on the Plaza, or where.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. We can attend to these matters; and, I repeat, we know more about the District of Columbia and how to fit in this activity with existing ones here than any commission can know, and I would not be willing to trust any commission to spend \$10,000,000 in the District of Columbia, for this purpose or any other purpose, without Congress having something to say as to the details. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. The suggestion I was going to make was that the amendment of the gentleman ought to extend to the whole appropriation, because then we would get detailed information as to what was being done at every point.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman simply to this extent: I trust that the Committee on Appropriations will have sufficient appreciation of its obligation to the House to obtain all the information that in reason can be obtained touching expenditures anywhere; but I submit to the House that it is manifestly impossible for that committee to obtain that information, and, having obtained it, to exercise a real judgment on it touching places all over America in the same sense that it could touching the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more, and I will try not to use it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman seems to understand, as I think a good many of the Members understand, that this amendment is only to apply to the \$10,000,000 appropriation. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken, because it is in the first section of the bill, and it applies to all the appropriations of the bill. In other words, all of the money—

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman did not catch the reading of my proposed amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. I am not objecting to the gentleman's amendment. I think it is all right, if it is to be adopted at all; but I am not speaking about that amendment. I am speaking about the committee amendment, which applies in general terms to all the appropriations of the bill; so that all the money could be spent in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; it could be if we were fools enough to appropriate it, but we are not going to. There is no danger of the Committee on Appropriations appropriating for the District of Columbia, and there is no danger that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds would come in here, or that anybody else would come in here, with the idea of appropriating \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 to be spent in the District of Columbia. We have enough practical problems ahead of us without getting worried about those that are not going to arise. And, in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I repeat in my judgment it is not practicable to put such detailed restrictions around the expenditure of the money over the country at large as to enable this work to be done expeditiously, as it needs to be done if it is to perform the purpose for which it is to be spent. We ought as far as we can to check up, and I hope we will; but, touching the District of Columbia, there are a great many problems beyond that simply of housing these employees. We ought not to let these people house them without regard to a great many other activities and requirements of the Government; and we have the information, as I say, greater than they will ever have, touching the District and as to where and how the moneys should be expended.

I have a personal view, not a final one, because I try not to make final views in this day of rapid readjustment of ideas. I have a view that we can build fireproof buildings for housing the women—and those are the ones we need to look out for the most—in the District of Columbia at a price cheap enough to give them rooms infinitely cheaper than they are getting them now and at the same time take care of the interest and amortize most of the principal invested in the building. I think it is possible to build a series of hotels in which a single room can be given to a girl for \$12 a month. If that is practicable—and it will be a matter to be demonstrated by actual figures—it is infinitely better than going into a program of building residential houses subsequently to be sold.

Now, the test is going to come here and elsewhere between doing this thing as a necessary incident to the war and doing it so as to carry out the theories of some gentlemen touching

the social conditions that should surround the workers here and elsewhere. We might as well be frank about the matter. I have no objection to improving the conditions of mankind wherever possible, but I have not yet reached the point where I believe, under the guise of war necessities, the Government of the United States that is struggling now—painfully struggling—to carry out necessary functions, should go into the unnecessary and probably undesirable one of creating such a socialistic state as to guarantee by public building the environment of the people of America.

That is the actual line of cleavage that you will find all through this. I hope if the House concurs, as the necessities of the occasion make necessary, in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, including the District of Columbia, it will also agree to the amendment I have suggested restricting it. It is manifest the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW] ought not to be agreed to because you ought not in this bill to specify every city where you spend this money. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Florida will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky. If that is agreed to, I will be glad to vote for his amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not understand the gentleman from Kentucky to offer an amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have not offered it; it is not in order at this point.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment striking out the last two words.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not want to shut off debate, but I thought debate had been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted on both amendments.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask for recognition in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on these pending amendments close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered to the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDOW].

Mr. WALDOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—46 ayes and 9 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 1, line 4, the words "local" and "other."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the comma after "housing" and strike out the word "local," and after the word "and" strike out the word "other."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of this House again a solution of vital importance to this matter of housing. I realize that gentlemen may think I am merely speaking for Baltimore, but I want to say that if we could arrange in some way to have regular trains leaving here on time and taking employees back and forward between here and Baltimore we could relieve to a large extent this expenditure. We have a city of 700,000 people. You have a city here of 200,000 white people. England is mobilizing 50,000,000 of people, and she has the city of London with 5,000,000 people to center all of these activities in. France is mobilizing a people of 40,000,000, and has the city of Paris, with about 3,000,000, to center all that in. America, mobilizing a country of 110,000,000 people, has only the city of Washington, you might say, to which to bring all of these activities, a city of something over 200,000 white people. I submit that there is only a slight distance between Baltimore and Washington, only 40 miles, and if trains are put on and run properly, you can add to the city of Washington within 45 minutes a city of 700,000 people, and carry these employees back and forth, and relieve a large part of this expenditure and congestion.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. What would be the actual cost for commuters between here and Baltimore on such a special train?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think the Government could very easily carry commuters backward and forward to Baltimore for somewhere about \$8 or \$10 a month. The railroads are now charging \$16.00, including the war tax; the electric line several dollars less. This matter is not something that is going to take time, like building homes. You can do this thing inside of a day almost, by putting on trains that will leave at a proper time and leave the other end at the proper time. Immediate relief is what is needed. You can not do it well under the general railroad schedules, because you have trains late for various reasons, and in the wintertime it would be impossible to do it on the regular train schedule. The trains run so irregularly. I tried to commute, and I did it up until the 15th of January, and some of the days I spent six hours on the trains going backward and forward. That was under the general schedule. What we want is special trains. I would leave there about daylight and get back after dark, so that you can see that for the year around on the present railroad schedule it would be quite a hardship, though many do so in spite of the task. You must establish trains to carry the employees, to bring them from Baltimore here, and have these trains leave at a specified time. If we would do that we would save millions of dollars of these expenditures for buildings. Why, you can build a railroad from Baltimore to Washington for less than what some of these buildings are going to cost you. I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House, but I do want to tell you that this is a matter of very serious consideration, not alone for Baltimore but for the Government at large.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Can the gentleman inform the committee how he would avoid the question of getting through the tunnel at Baltimore? My experience in going to Baltimore is that you frequently spend more time after you reach the tunnel in Baltimore than you do in going from here to the tunnel. How are you going to avoid that?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would say in reply to that, that the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. did have a great deal of trouble with its tunnel. It was enlarging it and making certain repairs, but that work has all been completed. So far as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. is concerned there is no tunnel to Baltimore, from here, and so far as the electric line is concerned there is no tunnel.

Mr. PLATT. Why not move a lot of these offices right out of Washington to Baltimore bodily?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is a good suggestion, but the trouble is that they are now here, and you have to take care of them. If we had started that in the beginning we could have relieved the congestion.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that one branch of the Army has moved its office over there within the last week.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then it has used good judgment, because they will get good homes there and be among good people.

Mr. ELSTON. Why would not the word "local" include the matter of transportation?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know. I did not ask the chairman of the committee as to that. This is interstate traffic between the District of Columbia and Maryland, and I do not think the word "local" would include it.

I tell you we are in a position where people must crowd themselves a little. There are a great many homes in Washington where people could live, there are a great many families in Washington to-day living in a great many more rooms than they need, and the Government has got to take this matter in hand and see that the people do accommodate the workers.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There are plenty of homes in Washington that are not crowded, and if the matter could be brought to the attention of these people I believe a great many employees in Washington would be taken care of by them. But there are lots of private homes in Baltimore where the people would be willing now, on account of the high prices, to gladly take care of these young ladies who have come to Washington and who want homes. I suggest in all seriousness that Congress consider this matter of commutation. This is not the last \$50,000,000 that we are going to talk about, and it is not the last \$10,000,000 that we are going to talk about spending in the District of Co-

lumbia, because employees are coming here constantly, and when we look at these large office buildings going up we know that there will be thousands of them come here and millions of dollars will be appropriated, and yet within 45 minutes you have a city of 700,000 that will help you to take care of them.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The director of the whole railroad system is now the Secretary of the Treasury. Would it not be within his power and that of the Interstate Commerce Commission to give you more trains without going to this Government expenditure?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is not a question of more trains. We have plenty of trains, and at this time they are running on schedule splendidly; but you should have particular trains to carry these employees which will get them home and bring them back in time for business in the morning. We have plenty of trains, and they are running heavily loaded.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Could not the Director General arrange the schedule and accomplish that purpose?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think he could. I do not think there is any question about that, but I think a direction from Congress would give the matter a strong impetus.

Mr. HICKS. In the gentleman's opinion, 80 miles a day is not an excessive distance for a person to commute. It seems to me that is a large number of miles.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There are plenty of employees living in the District of Columbia who take longer time to come to their office than the time to take a fast train to Baltimore. There are thousands now living in the vicinity of New York City who take an hour each way to go to their business.

Mr. HICKS. If my friend will permit, he will remember that after they arrive in Baltimore City they have to go on a trolley car 5 or 6 miles farther, perhaps.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to this fact: That the Pennsylvania Railroad lands right at Pennsylvania Avenue and at Edmondson Avenue, in the western section of the city. The Union Station is at the center of the city, and the Baltimore & Ohio lands in the southern and northern sections of the city. The electric trolley line runs to the midst of the business section and passes through the southern residential section, and these roads can land men almost within 10 blocks of where they desire to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. The question of housing and furnishing community facilities has got to be taken care of in a practical way. You can not expect employees to live in Baltimore and waste a good deal of time going from their houses to the depot there and then coming 40 miles to Washington, and then from the depot to the departments in which they work, and expect to get practical results. Now, the same situation applies in different sections of this country where our Government has awarded contracts for the building of ships and the manufacture of munitions and other things essential to the winning of the war. Up in Pennsylvania they are taking men from 25 to 30 and 35 miles away from their homes daily to work in these munition factories, transporting them back and forth every day. The reason for it is there is no housing facilities at South Bethlehem and other places, and the men spend several hours each day traveling that could be utilized in productive labor, and this same condition applies to different sections of this country. Now, we have got to adopt some sort of a plan to give them a proper place to live if we expect to get results in the way of increased production of war munitions, ships—especially ships, the most important need of this country and our allies at this time. It has been testified to before the Committee on Labor, and I presume before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, that in many instances in munition districts three men occupied the same bed in 24 hours. Now, it is a common occurrence for two men to occupy the same bed in 24 hours. Men will probably put up with some inconvenience for awhile. They have brought thousands of men in from distant cities, and expect them to settle in those districts, without any thought as to the conditions under which these men were going to live. Wherever we have undertaken our war activities men of families have been brought to work. They come, look the situation over, and they leave. The statement was made that the labor turnover was such that in one instance one concern, in order to get 600 steady workers, were compelled to employ 11,000 before securing the required number. It is not a question of getting the right kind of labor and in sufficient numbers, but it is a question of providing facilities for labor when you get it where it is mostly needed, whether it happens to be a department in Washington where you want

clerical or technical help, or in the shipyard or munition factory, where we need all kinds of skilled and unskilled labor for war work. You have got to provide proper housing and community facilities for these workers if we expect to get the maximum of efficiency and production. They will not work to the best advantage if their home surroundings are not made at least decent and comfortable.

