

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, expressing 100 per cent patriotism and energetic support of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Resolution in opposition to the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter, by the executive committee of the Authors' League of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Slovenian Republican Alliance, pledging heartiest support of the Government in the war and absolute loyalty to their adopted country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 22, 1918.

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

Almighty God, in Thy hands is the destiny of nations. Thou art moving forward in the accomplishment of Thy great purpose in the earth. Thou dost call us to the sphere of our personal responsibility that we may act according to the will of God and accomplish Thy divine purpose in us and through us. We pray Thee to fit us to-day for the divine obligations of the high and holy calling to which Thou hast called us as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 218).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a dispatch from the American Ambassador at Paris stating that the Fourth General Assembly of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce has been postponed from the first days of May until the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th days of July next, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

CENTRAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT WAR BUYING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution unanimously adopted at the sixth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, held in Chicago, Ill., on April 10, 11, and 12, 1918, upon the subject of "Central control of Government war buying," which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INSTALLMENT PAYMENT OF TAXES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution unanimously adopted at the sixth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, held in Chicago, Ill., on April 10, 11, and 12, 1918, upon the subject of "Installment payment of taxes," which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4292) to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10854) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10783) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

NONUSE OF WHEAT FLOUR IN TEXAS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a short letter from the Federal food administrator for the State of Texas, which I ask to have read. It announces the voluntary

determination of the people of Texas to abstain from the use of wheat flour for 45 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Houston, Tex., April 15, 1918.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. SHEPPARD: I feel sure you will be proud of your State in connection with its voluntary offer to abstain from the use of wheat flour for a period of 45 days, effective to-day, until June 1, and longer if necessary. I telegraphed this information to Mr. Hoover Saturday afternoon, and requested him to cable same to Gen. Pershing, whom I had the honor of knowing when he was stationed in Texas. I thought this good news would be encouraging and give renewed vigor to our boys in the trenches in France.

This was not a hysterical movement, but one which the people of Texas were anxious to undertake. I did not make the request. The offers kept coming in unsolicited. Now, I feel that the Lone Star State has done a great thing and is setting a wonderful example to the balance of our Nation. Surely this ought to make Mr. Hoover's work in reference to flour conservation considerably easier.

With best wishes, I am,
Yours, sincerely,

E. A. PEDAN,
Federal Food Administrator for Texas.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I present several memorials protesting against universal military service. I simply wish to state, in connection with their presentation, that I am receiving a great many letters favoring universal military service, but as these are simply personal letters I am not filing them with the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorials will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a petition of Tacoma Lodge, No. 102, of South Tacoma, Wash., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges with short terms of office, and placing the power in the people to recall Federal judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, of Boston, Mass., praying for an increase in pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Hudson, Mass., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the fixing of prices on cereals other than wheat, such prices to be based upon the present price of wheat, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona presented resolutions adopted by the Arizona Division of the National Association for Universal Military Training, of Tucson, Ariz., favoring universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bangor, Augusta, Belfast, and Greenville, all in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to impose punishment on persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or who in any way interfere with the successful prosecution of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4409) to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4410) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys of the District of Columbia," approved September 25, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 4411) granting an increase of pension to John Clark; and

A bill (S. 4412) granting a pension to George E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4413) for the division of general or special taxes assessed against any parcel or parcels of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 4414) granting an increase of pension to Charles Chandler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4415) granting a pension to John S. Dodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

THIRD LIBERTY LOAN.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram received from Herber J. Grant, chairman of the third liberty loan committee of Salt Lake, Utah, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SALT LAKE, UTAH, April 20, 1918.

Senator REED SMOOT,
Washington, D. C.:

Have to-day wired William G. McAdoo as follows: "I have the honor of advising you that Utah to-day oversubscribed allotment in third liberty loan, and makes official request for place near top on national honor flag."

HERBER J. GRANT, Chairman.

LOYALTY OF AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITIES.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I observed through the press last week that there were a number of people appearing before one of the important committees of the Senate testifying with regard to disloyalty in different parts of the United States. One reading the report of the hearings would conclude that the agricultural sections of the country were saturated with disloyalty. I do not know just how accurately these witnesses were reported, but the inference to be drawn from their statements was that entire communities—indeed, if not entire States—particularly agricultural or rural districts or communities were, as I said, saturated with disloyalty.

It seems, while these gentlemen were here advertising the disloyalty of the farmers and farmers' organizations throughout the country, the farmers at home were engaged in putting in their crops and subscribing for liberty bonds.

In order that the two sides of the question may go to the country and that the people in other parts of the world may understand that our farmers are no less loyal and no less devoted to this cause than any other class of people, I call attention to this item, which appears this morning in the Post:

All the States which have gone over the top and won honor flags are largely rural. Montana, whose quota was \$9,000,000, has reported subscriptions of \$14,741,000. North Dakota, with a quota of \$6,500,000, has reported more than \$10,000,000.

And North Dakota was particularly subjected to attack by some of these witnesses. You would suppose that the farmers, and it is almost entirely an agricultural State, were practically all out of sympathy with this Republic in its hour of peril. I regard it as a libel respecting those people.

Indications are that South Dakota has also subscribed its quota of \$22,000,000. Minnesota has contributed \$38,900,000, exclusive of subscriptions from Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, whose pledges amount to \$37,500,000. Northern Wisconsin and northern Michigan, which report to the Minneapolis Federal reserve bank, have about \$8,000,000 each.