Now, you can not get them even to work here in the District of Columbia at their best and travel back and forth probably anywhere from 90 to 100 miles a day and waste two or three hours going and coming from work. They are taking men from San Francisco and the surrounding bay region to the Mare Island Navy Yard, 2 hours a day on the train or 2 hours a day on the water each way. Those men put in almost 14 hours, leaving home in the morning and returning in the evening, to put in 8 hours work, and the Navy Department pays for their transportation. Is that proper? Can you expect to get the best results from labor in this way? You must furnish some sort of facilities for these people. If you are going to build houses, if you are going to plan houses in the District of Columbia, why not build them permanent and get something out of them for your investment? If we expend millions of dollars for buildings to be torn down after the war is over, we are doing that now in the Mall, where people will work during the day, they must have some sort of modern conveniences in their homes when they get there in the evening. They ought to be given modern conveniences, and this thing can be so arranged. I have no objection to a check on this expenditure for the District of Columbia; I think there should be some check on the expenditure, but when you do expend this money on a proper location in the District of Columbia you should build permanent buildings, and even if they expect, as I heard one man suggest, to get bungalows for each worker; give them bungalows and make them pay rental until such time as we decide to dispose of them permanently to the Government employees. Why not? We are furnishing the farmer with seed by loaning him money; we are relieving the banks of some of their obligations by the war-finance bill, why should not the Government employee here and in the vicinity of the navy yards and arsenals throughout the country have an opportunity to buy this land and these houses either now or after the war? Why can not we realize after this war is over on something? We are spending hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for war purposes, which is to go up in smoke. Let us try to save something out of this money. You can make your buildings permanent, and you can dispose of this property so you will get the most beneficial results, so far as rentals are concerned, and as far as getting back all of the money we spend in constructing permanent buildings or homes, the bill confers this power to so dispose of all these buildings and other properties.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NOLAN. I will.

Mr. BARNHART. I just wanted to inquire of the gentleman if he had in mind the fact that there may come to the city of Washington forty or fifty thousand Government employees in addition to those already—emergency employees—and that if the war should end those emergency employees would be out of the service; and if we should build permanent houses for those, and they should then of necessity have to leave the city, the Government would have a lot of permanent houses on hand which it could not sell and probably would not want to sell.

Mr. NOLAN. I will say to the gentleman common-sense administration of the provisions of this bill, I think, would take care of that. I believe we should try to build permanent houses for all those who might stay here after the war, giving preference to those who desire to buy, whether they are newcomers or old-timers. Let me call attention to this fact: Before the 1st of July of this year the alley law says that 8,000 people must get out of the alleys of Washington. What are you going to do with them? Some provision will have to be made for housing these people, if the law goes into effect; either that or this Congress will have to repeal or suspend temporarily the provisions of the act doing away with these alley houses. We can not drive these people out on the streets. They must be allowed to live in these houses, or else the Government will have to build immediately houses to take care of them. The gentleman from Indiana need have no fear that we will overbuild in a permanent way the city of Washington with the \$10,000,000 provided in this bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland, by striking out the words, in line 4, "local transportation."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 1, line 4, after the word "housing," strike out the words "local transportation."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTH-CUM]. I understand this is an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. A substitute for the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, all right. Go ahead.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are launching upon a policy which, if this war continues for a year, will involve, in my opinion, an expenditure of half a billion dollars, at least. Every community throughout the country where industries are located that are engaged in war activities will be besieging the local representatives for some of these funds for the erection of buildings in those respective localities. I think we will be going fast enough in this bill if we authorize the erection of housing facilities, without extending it to transportation facilities. And the reason why I am strongly urging that amendment is that in the war finance bill now pending in conference we authorize the banking corporation to advance money on long-time loans directly for the purpose of improving transportation facilities of public utility companies which are engaged in transporting people to industries connected with the war. It was stated in that debate that it was presented informally to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee that there were certain street railway companies, such as that in Detroit, which was in need of financial assistance and could not receive it because of the uncertain status of their franchise. And I assume that there are other railroad companies which are in need of similar financial support.

We have provided a means in the war finance bill to help that character of transportation facilities. But why should we here delegate to a different agency entirely authority to build or to lease or to advance money for the same character of work? We should never duplicate the same help that is going to be granted to the same character of utility. We should especially avoid that. And I believe it is far better for the War Finance Corporation to advance money directly on long-time security so as to allow the local corporations to expand and develop rather than for the Secretary of Labor, as here provided, to advance money directly to even build transportation facilities and to meet the same purpose.

So, I say, we should not try to duplicate endeavor, but should be satisfied with allowing the money to be advanced to private interests on adequate security, as is done in the war finance bill, rather than to authorize the Secretary of Labor here to either direct transportation facilities or to advance money to the same character of corporations.

Mr. McKENZIE. I take it that the gentleman from Wisconsin has read the hearings very carefully, and I would like to ask him—

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is mistaken. I have not read them carefully, but I have glanced over the hearings, and I have listened to the general debate, and particularly to the argument of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] in justification of this transportation feature.

Mr. McKENZIE. What I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin is whether he has any knowledge of any particular situation in the country where it would be necessary for this power to be given? If not, why put it in?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will state an instance where perhaps the Secretary of Labor will advance money to meet conditions in Detroit. The Government has advanced about \$50,000,000 to the Dodge Bros. for the erection of a very large plant 6½ miles from the business center of the city of Detroit. During the Christmas holidays I chanced to take an automobile ride out there where those employees were busy—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where those employees were busy erecting the plant which is going to be engaged in the manufacture of munitions. Everyone who is acquainted with transportation facilities in Detroit knows that private capital refused to advance money to the D. U. R. because it is operating under a temporary franchise. I suppose that corporation will come to this War Finance Corporation for a loan of money so as to improve its facilities for transporting the large number of employees from one portion of Detroit to the other. And so, also, as was stated in the consideration of the Emergency Fleet Corporation bill, it was necessary, in the district which has grown so rapidly since the war began, from Philadelphia south

to Wilmington, that the suburban railway was in need of money to be advanced in order to transport the large number of employees from Philadelphia down to Hog Island, and to Belmont, where the Baldwin Locomotive Works are established, and to those large establishments all along the Pennsylvania line southward from Philadelphia. Having made provision in the war-finance bill and also in the Shipping Board bill for the ship industry itself, I do not see why we should duplicate it, and so I wish to limit our authorization solely to housing facilities. Let us provide first the housing facilities for a large number of employees in those districts which have grown up so rapidly and where local capital, perhaps, will not advance money because they think the establishment will only be temporary in character and there will be no need for homes after the end of the war.

Let us meet that situation, but do not let us duplicate the authorization by providing transportation here, when we have provided money through the War Finance Board to meet this same condition by loans and advances made on long-time security to the private corporations that are now operating these railroad facilities.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. On the transportation question, I wish to ask the gentleman this question, which came up in the hearings: A munition plant is within a reasonable distance of a large city, like Hammond, Ind.; that, for instance, is 6 miles out from Chicago; would you think it would be better to erect buildings at a large expense of millions of dollars or run a little transportation line out there?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would say the practical business solution of that question would be to advance money through the War Finance Corporation to the present interurban road that is now operating from Chicago down to Hammond rather than for the Secretary of Labor to build a line. There are transportation facilities, as the gentleman may know, running down to Hammond and Gary, and if they can not get adequate facilities the War Finance Corporation can advance money, as authorized in the war finance bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I would like recognition for three or four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. I wish to call attention to a feature of this bill that may have escaped the attention of those who framed it. In the railroad compensation bill recently enacted we inserted on the floor of the House a provision giving to the Director General of Railroads authority to take over short-line roads, but we specifically exempted from that provision urban and interurban lines. But subsequent sections of the railroad bill give the Director General the power to take over electric, urban, and interurban lines, and I call your attention to the proclamation of the President, issued on the 26th day of December, reading as follows:

Nothing herein shall be construed as now affecting the possession, operation, and control of street electric passenger railways, including railways commonly called interurbans, whether such railways be or be not owned or controlled by such railroad companies or systems. By subsequent order and proclamation, if and when it shall be found necessary or desirable, possession, control, or operation may be taken of all or any part of such street railway systems, including subways and tunnels.

The railway compensation bill therefore gives the Director General practically the right to take over, to commandeer, to lease any urban or interurban line. It also gives him the power to take over terminal lines, or even to construct terminal lines, or make extensions to existing roads.

That power already having been granted in the railroad compensation act, it seems to me in this pending bill we are duplicating the power, because almost in every section and provision of this bill we give to the Secretary of Labor the right to control, the right to lease, to purchase local transportation. It may be that giving this power to the Secretary of Labor may bring him in conflict with the powers already granted to the Director General of Railroads. I merely make that suggestion for the consideration of the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to Senate bill 3388, a bill introduced by Senator FLETCHER, of Florida, granting power to the Emergency Shipping Board to take possession of, lease, or assume control of, or purchase the street railways and interurban roads and short lines. Is that in conflict with the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ESCH. I think it would raise another cause of friction.

Mr. ELSTON. I see that bill has been reported favorably.

Mr. ESCH. You will notice that subsection A, on page 1, gives to the Secretary of Labor power "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." What for? For the proper conduct of the existing war. It does seem to me, after you have given the Director General of the Railroads all these great powers for the successful conduct of the war, we ought not to dilute that power by giving it to any other department.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that neither of these amendments will be adopted. The committee spent some time on this very portion of the bill. It was realized that it was absolutely necessary in some cases for the Secretary of Labor to render assistance by way of loans of money or making increased facilities or taking over the roads, or portions of them, in order to transport laborers from the place of work to their homes. Now, the law with reference to giving the Director General the power was enacted to give him power for the purpose of promoting general transportation. Here is a power for a specific purpose, which we propose to confer on the Secretary of Labor. There will be no conflict. It is not possible, it is not thinkable, that there will be any conflict, because if the Secretary of Labor should ever take over any of these transportation lines they would be little short lines from some plant to the place of residence of the workmen. That is all.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. NOLAN. I understood that the Secretary of the Treasury had looked this bill over and had finally given his assent to it. Is that right?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that is true.

Mr. NOLAN. Carrying that provision in it to commandeer local transportation?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], if adopted, would mean to throw this bill wide open and take over any railroad or transportation line in the United States. If the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is adopted, then it deprives the Secretary of Labor absolutely of the power to increase the facilities of transportation lines from the place of residence to the place of work. Neither of these amendments should be adopted, and I hope they will be voted down.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not in the hearings anyone appeared before the committee and submitted any particular case that tended to influence the members of the committee in writing this provision in the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not remember any particular instance where they said it was necessary to do it. But I do know that they stated generally that it might be necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will permit, does he not think it rather a dangerous form of legislation to put in blanket provisions like this unless there is some crying need and necessity for it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, it was mentioned, for instance, I believe, that it might be necessary at Hog Island to increase the local transportation. But whether it was or was not, the committee thinks that this whole legislation, of course, is absolutely foreign to all our ideas of legislation in ordinary times. If it were not for the war, if it were not for the conditions existing that confront us, it would not be here at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will permit me, I can see very clearly—and I think every man in the House can see—the necessity for a provision in this bill for housing the industrial workers in these various plants. We know the facts about that, but there is not a single particle of evidence before this committee, or at least I have not heard of any, that will justify a man in voting against the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] in striking out this language from the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the case of Hammond, Ind., was one case where the workers might live in Chicago and go back and forth. The inclusion of that can not possibly do any harm. We thought it would be much better for the Government, rather than go into a great house-building operation, if it could loan money to a company already in operation and enable it to increase its facilities and transport workers

from their residences to the place of work to do that. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 26, yeas 33.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the yeas are 26 and the yeas 33, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. STAFFORD. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I make the point of order that that demand comes too late.

Mr. STAFFORD. What has intervened, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think it comes too late. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands tellers. [After counting.] Seven Members, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The amendment is rejected. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new paragraph immediately following paragraph (d)—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That part has not been read yet, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that has not yet been reached.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I withhold it for the present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to perfect the paragraph by an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "that the Secretary of Labor," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That a commission composed of the Secretary of Labor, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the chairman of the building committee of the Council of National Defense, and the Superintendent of the Capitol."

Mr. DYER. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Let the gentleman make the point of order, if it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. DYER. I make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes a point of order. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DYER. I make it on the ground that it is not germane to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; I do not desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the vain hope of saving \$300,000 for the fiscal year 1918. I know that it is almost useless to try to save money to the Treasury of the United States at this time. We should serve no useful purpose. We have an organization in the boys in the trenches rather than providing fat jobs for deserving Democrats, taking men out of the productive activities of life and placing them in jobs here in Washington, where they can serve no useful purpose. We have an organization in the Treasury Department that can be utilized in connection with the commission I propose in this amendment without the additional expense of a single dollar. Will gentlemen take that organization, or will they reach into the Treasury and take \$300,000 to make jobs for their friends? Washington is already congested with men and women who are producing nothing, and many of them doing nothing to earn the salaries which they are paid.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONDON. Does not the gentleman think this talk is rather too late to be of any influence in to-morrow's election in Wisconsin?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, unlike the gentleman from New York, I have my mind on things that do not pertain to elections. I am interested in conserving the money in the Treas-

ury of the United States [applause] and saving the people from having to pay additional taxes, buy bonds and war-savings stamps to pay the salaries of the friends of the gentleman from New York who, I take it, are being provided for out of this \$300,000. This amendment, if agreed to, will keep the Congress in close touch with the Treasury and with the activities of the building operations that are necessary.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; I can not yield.

Mr. MEEKER. For a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have but five minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Just one question.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield. We must have some control of the expenditure of these colossal sums of money. It is said hereby gentlemen who discuss these matters that it is unpatriotic to inquire into details, but somebody must save the Treasury, somebody must protect the taxpayers, somebody must do something to save the money to buy arms and ammunition. Already billions have been spent, and we are without arms, without ammunition, without flying machines and aeroplanes, without facilities that would give our boys in France a fighting man's chance. Billions have been spent on trimmings, while arms and ammunition have not been provided. Men are more interested in providing for organizations, overhead expenses, jobs for their friends in Washington, than they are in providing arms and ammunition for the boys in the trenches.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to perfect the text, to strike out the words—

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, is there not an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. LUNN. I wish to speak against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. LUNN. I want to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the question was asked—I do not know why it was asked nor when, but it went all over the United States—"What's the matter with Kansas?" Now the question is, "What's the matter with the gentleman from Kansas?"

I am beginning to wonder what is the motive that causes such anxiety on the part of the gentleman. I do not want to suggest that his ambition to save the Treasury is not perfectly sincere, but I would dislike to think that he is the only Member of this House who is interested in the Treasury of the United States. If he expects that \$50,000,000 can be properly expended without some organization adequate to the expenditure, he is not very convincing, and the parts of his speech that do not appeal to me as being consistent with his claim for saving the Treasury are those parts which are susceptible of the interpretation of being decidedly political. I have heard two political speeches by the gentleman from Kansas during the past two days. I think it was on Saturday—or it may have been on Friday—that I first heard him, and in speaking he used the phrase "deserving Democrats." He has just repeated that cunning couplet. Now, I do not care a rap for "deserving Democrats" or "deserving Republicans." I do not care a rap, in this emergency, whether a Member is a Democrat, a Republican, a Socialist, or a Prohibitionist. My only concern is that he be an American; a man who is looking at legislation, in these serious days, purely and solely as an American. [Applause.] To inject a political phrase into our discussion arouses my blood—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is the gentleman interested in the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. LUNN. Assuredly I am interested in the Treasury, and that is the reason I do not want thousands of dollars wasted by political speeches on the floor of the House.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Kansas, who refused to be interrupted, has no right to interrupt the gentleman from New York without his consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. LUNN. To my mind we are absolutely called upon without question to provide houses for these workers in the munition plants, and the thing for us to do is to get these houses, and to get them as quickly as we can. Any word that we utter unnecessarily is a word that costs blood. These wasted words, these wasted speeches, these political flurries, and this very amendment are consuming precious time while our boys are on the battle front. I almost feel like apologizing for taking even five minutes to protest against waste of time. Some gentlemen

are arguing along lines that are not in the interest of real saving for the Treasury. They seem to have some ulterior object, if we are to judge by their remarks. The crux of the question is, Do we need the houses? No one doubts that. Can we get them without paying for them? And that is answered in the negative. Then we must estimate about how much we need. The committee, after consideration, says \$50,000,000 for housing throughout the country. That is the issue, and should be settled quickly.

There are some here who, instead of thinking about this as a problem, are worrying more about setting precedents. Why worry about precedents? The old order has gone forever. When this war is over these men who have been in the trenches are coming back, and your old Bourbon ideas—I do not care whether they come from a Bourbon Democrat, or a Bourbon Republican, or a Bourbon Socialist, or a Bourbon Prohibitionist—are going into the discard. We are advancing toward a new day with new ideas. The new dawn approaches. The immediate necessity is to provide dwellings for thousands of loyal workers and do it now. Fifty million dollars is needed as quickly as we can provide it to be expended as efficiently as possible. I am therefore opposed to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. I stated the other day that after very full consideration the members of the Cabinet, when this matter was first talked of, agreed that it ought to be administered in the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor was selected as the man and the best agency through which to execute it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman did not agree with that contention when he took the measure away from the Committee on Labor to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, yes; there is a vast difference between the Department of Labor and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This is a proposition to allow an executive department to administer a law. The other was a proposition to take from the committee a jurisdiction which it did not have and was not entitled to under the rules of the House and give it to a committee that did have jurisdiction. The question whether it was a labor proposition or not made no difference. The gentleman talks about it costing \$300,000. The Supervising Architect's Office has no building organization. It has architects, draftsmen, and clerks, and so forth. If this work was given to the Treasury Department, they would have to build up a building organization the same as the Department of Labor will have to.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not now, but later. They would have to build up a building organization the same as the Department of Labor will have to. They have got their draftsmen and their architects and other clerks, and we have made provision in the bill for the use of that force by the Department of Labor in administering this trust. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman being chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I would like to have him explain to the House and the committee the purport of the observation which he made, and that is this: It is well known that the Supervising Architect, who builds the public buildings, does not build them himself; we know that. He makes the contracts. Now, what would the Secretary of Labor do? Do you mean that he would personally supervise the building of the houses himself, or would he give them out by contract? Does it not all amount to the same thing?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the whole plan is thoroughly understood. There has been no concealment about it. The Secretary of Labor has selected Mr. Eidlitz to take charge of and administer the trust under him without cost to the Government. Mr. Eidlitz is an experienced contractor and will make the contracts. He will give out contracts to people to build these houses wherever necessary; and that is to be determined by the Secretary of Labor. That is all there is to it. There will be no unnecessary force, no greater expenditure of money under the Secretary of Labor than there would be under the Secretary of the Treasury. In addition to that, we propose to use the force in the Supervising Architect's Office as far as we can. We can not have all of it, because they are engaged in drafting plans and doing their ordinary work. This is an emergency, and we want an organization that will put it through promptly and expeditiously, so that the boys in the trenches, which the gentleman likes to talk about so much, will have the benefit of it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. KEATING having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes.

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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few minutes on this subject, because it has been discussed so much under a misapprehension. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has been talking against this function being granted to the Secretary of Labor. I think the gentleman fails to perceive all the problems involved. This is not simply a proposition to build houses. That in some respects is a less difficult problem than the others involved. One problem is the problem of getting out workmen who will work. The Supervising Architect has no experience in that, although he may be and undoubtedly is a capable man. It is a question of getting labor to live in certain localities, and a question of providing for them certain accommodations.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. No; I will not yield. If I had time I would yield, although the gentleman did not yield to me. It is a question of accommodating labor as it ought to be accommodated. A man with a family must have decent kinds of quarters, and if you do not give him decent quarters you are not going to get him to work. You are going to lose effectiveness. There are many other problems concerned which I have not the time to take up. But let me suggest that there is the problem of providing the real estate, there is the problem of leasing houses, there is the problem of condemnation of land and houses, and the problem of procuring boarding houses and hotels and tenements, and perhaps the combination of all three.

There is the question of the amount of rent to be charged; there is the question of disposing of the houses after they are built; there is the question of selling them to the workers. All of those things which are more or less social in their nature rather than a matter of construction are involved, and those matters of social or economic nature constitute the difficult phases of the problem. The question of building houses themselves, drawing the plans, and constructing them is in some respects the easiest of all. So that while the Supervising Architect's office has had experience in building public buildings, it has had no more experience than anyone else in dealing with these problems which I have suggested. When all this was gone over by the various administrative officials, Cabinet officers, and the President, it was finally decided that the best place in which to center authority was the Secretary of Labor; and let me point out that we are giving the Secretary of Labor tremendous powers. When we first took up this bill I think every member of the committee wanted to restrict, wanted to limit the powers given in the bill, wanted to put on safeguards to protect the expenditures of money, but here is what we are facing. We must construct these buildings with the utmost speed if we are going to continue this war as vigorously as we should. We have let many valuable months go by now when good labor has been lost and production lessened, because we have not had the places to house the labor. We are looking for speed, we are looking for an energetic speeding up of production, and if we are going to get quick results we have got to lodge the power some place, and we have to grant it without too many restrictions. The more restrictions we put on it the less we can get speed and quick action. It is all important to get haste and to use speed, and for that reason we have given great powers, much greater powers, than any of us originally wanted to give. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has proceeded to argue for the bill so many things that there is no provision in the bill for that I was wondering where he got the basis for his argument. This is a housing proposition, as I understand it.

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman evidently has not read the bill as carefully as he should.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have read it very carefully.

Mr. PHELAN. I will tell the gentleman that I got my information from a better source than he got his information.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I got mine from the bill.

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman says that Mr. Eidlitz has already made contracts for the expenditure of, or obligated the Government to expend, \$50,000,000 or \$100,000,000. I say that statement is not so, because Mr. Eidlitz has no power to do so. Mr. Eidlitz, who has been appointed by the Secretary of Labor to look into this question, and who undoubtedly will be appointed if this bill becomes a law, has started his organization, and he has done a good thing in starting it. We want to get this thing through as soon as possible, and Mr. Eidlitz has done a good work when he has prepared his organization in advance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN], with which I in large measure agree. It is no answer to the necessity for this bill to say that manufacturing plants have been located where they should not have been placed; that we have created the necessity for this measure by placing the activities where these workers must go at places that are remote; that we should have given these contracts to other places and have distributed them through the country. The provision has been made otherwise, and to-day it is of the highest and gravest importance that we proceed as rapidly as we can, and to do that we must avail ourselves of all that has been done. We must continue from where we now are. We can not undo the work of the year which has passed since war was declared.

I have no sympathy with the condemnation or censure of Mr. Eidlitz. It is obvious from what was read by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] that Mr. Eidlitz is a man of standing worthy of this great trust that is to be reposed in him, and I for one condemn any attempt to censure a man unless there is basis for the criticism. It is our privilege and duty to condemn when we see a basis for condemnation. We should condemn whenever we see a ground for censure, but here we have none. We have simply the fact that a man apparently prominent, a man who has made a place for himself in the world, is about to perform for the public a duty commensurate with the important things he has done in private life.

I am in sympathy with the purposes of this bill. I believe these workers should be adequately housed. I believe they should be provided with all the facilities contemplated by this law, but I can not see, and I am not saying it in a partisan sense—I am advocating it from a business standpoint—I can not see why the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] should not prevail. The Secretary of Labor, moreover, has many duties. Why would it not be well to provide for just such a commission as this amendment contemplates? It includes Mr. Eidlitz; it includes the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor alone can not do this work. It includes the distinguished chairmen of the two committees on public buildings—one in the House and the other in the Senate—who would keep the legislative bodies more closely in touch with this work and enable us to see that the spirit and purpose of this law are observed.

In England to-day, while the Government itself is hampered for funds and has to come to us to borrow money, and in France, too, the industrial worker is better off than he ever was in the history of those countries. I believe that he will be more prosperous in this country, but we should start by providing for him in such a way that he will be happy and contented while he grows prosperous. He is sure to have work at high wages as long as this war lasts if only we provide proper housing conditions about the various plants which will produce our war munitions and supplies, so that he can do the work we must have done.

I favor the enactment of this bill. I favor also the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, not upon the grounds upon which he has placed it, not upon partisan grounds, not because I criticize Mr. Eidlitz; on the contrary, I commend him and say that he is an admirable citizen of the city of New York—but because I believe that its adoption will mean a more complete realization of the purposes of this necessary and highly commendable measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas) there were—yeas 25, yeas 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "only during the continuation of the existing law" and the comma following the word "law."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, those words were not contained in the original bill as presented by the Secretary of Labor and as introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Labor. While I realize that we are dealing with a war emergency, with an extraordinary situation which must be met now, and while our immediate object is to satisfy an immediate need, we must not lose sight of the fact that the end of the war will bring with it certain problems. We must not tie the hands of the Secretary of Labor. This provision will, as soon as the war is concluded, prevent the Secretary of Labor from making repairs and from taking care of the buildings constructed at the expense of the Government of the United States. It will compel the Government to practically throw away all the resources expended in the construction of those buildings. It will force the Government to throw upon a demoralized market all the constructed buildings.

Mr. CANTRILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. In a moment. By the retention of those words "only during the continuation of the existence of the war," and, on page 2, line 2, of the phrase "for the proper conduct of the existing war," and then in lines 24 and 25, page 2, and in lines 1 and 2, on page 3, by a repetition of those words, we make it impossible for the Secretary of Labor to retain any structure or retain control of any structures except for one purpose, and that is to sell them and dispose of them at any sacrifice to private individuals. That is my objection to retaining these phrases in the bill. That is my objection to this vicious amendment to the bill as presented by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Why should we preclude the Secretary of Labor from utilizing—why should we now preclude the Government from utilizing—the structures built at the expense of the United States? Why should we now compel the Government to sacrifice all the money invested in building these structures? Why should we now tie ourselves to private interests in localities where those buildings will be reared? Why should we now tie the hands of the Government? I realize that we are dealing with a temporary emergency. Why should we fly in the face of every experience of every other country? England is to-day discussing the construction of 1,000,000 houses, with an expenditure of \$1,200,000,000; to begin the construction, two years after the war, in addition to the structures built during the war. The French Government has adopted a policy of constructing Government buildings for the purpose of compelling the private landholder to lease his buildings cheaper; in other words, to act as the competitor of the private landholder. Here we are tying the hands of the Government in advance. We are failing to prepare for the really crucial moment, that crucial hour, when, after an expenditure of \$50,000,000—of hundreds of millions of dollars—the Government will find itself with buildings on its hands, some 90 per cent ready or 95 per cent ready, some only half completed. When the war ends shall all this wealth be squandered? Are the private interests of the private real estate holders to prevail over the interests of the entire people? During the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Labor this very important fact was brought out by Mr. Ackerman, an architect of experience. I am reading from page 159 of the hearings—last page. Mr. Ackerman was asked what was the difference in cost between a temporary structure and a permanent structure, and his answer was:

When you consider that in temporary housing operation you have to put in roads, sidewalks, sewers, gas, electricity, plumbing, etc., you have a total—I know from conditions in England—of cost in the case of temporary operation amounting to between 80 and 90 per cent of the cost of permanent structures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to speak for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONDON. The difference between temporary structures built for temporary purposes and permanent structures is only 10 per cent. At the conclusion of the war we may find ourselves with buildings constructed—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that statement ought to be modified—that there is a difference of only 10 per cent in the cost of temporary and permanent—

Mr. LONDON. That is, speaking of a certain class of buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be true if all the underground work and all the overground work, such as sewers, water plumbing, and so forth, had to be carried in, but if you construct a building where all those improvements were already in, then, of course, the condition would be different.

Mr. LONDON. I understand that is on the suggestion of building, as it were, new cities—

Mr. MADDEN. It is a question whether that will be done, or hotel buildings.

Mr. LONDON. I know. But we may have to build new cities. All the provisions wherever they occur in the bill and which have the effect of restricting the Secretary of Labor to temporary structures only should be stricken out. That would leave it to the judgment and good sense of Congress to deal with the problem when it presents itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from New York and the question raised by him in offering his amendment, I desire to call the attention of the committee to section 5 of the bill, which answers fully and completely the issue raised by the gentleman from New York. That section of the bill says:

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.

Now, the bill absolutely takes care of the situation presented by the gentleman from New York, because after the war the Secretary of Labor can fully protect in every way the interests of the Government in disposing of this property which he has had constructed or leased. I do not think there is any necessity at all for the amendment offered by the gentleman, because the bill fully and completely meets that very situation.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. In just one moment. In further answer to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LONDON), in rather criticizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—

Mr. LONDON. I want to withdraw that statement, because it was an unfair implication.

Mr. CANTRILL. I am glad the gentleman withdraws that, because the committee thoroughly understands that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had before them all of the hearings presented before the Committee on Labor, and, of course, it would have been simply a waste of time for our committee to have examined men who had already been examined and whose testimony was in those hearings, and I am glad the gentleman realizes that fact and withdraws his statement.

In further answer to the gentleman from New York as to his criticism of the present bill, I beg to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the original bill (H. R. 9642) which was before the Committee on Labor, specifically stated in section 5 that the power and authority granted in paragraphs (a), (b), and (d) shall cease with the termination of the present war with Germany, showing that it was clearly the intention of the Committee on Labor and the Secretary of Labor and all others connected with this proposition, except probably the gentleman from New York, to keep this idea in view, but the bill presented by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in order to safeguard the interests of the Government in every particular, has added section 5 to the present bill, which gives full authority to the Secretary of Labor to protect the Government.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute in order to ask a question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL]?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that by unanimous consent debate was limited to 10 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. LONDON. I now ask for one minute in order to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order is called for, and regular order is the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Page 1, line 5, after the word "in," insert "arsenals of the United States and in."

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I believe from what he said on the floor of the House Friday that this amendment will not be regarded adversely by the committee. If this is adopted the section will read as follows:

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 arsenals of the United States and in the industries—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is necessary, but the committee is perfectly willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I think it is a safety provision that ought to be in there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. LONDON. Let the amendment be reported, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again read.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 1, line 3, after the word "Labor," insert "when so requested by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee on this matter, because it seems to me that some restriction of this kind is absolutely necessary if the Treasury is to be properly safeguarded. In other words, my amendment simply provides that if the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall request the Secretary of Labor to furnish housing for employees in certain particular places where they know that it is necessary, then the Secretary of Labor shall proceed to furnish the housing facilities.

Now, to show that this amendment is necessary, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to what has happened in my district. From the time when a question of housing was first broached I have been deluged with correspondence from people who want to sell property to the Government in connection with the Watertown Arsenal. It was rumored—and the town of Watertown as a municipality, through its board of selectmen, opposed the idea—that certain parties were proposing to unload upon the Government a large amount of real estate, some buildings already constructed and some in process of construction, and the town officials asked me to look into the matter. The Ordnance Department, which has jurisdiction of the Watertown Arsenal—and that department, I may say, is now presided over by Gen. Wheeler, who formerly was commandant at the Watertown Arsenal, and whose right-hand man is now Gen. Dickson, who was Gen. Wheeler's successor at the Watertown Arsenal—stated to me that there was nothing of the kind in contemplation; that it was not necessary for the Government to acquire any land or dwelling houses in connection with the Watertown Arsenal; that the problem at Watertown was a question of transportation; and that if certain things were done in the way of improved transportation facilities which this bill gives the Secretary of Labor the power to do, it would not be necessary to spend any money there for land and dwelling houses. I found, however, that the rumor still persisted. And it was confidently asserted by certain real estate operators in Boston that if the Secretary of Labor was given the authority which this bill gives him that a large tract of land and dwelling houses would be purchased by the Government, whether the Ordnance Bureau or the War Department approved of the idea or not.

Now, it seems to me that the Secretary of Labor ought to be given the power to furnish all the housing that is necessary, and I am heartily in favor of the bill. I would not delay the passage of this legislation for one minute, but I submit that the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy are in a better position to know in what parts of the country they need to have this housing provided than the Secretary of Labor can possibly

be. We all know that parties who have an ax to grind may come down here to Washington and see Mr. Eidlitz or some of his subordinates, and may apparently make out a good case, and Mr. Eidlitz may recommend the purchase of land and buildings; and the first thing we know a contract may be entered into and property may be purchased which the War Department or the Navy Department may think unnecessary or may even oppose.

Mr. BARNHART. It was developed in the hearings that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and even the Secretary of the Treasury, considered that this housing question was so completely and so fully attached to the question of labor itself and the securing of labor that they should go hand in hand, and they all conceded that the Department of Labor was the department it should be referred to.

Mr. DALLINGER. I admit everything that the gentleman from Indiana has said, but I still insist that the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, ought to first request the Secretary of Labor to furnish housing in certain particular places before that housing is furnished. In support of this contention I have cited a concrete case, where the Ordnance Department, which has charge of a particular Government arsenal, does not think it necessary for the Government to take a large amount of land and buildings, and yet the Secretary of Labor may go ahead and do it. Now, it seems to me a simple matter for us to say that the Secretary of Labor shall do what you have given him the power to do, but that he shall do it only at the request of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy whenever they deem it necessary in the carrying out of their war program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. Will the Clerk read it again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. DALLINGER: Page 1, line 3, after the word "Labor" insert "when so requested by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing recently a great outcry against red tape, and too much formality, too many administrators having to be consulted, too many bureaus having a hand in matters. Now, as has been said by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], partly for the purpose of preventing just such circumlocutions as that, the various departments agreed that the Department of Labor should handle this proposition. If the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is adopted, the very machinery that has been provided for, and that the gentleman from Kansas has had so many fits about to-day because \$300,000 is to be expended, would still have to be used, and the procedure would be, first, to bring it to the attention of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and then perhaps to the Shipping and the various other commissions, whereas it should be done immediately. Surely skilled contractors, surely men expert in housing laborers would be informed about the various plants in the country and as to the needs of housing the laborers at those plants, and should be the ones to suggest the relief, if any is necessary. Ought they to wait and delay? Why not, wherever they find that necessity exists in their rounds examining these various activities, at once order that it should be done without the Secretary of War having to make an investigation or the Secretary of the Navy having to make an investigation, and then report to the Secretary of Labor, and have the Secretary of Labor order it to be done?

Mr. DALLINGER. I know that the gentleman from Alabama wants to be fair. He is putting up a straw man, however, and hitting at it. Does not the gentleman think that the Ordnance Department, that has absolute control of the Rock Island Arsenal and the Watertown Arsenal, would know more about the needs of the men at those institutions than the Secretary of Labor, who has ordinarily nothing whatever to do with them?

Mr. BURNETT. If they do, Mr. Chairman, they could communicate with the Secretary of Labor without submitting their wants to the Secretary of War and having the Secretary of War submit them to the Secretary of Labor. Surely they could bring it directly to the attention of the Secretary of Labor or the men who have charge of the actual construction.

Mr. DALLINGER. The gentleman does not understand the purpose of this amendment. I have no doubt, if there is a demand for this thing, it will be done. What I am trying to guard against is the expenditure of millions of dollars in my district, or in any other district, where there is no demand for it. The Ordnance Department are in constant touch every day

with the Watertown Arsenal, and they know just what are the needs of the men who work in the arsenal, and I contend that this thing should not be done over their heads when it is not necessary. If they want it, they simply say to the Secretary of War, "We need the housing done," and the Secretary of War says to the Secretary of Labor, "We want housing at Watertown," and the Secretary of Labor goes ahead and provides it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a speech in my time longer than the speech that I have made. If the gentleman is right, that it will be properly submitted, then why have it stated in the law? He talks about it not being needed there. I venture the assertion that he and his people will be among the very first to come down here and ask that houses be built, and I suggest that the gentleman should not let some of his remarks go into the Record, because they might rise up to plague him hereafter, when the people of Watertown are coming to the Secretary of Labor and asking him to build additional houses to take care of the increased number of laborers that they have there.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be adopted. What we want to do is to cut out red tape. The gentleman's amendment would tie us up with red tape. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to say that I heartily agree with the gentleman from Alabama on that subject. Let us put some one in who has responsibility, and hold him responsible, and do business.

Mr. BURNETT. I am glad the gentleman has so much confidence in the Secretary of Labor. I have much confidence in the opinion of the gentleman, and am glad that he has so well fortified and strengthened the views that I have tried to express.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(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.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "for the proper conduct of the existing war" on page 2, line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONDON: Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "for the proper conduct of the existing war."

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, the phrase "for the proper conduct of the existing war" is absolutely meaningless in this paragraph. The Secretary of Labor has nothing to do with the conduct of the war. He can not by constructing a dozen or two buildings or by entering into leases help properly conduct the war. But from the use of this phrase, "the proper conduct of the existing war," you can see the fear of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that the time might come when the Government might desire to utilize some of these structures, erected at the expense of Uncle Sam, and use them permanently, for the permanent benefit of the community in which these buildings will be reared, or for the permanent benefit of the Government employees, or for the permanent benefit of employees in munition industries which may some day be taken over by the Government, and this the committee is determined to prevent. The expression "for the proper conduct of the existing war" is absolutely meaningless, and the necessity of striking it out should be apparent to you, notwithstanding the fact that I have offered the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I do.

Mr. CANNON. If it is meaningless, why strike it out?

Mr. LONDON. Because the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is a good lawyer, and I do not like to see his handiwork spoiled by meaningless phrases. To be serious, the phrase is either meaningless or its meaning is bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

And 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.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK: Page 2, line 15, after the word "determine," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following language: "Provided, That no sale and conveyance shall be made hereunder on credit without reserving a lien on such property for the unpaid purchase money."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, under this paragraph C the Secretary—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, the committee are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if it is contemplated under the provision of these sections that are now being considered, in view of the amendment adopted to the first paragraph of section 1, that the existing street railway facilities here in the District of Columbia may be taken over or leased in connection with the relieving of the congested situation, and whether there was anything of that sort brought out in the hearings?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have heard no discussion of that at all. There has not been any.

Mr. WALSH. But the language would be broad enough to do that, would it not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think they could do it; yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

(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.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has at the desk an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend by inserting as a new paragraph immediately following paragraph (d) the following:

"(e) To take possession of, alter, repair, improve, and suitably arrange for living purposes, to be used under the terms of this act, what is commonly known as the Maltby Building, as well as all other houses on square 633, owned by the United States, together with any other houses in the District of Columbia owned by the Government and not now occupied. The Secretary of Labor shall in the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia make use of any lands owned by the Government of the United States deemed by him to be suitable for the purpose and which have not heretofore been dedicated by act of Congress for specific buildings."

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

As I was passing the Maltby Building this morning I saw considerable activity about the building in the way of removing old furniture that has been housed there since the building was last occupied. As I saw the furniture being removed, I thought perhaps the Government had taken or made arrangements to take possession of that building for office purposes. Has the gentleman any information as to whether any department has taken a position for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I have not. I will state that my last information from Mr. Woods, the Superintendent of the Capitol, was that this property was available for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 2, page 3, the words "to so construct them."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the purpose of that amendment is this. The proviso reads—

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.

The committee thought that the words "to so construct them" would leave it to apply to temporary buildings everywhere, because it would be practicable to so construct them. The committee thought that the words had better be omitted.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I would like to state my position in this matter. I was opposed to the proviso at the bottom of page 22:

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.

I think it would have been better to have left out the whole proviso. It was afterwards voted to amend it as the chairman has proposed to amend it, and I am not going to object, but I think it would have been better to omit the whole proviso.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "designate" strike out down to and including the word "them" on line 2, page 3.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a substitute for my amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order is well taken. I would like to have the amendment pending and I will offer it later.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment. Between the word "is" and the word "practicable" on line 2, page 3, insert the words "desirable and."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the position, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut was to insert after the word "is" the words "desirable and." I take it that that is a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offered it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut a preferential amendment inasmuch as the amendment of the gentleman from Florida is a motion to strike out?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offered it as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he had offered it as an amendment to the paragraph, would it not be in order before the amendment of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Florida is an amendment to strike out, while the motion of the gentleman from Texas was a motion to strike out the same language with additional language. I can understand that the Chair did not quite grasp that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offered his amendment as a substitute. He can offer it later.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment as an amendment to the paragraph—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "is," insert the words "desirable and."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. CANNON. What does that mean, "desirable and practicable"? "Practicable" means to determine whether or not it is a good thing to do. "Desirable" means the exercise of discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I suggest to the gentleman that the committee accepted the amendment because it leaves the whole thing to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, anyway.

Mr. CANNON. Then what is the use of the amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not see there is any use of it. I did it to save time.

Mr. CANNON. I think it does make a difference, because it allows the Secretary of Labor, or someone else who would control, to say that he does not think it is desirable to put up anything but a cement building or a brick building and finish it with mahogany, and so on.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think it is at all necessary, but, as I say to the gentleman, I did it simply to save time and hurry on.

Mr. CANNON. If it does not mean anything, let us not put it in, because I think "desirable" is too broad. Suppose the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] was the Secretary of

Labor, or suppose he occupied the place of Mr. Eidlitz, he would not think it was desirable at all to put up anything except a first-class residence or a hotel that would stand through the ages. I think we had better stick to the text.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Very well. Let us have a vote upon it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will recognize the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, in response to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said, I would call the attention of the committee to paragraph (d), which provides, in certain cases, for loans. Obviously, if the Government is going to use other builders' or loan money, they must have some provision for loaning upon permanent improvements, and, therefore, I thought it was desirable, and I still think it desirable, to put in the words "desirable and practicable," so as to cover those contingencies. I think there will be some cases where only permanent buildings will be desirable, and others not.

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

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to God the loan could be made all along the line upon good security for these buildings, because we would get the money back, and we would not be bothered further with it; the owner could deal with that.

Mr. MERRITT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. But that is passed; (d) is passed.

Mr. MERRITT. That is true, but this has to do with (d). (d) provides that you can loan, and this provides that they shall always be made temporary where practicable, and "practicable" refers to the practicability of the building and not to the business practicability, and the word "desirable" refers to the business point of view.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I think the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is eminently correct. There is a great deal of difference between "desirable" and "practicable," and by striking out the three words which we eliminated by the amendment just offered by the chairman we took away the very construction that the gentleman who offered the amendment put upon it. He said it is practicable at any time to construct buildings. That is the trouble with the bill without the amendment, it is always practicable to construct a temporary building, and if you just stop with the word "practicable" it leaves the question as to whether under all of the conditions—that is, taking into consideration the neighborhood in the city in which a permanent or a temporary building shall be constructed, and all other considerations—a temporary or permanent building ought to be constructed. By striking out those words we have left the practicability as to the character of the buildings open; it is all then to be taken into consideration as to whether it was practicable to construct a particular kind of building. But if you put in that word "desirable" you have enlarged the scope very much and you have then put it in the hands of the Secretary of Labor or some one else to say whether he desires a temporary of a permanent building, whether he desires a temporary building at one place and a permanent one at another. It gives him too much power. I would be glad, as suggested by some gentleman here to-day, if every one of the buildings could be of a temporary character, because I have never been imbued with the optimistic idea that after this war is over we are going to get back anything like the cost of the construction of the buildings. I believe that the Government is going to lose money when the war is over, but it is war emergency and we have to look it in the face even if loss has to be incurred. Therefore, as I said, I would have been glad, believing, as I do, that losses will be incurred, if all could have been constructed of a temporary character, but we knew that the regulations in some cities would not permit that, we knew that conditions were such that it would not do to erect temporary buildings in all localities, but we wanted to show that the desire of the committee was that whenever it is practicable buildings should be of a temporary character.

But I am not willing to go on and enlarge it so as to leave it to the unlimited desire of anybody, whether he is a Democratic or Republican Secretary of Labor, as to what the character of the buildings shall be. Therefore I believe that the amendment of the gentleman ought not to be adopted. Now I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. REED. Will my colleague permit me to offer a substitute to substitute the word "expedient" for the amendment of my friend?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it needs any amendment. I do not believe you can strengthen it any, and I am afraid you will weaken it because it now expresses something strong, and, so far as I am concerned, I want it to express something strong, and that is wherever practical these buildings must be of a temporary character, and that reflects the views of most of the members, if not all the members, of our committee, except, perhaps, my good friend Mr. PHELAN, who said awhile ago that his idea was that we ought to strike out the entire proviso. If we do strike it out, that is equivalent to saying that this Committee of the Whole does not care whether they build temporary or permanent buildings, but if it goes on in this way it is the expression of the committee that reported it and the committee that acted on it here to-day that wherever it is practical to do so we expect them to build temporary structures and no other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two minutes in which to answer some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island that the gentleman from Alabama be permitted to proceed for two minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important question. I was called away to the meeting of another committee, and I want to find out about what took place during my absence.

Mr. BURNETT. I could not undertake to tell the gentleman all that occurred.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman could not tell me?

Mr. BURNETT. I could not.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I pity the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Well, that is a compliment to me; whenever I have the gentleman's pity it is a compliment.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I meant to say to the gentleman the committee must have had a really hot time.

Mr. BURNETT. A good time; that is true.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want to ask the gentleman if I understood him to say that if this amendment is rejected that we, in effect, say to the administrator, "We do not want you to put up any permanent buildings except where they are absolutely necessary; that we set our faces against permanent buildings."

Mr. BURNETT. That is not my idea; that is not what I want to do.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I understand that there will be a grave necessity in some places, of course, to put up permanent buildings; I mean permanent buildings, for instance, for workmen; and if the workmen will pay for those buildings on the plan indicated in the report, what objection would there be to that?

Mr. BURNETT. That is authorized under this bill, and this question of practicability comes in so we leave it to the commission or to the Secretary of Labor. What I want is that I do not want these buildings to be ornamental buildings that some civic organization of a city wants to undertake to put up in order to help beautify the city. That is not what these appropriations are intended for in these extreme war times.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that that was the explanation I was looking for, if it contemplated homes for workmen.

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. That is in the inhibition.

Mr. BURNETT. Just one moment, if the gentleman pleases, we realize if we want to get the most expert workmen, which we need in many of these factories, we will have to have some permanent class of homes, and all of this comes in the question of practicability.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment if it means what I think it means, that it gives greater discretion to the Secretary of Labor. I have already stated I was opposed to the proviso. I think the whole matter as to permanent or temporary houses in each case ought to be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor. We have given him almost unlimited power in other parts of this bill. We let him arrange for the rent; we let him arrange for the terms of sale, if there are any terms of sale, for the price and number of years to be taken to pay for these buildings, if they are bought by workers; we have left to his discretion entirely the contracts he makes with individuals and corporations, and yet we tie him up in one of the most important parts of the bill.

Now, whether we put up temporary buildings or permanent buildings, the cost is not going to be a great deal different. The cost of temporary buildings, if they are going to be fit to live in, will not be a great deal less than permanent buildings, and when we get all through with them the temporary buildings will be worth absolutely nothing, while permanent buildings will be

worth a great deal. Taking the point made by the gentleman from Illinois, if I understood him properly, he stated he hoped to see as much money loaned as possible. Under this bill is it intended, wherever practicable, money shall be loaned by the Government to firms, corporations, or even individuals who desire to put up the houses themselves, make advances to them, and let them build the houses and subsequently acquire them? If you indicate by the action of this committee that we prefer temporary buildings, the Secretary of Labor may be handicapped in disposing of those buildings to corporations. He can not dispose of temporary buildings and take back loans on them, if that should prove desirable, after the buildings are erected by the Government.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to get the workers to live in these buildings we have got to give them decent places of abode. We could not get expert workmen with their families to go into places that are only temporary unless the temporary structures are mighty good ones. And if we have temporary structures with modern conveniences and fit to house men and women and children in a proper way, then we are going to spend almost as much money for them as for permanent structures. I believe from every point of view it is better to leave the discretion with the Secretary of Labor and not tie his hands and not limit him or restrict him. I think in the end we will get much better results.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat what I said before, that we have given almost unlimited power under the provisions of this bill to the Secretary of Labor. I do not think we ought to confine him in this respect. I think we ought to leave the matter in his judgment, and without any restriction or indications of how we feel in this matter, but leave it to him in the individual cases coming before him as to whether the buildings shall be temporary or permanent.

Let me add one thing. Let us see what we are doing with some communities. We are going into these communities and put up such buildings as the Secretary of Labor and those employed by him desire to put up. If, acting on this suggestion on our part, he puts up temporary buildings, what is going to become of them? Are they going to be left there as an eyesore, sold to some one and maintained in a dilapidated condition after this war is over? I say that we ought not to create the impression in this bill and indicate too strongly to the Secretary of Labor that we want temporary buildings, but should leave it, as we leave other matters in this bill, to his discretion.

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman's reasoning was fast convincing me. He was going on the ground that some owner of land might want to borrow money and erect a good structure and lend it to the Government, but this proviso applies only to structures to be built by the Government and does not apply to parties who might borrow money from the Government and give good security for its return. That part of the gentleman's argument—

Mr. PHELAN. The buildings can be erected by the Government and still money be borrowed on them by private individuals. The buildings can be constructed. It can be done in any way the Government sees fit to do it. The loan might be made subsequent to the erection of the buildings.

Mr. HARDY. This is only for Government-erected buildings.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can not reach some conclusion. I want to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is one of the most important matters in the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. How much time does the gentleman from Iowa want?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS. I want at least five minutes. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. On the pending amendment?

Mr. SUMNERS. A parliamentary inquiry. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry of the Chair?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which proposes to strike out the proviso which begins at the bottom of page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that amendment and will recognize the gentleman later for that purpose. There are two amendments pending now.

Mr. SUMNERS. There are two amendments pending to this proviso. My parliamentary inquiry was whether or not it would be proper to consider the motion to strike out the whole proviso at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not. The motion to perfect the text has preference over a motion to strike out.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman from Texas desire time on this amendment?

Mr. SUMNERS. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these amendments close in 18 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 18 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CANNON) is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let me read that proviso:

Provided, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character wherever it is practicable to so construct them.

There is a proposal to strike out the words "to so construct them," to which I have no objection, and then comes the amendment, and later on comes the amendment to strike out the proviso.

Earlier in the bill it is provided that loans may be made to construct these buildings. Practically loans would be made to people who would desire to construct and own them, and they would have to give good security, and so forth. Therefore I said I was quite willing, because we would be sure then to get back the money in the end, provided the security was good.

Now, I do not know that I can add anything to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has said, and possibly what I may have indicated by asking the question. I am for the construction of these buildings as a war measure. Great heavens! Suppose the Secretary of Labor should die and my friend LONDON should be appointed Secretary of Labor, or my friend from California, or my friend from anywhere else, who proposes to accomplish a double object, namely, something as a war object exclusively, and also something as a peace measure. These buildings, wherever practicable, ought to be temporary. If we lose on them, well and good. That is a war loss. Peace will come, and let us go back without any clogs to consider what would be proper to do at that time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. A gentleman from New York has just called my attention to another fact that I did not realize, and that is the immediate necessity of immediately constructing these buildings, and therefore temporary buildings could be more quickly constructed than permanent buildings.

Mr. CANNON. Absolutely. Good heavens! Are we not going to tear down these buildings that cost millions of dollars on the Mall and right across from the Lincoln Memorial? Certainly. They are temporary buildings. Why? We have to have them quickly to house the employees. They are sanitary. It is wholly a question of practicability. "Practicability" covers it. I would not trust myself, I would not trust anybody, where the policy is to build temporary buildings and where it is a war measure, to go out and to determine whether it was desirable or not, or how it should be ornamented, or how it should be finished inside, and all that kind of thing.

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

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What does the gentleman think about the provision passed here of vesting in the Secretary of Labor the power to appropriate such money as he may think necessary for the proper conduct of the war? I was absent from the Chamber when that section was passed.

Mr. CANNON. I think that has been passed.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion about it.

Mr. CANNON. That is a discretion that we have given to the President. Good heavens! We have given him enough power to move the world, and I hope and trust he will use the power when necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and only for such success.

Mr. GORDON. You have given it not to the President, but to the Secretary of Labor, to decide what is necessary to win the war.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I take it that the Secretary of Labor, if he has any regard for his scalp, will not go to work at the Watertown Arsenal, for instance, and build something that is not necessary. I should guess he would find out whether it was necessary for the public interest to do it, and so on. I am not exactly pleased with this bill all around, but nevertheless I will vote for it if I can get it substantially as it stands, with an amendment or two later on to be offered.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this provision ought to stand substantially as it is. It is the one limitation that is contained in this bill. It is the one indication that the framers of the bill cared how the money which was appropriated is going to be spent. It is the one indication that we have that they thought for a moment as to whether the resources of this Government could continue to be thrown out in the way that they have been poured forth by the numerous bills that we have been passing lately.

Mr. Chairman, not long ago we passed a bill here of the same character, in some respects worse, and in some respects better than this bill, providing for the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be used by the Shipping Board for the purpose of housing the shipbuilding workers. And what do we find? When we come to the hearings upon this bill we find page after page taken up with testimony as to no houses being built for these workers, and as to the need of houses for them, with the evident expectation that some of this money is going to be appropriated for that purpose. I doubt whether any of it will be, but it is one of the excuses why this bill is brought forward at this time. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts, last Saturday, told how they did not have any houses at Fore River for the shipbuilders there. Apparently he had forgotten all about the fact that we had appropriated \$50,000,000 for the purpose of constructing building to house those workers.

Gentlemen have stated that six or seven hundred million dollars will eventually be expended in housing these workers, and that is given as a reason why we should pass this bill at this time without anybody knowing how much they expect to expend in any particular place, without having offered any estimates as to how much would be needed at any particular place, without any statement as to the kind of buildings that should be constructed, except this one bare statement here, which ought to be retained in order that there shall be some limitation.

Now, I say that it will run six or seven hundred million dollars that we will spend for the housing of these workers. It will run a billion dollars if we keep on in this kind of a way with these lump-sum appropriations, authorizing them to be spent in any manner whatsoever that the Secretary of Labor may determine. And I do not care whether it is the Secretary of Labor or the Secretary of the Treasury, or who it is, if there is no effort made to limit these appropriations there will be no limit to the amount of them. That is what we have got here. Gentlemen seem to think that the resources of this country are so boundless that we can go on appropriating in \$500,000,000 here and \$500,000,000 there, and \$50,000,000 here and \$50,000,000 there to all eternity, apparently forgetting the fact that we will need twice as much next year if this war goes on; and it will go on next year if we win it. Instead of coming in here with a detailed statement that so much is needed at Bethlehem for so many houses of such a character, we have not a word or a line of testimony in the hearings about that, not a word of information from anyone as to where this money is to be spent, as to how much is to be spent in this place or that place, or the kind of buildings to be constructed. We have only this bare limitation, which it is intended in effect either to strike out or so to modify that it will amount to nothing, namely, that whatever buildings are constructed by the Government shall be of a temporary character. That is what they should be. They will be constructed near some of these factories; they will be constructed where they will not be wanted after the war is over, because this demand is all abnormal. They ought to be of a temporary character. There is every reason why they should be of a temporary character.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me just a moment?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman that it was the purpose of the committee in drafting this provision to fix it so that temporary buildings would be built at those places where the communities were transitory.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Quite proper.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And where the activities would be wound up after the war is over, but in cities it was intended to build permanent ones, if it was thought best to do so, because of the permanent demand.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will be entirely unnecessary. If these buildings are to be constructed in places where there will

be a permanent demand, then there will be somebody who will be willing to put up these buildings on a loan from the Government and own them afterwards. There is no necessity for the Government buildings being of anything except a temporary character, and nothing else ought to be built.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take up a minute. I want to amend the amendment of my colleague [Mr. MERRITT] by striking out the word "desirable" and substituting the word "expedient." I think the wisdom of that will suggest itself to the Members without argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I need to take up very much of your time, but I do want to say that this is a very important section of this bill. I believe this bill is a good one, and that we ought to have confidence enough to leave with those who are going to administer it all the things that are in the bill. I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT], but I am more in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], to strike out all reference to temporary buildings. I am in favor of that for this reason. I believe that it will save this Government a great deal of money. There are two propositions, one to build houses of a transitory character and the other at places like Davenport and Rock Island, where there is a permanent community. In this instance the buildings ought to be permanent and built in connection with the corporations that only want to borrow the money. They will pay all of the money back to the Government, and you will save money in the end. If you have in this bill this provision that seems to bind the Secretary of Labor to build temporary buildings, you may interfere with the plans of these communities to make these buildings permanent.

Mr. BURNETT. That only applies where the Government is to build the buildings. If they want to borrow the money, there is no limitation.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If I was satisfied that the gentleman from Alabama was right, I would say it was all right, and you would not need to amend the bill. I am not satisfied that the language is not too vague. You have in it the provision that they shall be of a temporary character wherever practicable. I do not know how far that will go or how far some one will interpret it. I am in favor of striking out, as the gentleman from Texas proposes, all reference to temporary structures.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I again desire to emphasize the danger of prohibiting the Secretary of Labor from constructing buildings of a permanent character wherever and whenever permanency is to be preferred. The language to which I object will practically make it obligatory on the Secretary of Labor to construct buildings of a temporary character only. This is a direction to the Secretary of Labor to construct temporary structures. We will find ourselves with the work in the same position in which a great deal of the work is done under the river and harbor bill to-day. You will appropriate a certain amount of money in connection with river and harbor work, and then there will be an agitation throughout the country that it is pork-barrel legislation and there will be no appropriation for a year or two, and all the moneys expended in connection with the work is wasted and you have to begin all over again.

Wherever and whenever the Secretary finds it necessary to establish structures of a permanent character, and wherever and whenever the difference between the permanent and temporary structure is slight, it should be left to the Secretary of Labor and to his intelligence and to the men charged with this great work to choose whether the permanent expenditure of the people's money should not be applied to erect structures that will be of lasting value.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia to the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut to strike out the word "desirable" and insert the word "expedient."

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MERRITT) there were 21 ayes and 26 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 2, page 3, the words "to so construct them."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 3, page 3, the word "clerical" and insert in lieu thereof the word "office."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] to move to strike out the proviso.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after the word "designate," strike out all down to and including the word "practicable," on line 2, page 3.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have a perfecting amendment to this same clause, and the question in my mind is whether if I waive my rights to ask for recognition it will be too late.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to amend takes precedence over a motion to strike out.

The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "practicable," insert: "Except in cases where such buildings are erected for the purpose of the housing of employees or industrial workers at any arsenals of the United States, where such buildings may be permanent if the Secretary shall determine the same to be for the public interest and where such permanent buildings are capable of being used as a part of the permanent plant of such arsenal."

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee thinks that the substance of my amendment is already included within the section as it stands. If that is true, I do not care to press this amendment. However, I was in doubt about it. If the chairman is right about this thing there is no necessity for the amendment. Here is the object of the amendment, and the committee will judge for itself whether it is necessary. The amendment provides that these buildings shall be of a temporary character, except in cases where they are erected for the housing of employees at a Government plant or arsenal, where they may be permanent if the Secretary of Labor thinks it necessary and where they can be thereafter used as a part of the permanent plant of the institution.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. If your amendment was agreed to it would be a part of the act.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Then would it not apply to that just as it will to any other part of the act? Would not the construction of the buildings apply as well to that as a part of the act as to any other part?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes; but let me ask this question, which will resolve the doubt in my mind: For instance, take the arsenal at Watertown. Suppose the Secretary finds it is necessary to build some buildings to take care of those employees. It may be quite practicable to build a temporary building, and under the language of the statute, if it is practicable, the direction is there to build them, while it may not be desirable or the thing to do or the thing that you want him to do. I think the committee agrees with me that wherever it is practicable to use those buildings at permanent plants, or necessary, we ought to make them permanent if we can; but if the language of the bill is broad enough to do that, I am satisfied. I agree with the committee in their idea.

Mr. BURNETT. As to the particular character of the buildings, in the debate it has been made apparent, it seems to me, that the matter of practicability took into consideration all the surroundings and conditions.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Let me ask a question of the chairman of the committee, if he will give me his attention. In the opinion of the chairman, is this bill capable of the construction now that if the Secretary of Labor goes to a Government plant and wants to take care of the employees there he has the right to build a permanent building?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely. It is entirely within his discretion. Your amendment, if adopted, would still leave it in his discretion.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is where it is now.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like the chairman to answer a question that I have in my mind. Does the chairman base that opinion on the presence of the word "only," in line 1, page 3?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. "Houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character whenever it is practicable." Otherwise they should be permanent.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. If the gentleman will permit, I think the opinion of the committee, if I may be permitted, would be this: That in case it is necessary to build permanent structures, we should give that right and give it specifically to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. He has got it. We provide in the bill for the sale of those houses after the war.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. That has not got anything to do with the construction of permanent buildings. I doubt if this language effectuates the committee's intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much to oppose the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, of which committee I was for a number of years a member. Especially do I regret to oppose my good friend, the able chairman, who has this bill in charge.

There are two ideas in the House with regard to these improvements. One is that wherever the Government can it ought to make these buildings temporary; the other is, wherever the Government can, where there is a community need for it, the Government ought so to construct these buildings that they can meet that permanent community need when the war is over. It has been suggested here that we have limited resources and therefore should erect temporary buildings. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] suggested that. It is true our resources are limited, but I call the attention of gentlemen to what really constitutes the resources of a nation. It is not money in the final analysis, it is lumber, concrete, iron, and things of that sort; that is what constitutes the real resources of a nation. These buildings will belong to the people of the Nation. They will be put up by all the people of the Nation out of their resources and as a tax upon their resources. I can not discover common sense in taking the people's money, buying lumber, sawing the lumber up, leaving spaces for doors and windows, driving nails into it and shaping it into a building, and then tearing down the structure at the end of the war, selling the lumber and other material for a song, while somebody else comes along, takes new lumber, and builds a permanent building on the same spot. That is not conserving resources; that is wasting them. We ought not to build permanent buildings where there is not a permanent need. But let us see what is in the mind of the committee. Why not leave the character of buildings to the Secretary's discretion by striking out this proviso?

Gentlemen, you do not leave that matter to his undirected discretion. You indicate to him what you want him to do, and that is to favor the temporary type. You are speaking as the legislature of the Nation originating this proposed activity, and you say to the Secretary of Labor, "You shall erect buildings of a temporary character in preference to permanent buildings." Now, why do you put in the word "temporary" unless you want him to give preference to the temporary buildings wherever he can? You not only do that, but you put the word "only" in there. I say to you, gentlemen of this committee, that no Secretary of Labor, if he respects the direction of the legislative body which confers authority upon him, will erect a permanent building where he can "get by" with the erection of a temporary building. No; it ought to be just the other way around. We ought not to take the people's money, invest it in lumber that is to be sawed up and driven full of nail holes and into concrete and other material which is to be used during the continuance of this war, perhaps for two or three years, and then torn down, when there is a community need for that lumber and material in houses of a permanent character. Why not put up such houses now and save the economic waste of labor and material? But the contention of the committee is that the Secretary of Labor will have the discretion to do that. Why not leave him with unbridled and unhampered discretion? Why do you put the word "temporary" here at all? Why do you put the word "only" in here? The fact is that when the Secretary of Labor is vested with the power to be conferred hereunder he will receive it with the mandate from the legislature of the Nation to put up temporary buildings in preference to permanent buildings, and that is contrary to every principle of conserva-

tion of material, money, and labor. The policy ought to be permanent buildings, unless there is a good reason for temporary ones, instead of the other way around as is provided for in this bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. It is contemplated that many of these buildings are likely to be built upon leased ground. Would the gentleman put up a permanent building on leased ground?

Mr. SUMNERS. I certainly would not, nor would I put up a permanent building where there is only a temporary need; neither would I put up a temporary building where there is a permanent need, giving due consideration to the urgency of the need and the difference in the length of time required to construct the two types of buildings. If the gentleman will note the language down near the end of this section, he will observe that it provides that whenever the Government puts up a building on leased ground it shall have the option to purchase.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will yield right there, the committee has an amendment to strike all of that out which will be explained when the opportunity comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] I will say I think that matter of his proposed amendment was pretty well thrashed out a while ago.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds wished, and I believe this committee will wish, to make known, so far as they could, without laying down a cast-iron rule, the desire that these buildings should be of a temporary character wherever it was practicable, all things considered, to have buildings of that kind. I have as much confidence in the Secretary of Labor as anyone has. I have confidence in the board that it is anticipated will supervise this work; but, Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought, wherever we can, to manifest the tendency of the legislative mind on these questions without unduly hampering or restraining the work. One of the reasons, as ex-Speaker CANNON said a while ago, for these buildings being temporary where they can be, is the necessity for great expedition in their construction. Permanent buildings take more time to erect. Why, gentlemen, we had almost a scandal last year in regard to matters that grew out of the Shipping Board and delays, and delays in constructing shipping—delays all around. We want something to get men housed right now.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY], called my attention a few moments ago to the fact that over there at his place they have, as I believe he said to me, about 2,100 people now building ships; that they needed 5,000, and could not get them because they did not have the houses. Now, without unduly hampering the Secretary of Labor, we want expedition, and demand it, and is there anything wrong in letting him and the country know that it is the expression of this committee that there ought to be such expedition as will bring about results? Temporary buildings, wherever practicable, will help to get these results.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Would not the word "preferable" instead of the word "practicable" be the right word?

Mr. BURNETT. No; that is worse than ever. I would rather have had the language of the gentleman that offered the amendment a while ago than that. Who is to prefer? When you say "practicable," you leave it to the judgment of practical men; but when you say "preferable," you leave it to the question of preference, without regard to expedition or practicability or anything else, and that would be just as impractical as some of the other ideas and theories of the gentleman from New York who asked that question. I believe this is good just as it is. I do not believe you can improve it, and in the interest of hurrying this work I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will prevail. It has become the fashion in this country to profit by the experience of our allies, and I think we should profit by that experience in the consideration of this bill, as we have in other things. I think I am safe in saying that not one witness who appeared before the Labor Committee, when that committee had this bill under consideration, not one witness who had examined into the experience of Great Britain, favored temporary construction, except in those emergencies suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Did the Committee on Labor have before it the Secretary of Labor himself?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. BARNHART. He did not testify? He testified before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

So far as the intent of the department is concerned, it is purely an emergency proposition. We have not in contemplation, and do not believe it would be wise, for the Government to provide a general housing or continuous housing method of its employees.

And he went on to tell why it would be disadvantageous to labor generally to undertake to house it and furnish it fuel and light, and so forth.

Mr. KEATING. And still the gentleman feels in the face of that declaration that this proviso must be placed in the bill to prevent the Secretary of Labor from doing what he says the Secretary does not intend to do?

Mr. BARNHART. The Secretary wanted it there himself, by his own statement.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman will not say the Secretary of Labor asked for this proviso in the bill?

Mr. BARNHART. It was in the bill, and he did not object to it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to make was this—and I think I know something about the attitude of the Secretary of Labor—that England has abandoned this policy, and if this House goes on record as declaring that temporary construction shall be favored wherever that is practicable, it is merely beginning where England has left off. Because in England the very reverse is the policy adopted. They adopt temporary construction where that is necessary, but where it is practicable they adopt permanent construction.

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

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Secretary Wilson testified before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, when the question came up of temporary or permanent buildings—I am reading from page 10, the tenth line from the bottom:

On the other hand, if you erected buildings, say, at Bridgeport, Conn., or at Newport News, or at Charleston, or Savannah, or Galveston, where there is an established town, an established community, the presumption would be that those buildings would be of value after the war emergency was over, except to the extent that there would be a reduction in value of them by virtue of a possible—in fact, a probable—reduction in the population through the decentralization of manufacturing.

In other words, in these cases it would be necessary to construct permanent buildings.

Mr. KEATING. I have not read the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, but I do know that the men who came before the Committee on Labor, representing the Labor Department, men who had been to England, men who had studied this question from the beginning, without exception advocated the policy of permanent construction where that construction was desirable. All that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] proposes by his amendment is that the matter shall be left to those executive officials who will be charged with the expenditure of this money. I think that we may trust the Secretary of Labor and those under him to see to it that the thing is done that is necessary to produce results. I do not think it is necessary for us to go on the theory that the Secretary will do a foolish thing.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like to supplement what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] said in his question by quoting what Secretary Wilson said in answer to the question by Mr. ASHBROOK. I read:

Mr. ASHBROOK. In all probability, then, these buildings in the majority of instances wouldn't be used after the conclusion of the war?

Secretary WILSON. That is problematical. One doesn't know whether they will or will not, but you must work upon the assumption in some of the communities that they will not be used after the war. You would naturally move upon the assumption at a place like Sparrows Point or Hog Island, that after the war those buildings would not be used, and you would construct your buildings accordingly. It may develop, however, that both Sparrows Point and Hog Island will become permanent communities, but the erection of the houses now should not be made upon the presumption that they will become permanent communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SUMNERS. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair announces the vote I make the point of no quorum in connection with the vote. Do I get a vote in that way more quickly?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make or withdraw the point?

Mr. LONDON. I withdraw it.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 14, noes 32. So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to strike out, on line 3, page 3, the word "clerical" and insert the word "office."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out, on line 3, page 3, the word "clerical" and insert the word "office."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that the original bill had the language "clerical force," and it was thought better to make it read "office force."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BARNHART: Page 3, line 6, after the word "so," insert a period and strike out all after that in line 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, by way of brief explanation, it has been decided by the committee that the provision carried in this sentence would limit the Government in the possibility of securing low rates on the leases it is about to make. There are many tracts of land, it has been learned, that are available for lease, some of them without any compensation on the part of the Government to the owner, which could not be secured at all if it were necessary to compel those making the leases to give an option on their land for sale. Therefore the committee decided it would be best to strike this out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman from Florida going to move to rise?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To offer an amendment. I move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor," on page 2, line 21, and insert "President."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 2, line 21, strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof the word "President."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If this amendment carries I shall ask unanimous consent to offer the same amendment on page 1, in line 3, to strike out the words "the Secretary of Labor," where they occur, and insert the word "President," and so on throughout the bill.

Most of the war measures that have been brought in have put the responsibility directly upon the President of the United States, and it seems to me very proper that that has been done. The taking away from the President of the expenditure of so vast a sum as \$50,000,000, and the transferring of the power in this way is an innovation. It has not been done up to this time. What is the reason for placing this particular power in the hands of the Secretary of Labor? Is it intended that he shall not consult the President about a matter of such momentous importance? Is it intended to break the practice that has held since the beginning of the war?

Mr. BARNHART. Did not the gentleman vote very recently for the bill giving the Shipping Board \$50,000,000 for the purpose of building houses for the shipbuilders at Hog Island and other places?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I voted for such a measure, but my recollection is that the President's indorsement was required in that instance.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The President has certainly indorsed this or requested that this work be lodged with the Department of Labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But it is not so stated in the law.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman would not have us state in the law that the President had requested that the Secretary of Labor be clothed with this power?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all; but I call attention to the fact that in nearly all of the financial bills that have

been brought into the House provision has been made that the President shall do so-and-so. If it is a matter that is to be executed by the Secretary of the Treasury, still the President is to be consulted as the business goes along.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations have given \$100,000,000 to the Ordnance Department direct, and other sums to various branches of the War Department, without any reference to the President.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am raising the question whether we should digress in this case and permit the Secretary of Labor to proceed under our sanction without consulting the President as to the locations where this \$50,000,000 shall be spent as to the purchase of ground, as to the leasing of ground, as to the construction of temporary or permanent buildings. Here is an opportunity for a great deal of favoritism, if any particular department head wanted to exercise it. Here is an opportunity for the employment of certain special agencies, if the particular department in charge wanted to avail itself of those special agencies.

Mr. BARNHART. What particular difference would it make whether the President were delegated to authorize the Secretary of Labor to do this or the Secretary of Labor were authorized to do it directly? Is not this method the best way of avoiding the red tape that we hear so much about all over the country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No. Red tape is not an issue at this particular point.

Mr. BARNHART. But it is an issue that is being made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It would be well to have the Secretary of Labor, in the expenditure of \$50,000,000 in a lump sum, at least consult the President as to the wisdom of its expenditure.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERLEY: Page 3, at the end line 6, insert:

"Provided further, That the powers herein authorized shall not be exercised in the housing of Government employees in the District of Columbia except upon detailed estimates and appropriations for such purpose."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The committee have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

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. KELLEY 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) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. IRELAND, for 10 days, on account of illness; and

To Mr. LARSEN, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION BILL.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill S. 3714 (No. 448), the War Finance Corporation bill, for printing, under the rule.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from North Carolina care to indicate when he proposes to call up the conference report?

Mr. KITCHIN. To-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Bayou Dorcheat, La., through Lake Bitsineau and Loggy Bayou (H. Doc. No. 1007); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Arcata Channels, Humboldt Bay, Cal., with a view of dredging a channel leading up to the proposed municipal public wharf (H. Doc. No. 1008); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Gardiners Island, N. Y., with a view to the construction of a breakwater (H. Doc. No. 1009); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Bayou des Glaises from Simmesport, La., to the junction of Bayou des Glaises with Bayou du Lac and Bayou Rouge, 1 mile east of Cottonport (H. Doc. No. 1010); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$40,000 required by the Ordnance Department for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, for the erection of a permanent hospital building at Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill. (H. Doc. No. 1011); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting eighth annual report (H. Doc. No. 1012); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10818) to authorize the county of Loudon, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 431), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10745) to authorize Cole and Osage Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across the Osage River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 432), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3009) granting the consent of Congress to the P. M. C. Coal Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Pike County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 433), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10593) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Bonner County, Idaho, to construct a bridge across the Clarks Fork River at or near the village of Clarks Fork, Bonner County, State of Idaho, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 434), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNOOK, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10021) granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 435), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10613) to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 445), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10894) permitting certain persons to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 446), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3476) to authorize the extension of a spur track or siding from the existing lines of railroad in the District of Columbia across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the buildings occupied by the Field Medical Supply Depot of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 447), 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. IRELAND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9120) for the relief of Lizzie Wilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 436), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3825) for the relief of Oscar Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 437), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1796) to reimburse D. H. Carpenter, postmaster at Seddon, Ala., for money and stamps stolen from said post office at Seddon, Ala. and repaid by him to the Post Office Department, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 438), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3403) for the relief of Paymaster Alvin Hovey-King, United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 439), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3131) for the relief of Col. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 440), 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. 10998) to reimburse Tennie A. Anderson, postmaster at Maplewood, Fayette County, W. Va., for money, money orders, and postage stamps stolen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 441), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYPOOL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6171) for the relief of Edward C. McGonigal, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 442), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2860) for the relief of Gertrude Becherer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 443), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5576) for the relief of Hugh Cameron, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 444), 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. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 11166) authorizing and directing the President to fix the price of binders, reapers, headers, mowers, wagons, and other farm machinery, and to provide for the regulation of the production, storage, and sale of same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 11167) to require cashiers, other officers, and employees of a national banking association handling its funds, books, or assets to give bond; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11168) to amend the war-revenue act in relation to taxation of legacies

and inheritances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 11169) providing for an appropriation to dredge the Illinois & Michigan Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Resolution (H. eRs. 297) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House the facts in reference to the issuance of a commission as captain to Herbert A. Meyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution (H. Res. 298) providing that all bills and resolutions relating to the present war reported from the Committee on Military Affairs or Naval Affairs shall be privileged and have precedence over all other business except appropriation bills and conference reports during the remainder of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 11170) granting a pension to Sarah Blackburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 11171) granting a pension to Bessie M. Trenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11172) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11173) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Risner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUNN: A bill (H. R. 11174) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Van Steenburgh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11175) granting an increase of pension to Martin Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11176) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11177) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel H. Ballah; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 11178) granting an increase of pension to James McCune, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11179) granting a pension to Zettie Swalls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11180) granting an increase of pension to Enos Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11181) granting a pension to Emma Swalls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 11182) granting a pension to Martha Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 11183) granting an increase of pension to John McGill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 11184) granting an increase of pension to Charles Depue; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of the Pilot Grove Farm Club, Jamesport, Mo.; the Forest Grove Farmers' Club; the Pleasant View Farm Club, Novelty, Mo.; and the McKean Farm Club, Grant City, Mo., asking that minimum prices be set for corn and live stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolution of the Manuscript Club, Boston, Mass., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage rates amendment to the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY: Memorial of Winchester Post, No. 197, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, urging increase of pensions for veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of the Cleveland Post, No. 84, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Cleveland Post, No. 84, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in favor of alien slacker bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the White Sewing Machine Co., protesting against the Cary licensing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Rocky Mountain district of the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, urging prohibition for Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Amboy Woman's Club, of Amboy, Ill., protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gertrude Staats, Mary Hughes, Blanche Smith, Francis Kirby, Anna C. Harrod, Mrs. S. W. Albone, Bertha Selleck, and Maggie Sawdey, all of Denver, Colo., praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Woonsocket District Medical Society, favoring the Owen bill (S. 3748) and the Dyer bill (H. R. 9563); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of Mrs. C. E. Mogg and 43 other citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3746, permitting the running of railroad tracks near the Sibley Hospital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce in favor of bill authorizing prison labor on war work; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, asking the retention of the pneumatic mail tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Dr. James R. Bloss, of Huntington, W. Va., editor of the West Virginia Medical Journal, published by the West Virginia State Medical Association, favoring the passage of the Dyer and Owen bills, fixing the grades of the commissioned officers of the Medical Corps, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 2, 1918.

The Right Honorable and Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of York (Cosmo Gordon Lang), Primate of England and Metropolitan, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. O Almighty and Eternal Lord God, Thou strong tower to all them that put their trust in Thee, to whom all things in heaven and earth do bow and obey, we beseech Thee to hear the prayers of Thy people which rise to Thee at this time of trial with reverence and godly fear. We see Thy hand laid upon this Nation at a supreme moment in history and upon the nations who are joined with it in the defense of the peace and freedom of the world. We devoutly believe that Thou wilt show Thy favor if they will rise to the heights of Thy justice and mercy. Uplift them, we beseech Thee, by Thy strong and holy spirit, that they may find in Thee their refuge and their strength.

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as Thou givest us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in. Strengthen our hearts and our hands and confirm our purpose that contending valiantly for truth and freedom we may conquer by Thy might.

Imbue with wisdom Thy servant the President of the United States of America and the assembly of Congress, and with them the rulers and the assemblies of the people allied with them in the cause intrusted to their care.

Hear the prayers which we offer before Thee for all who bear command of our forces both by sea and by land. Stretch forth Thy almighty hand to succor and defend the men who are now defending the cause of truth and freedom in the awful battle being waged across the sea. Strengthen them that they may stay the hand and hold their place. To those who this day will be wounded give Thy soothing and healing touch; to those who are called to die give Thy peace; and for all who have laid down their lives for their country we beseech Thy mercy. God accept them; Christ receive them.

If it be Thy gracious will, grant success to our arms and overrule, we beseech Thee, the issues of this war so that through Christ we may be brought to a lasting and righteous peace, and that the nations of this world may be united in a closer fellowship for the promotion of Thy glory and the good of all mankind.

These, our prayers, we offer and present to Thee in the name of Him who hast taught us to pray: Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

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

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Boy Scouts of America, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GORE, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. NORRIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WEBB, Mr. CARLIN, and Mr. VOLSTEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to 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, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further 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 bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate, requesting the President of the United States to recommend a day of public humiliation, prayer, and fasting.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BECKHAM. I present a communication from the president of the Rotary Club, of Louisville, Ky., inclosing a resolution adopted by that club on the 28th ultimo. I ask that the communication and accompanying resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROTARY CLUB OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Ky., March 30, 1918.

Hon. J. C. W. BECKHAM,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed resolution, adopted March 28 by the Rotary Club of Louisville, is earnestly recommended for your careful and immediate consideration.

The Rotary Club does not doubt that our Government, through its Secret Service agencies, is doing a great many things that we know nothing of; but we do know that in Louisville, and in every other section of America, traitors flaunt their treason boldly and arrogantly, and we feel that treasonable words should be dealt with as resolutely as treasonable acts.

Unless more stringent laws are enacted, or those that we have are more vigorously enforced, the people will be compelled to take this matter into their own hands, and thereby lay themselves liable to the unjustifiable charge of mob violence.

Respectfully,

J. H. RICHMOND, President.

Whereas the newspapers of this country are daily reporting the activities and expressions of enemy aliens and pro-German sympathizers in the United States; and

Whereas such actions and expressions are calculated and intended to give comfort and aid to the enemies of this Government and its allies; and