Mr. President, a state of war not only calls out the great virtues of the people, but it calls out other characteristics less admirable. I trust that these political Pharisees who come here with the American flag wrapped around them to exploit their own virtues and to decry the virtues of entire communities and entire States will not be regarded as voicing the real sentiments of the American people in this war. I trust also that this wholesale denunciation of entire classes and communities will receive the condemnation at the hands of all sane and patriotic citizens which it deserves.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think I ought to say, if I may be permitted, in connection with and support of the observations of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], that Iowa, a purely agricultural State, a State in which the agricultural interests overshadow every other interest, was the first State in the Union to subscribe its quota to the third liberty loan. There has been some contest between Iowa and Oregon in that respect, which I shall not attempt to settle, but I think the evidence now shows rather clearly that my State was the first to complete its subscription.

I do not mention this for the purpose of promoting that Commonwealth above others, but only to indicate that the suggestions which have been made from time to time with regard to

the attitude of the farmers toward the war and their unwillingness to bear their fair share of the burdens of the war are not well founded.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Idaho indicated that the farmers of the Northwest, including Minnesota and other States, are disloyal, but rather dissented from that view. I have lived in that country for 53 years and my associate, I guess, many more years, and we know intimately the farming communities of the Northwest. There is absolutely no foundation for any claim that the farmers are lukewarm in the war or disloyal. Their loyalty is beyond doubt. The way they have subscribed to the last liberty bonds is a strong indication of that. I did not understand the Senator from Idaho to indicate anything to the contrary, but I may have misunderstood him.

REHABILITATION OF WOUNDED SOLDIERS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have a letter which I would be glad to have printed in the RECORD. It relates to a bill that is pending, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The printing is objected to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a short letter from a very thoroughly informed man upon the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers and what has been accomplished along that line. I think it is valuable information for the Senate, and by simply printing it in the RECORD I felt that I could give it to the Senate and to the House also without taking the time of the Senate to read it.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator can read it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can read it, but I move that it be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, it is peculiarly unpleasant to me to object to the publication of the letter in the RECORD. There is no one in the Senate I would sooner please than the Senator from Georgia, but the truth is that we are absolutely short of paper in the great Printing Office. The RECORD is already burdened with an enormous expense, and nobody reads the fine print that you find in the RECORD as it is circulated in the country. A Senator may occasionally refer to it, but I think those cases are extremely rare.

I am not doing this of my own accord particularly, but it is the desire of the Committee on Printing, and I have been requested by them to stop the practice if I could possibly do it. I hope the Senate will decline to print in the RECORD matter that ought not to be printed in the RECORD. I am not referring to this particular letter, and I know my friend from Georgia will understand my position. I am acting largely under the direction of the Committee on Printing in trying to stop the practice as much as I can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia to print the communication in the RECORD.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

The matter referred to is as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.,
New York, April 18, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been identified for years in America and abroad with manufacturing interests employing many thousand men, and being familiar with labor conditions abroad and at home, I am intensely interested in your Senate bill No. 4284. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been proposed. It deals with a subject of national importance which will require early attention.

At an early day our splendid young men will be returning to us, thousands of them unable to follow their own vocations and great numbers untrained in any craft.

The greatest weakness in America to-day is the lack of universal and thorough training for our young men in the various vocations. Much is being done in the agricultural colleges. The technical and industrial fields outside of agriculture almost universally fail to properly educate our young men. As a rule Americans refuse to give the time necessary for thorough training in any craft or trade.

The majority of the men in our penitentiaries are without a trade or vocation. It is this fact and the fact that they have been brought up in a vicious atmosphere that leads most of them behind the bars.

There are few large industrial concerns which have any extensive or complete system of apprenticeship.

Through your legislation or otherwise the men coming back from the front can be made efficient, can be made self-supporting, and can be put into the decimated ranks of industry, where there will always be a shortage. If you should accomplish this, the Nation would be forever indebted to you.

Now, to the point of my letter. In Europe training such as you propose is being carried on systematically and thoroughly, and they have already had the advantage of experience which has taught them what to do and, what is more important, what not to do.

If your law is put on the books and the usual red-tape methods of the departments are followed, it will be a long time before you have any reliable information on which to act. Would it not be possible for you in some way to have a very small commission—the smaller the

better—sent abroad immediately to study and report on the conditions there, on the methods they pursue, etc., so that after your legislation is in the books the Government will be in position to act very promptly?

In European countries the governments are fostering combinations in the different industries and the training of men in the different industries, so that each industry may act unitedly in attacking the outside markets of the world. It is these combinations we will have to meet when the war is over. We can not act too promptly or prepare too thoroughly.

Pardon this intrusion on your time, but I am as deeply interested in this subject as you are.

Yours, very truly,

P. T. DODGE.

LABOR CONDITIONS ON THE PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I send to the Secretary's desk a letter from the secretary of the Central Labor Council of the City of Seattle, with resolutions attached. I ask that the letter and resolutions be read, and I shall ask the consent of the Senate to make some remarks upon the letter and the resolutions and call attention to some rather remarkable features of the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona objects to the reading of the letter and resolutions.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I can only repeat what I have said before. As long as the present condition of print paper is as it is I shall object to printing anything in the RECORD except what is absolutely essential to the regular proceedings of the body.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, I will not insist upon the Senator withdrawing his objection, but I would like to call attention to the character of the matter that is really a statement of the subject upon which I wish to make some remarks in the Senate. It is a matter which I regard as of vital importance.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does the Senator propose now to take the floor?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection if it is preceding a speech and the speech is to be based on it. I should not like to object in such a case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is withdrawn, and the Secretary will read the letter and the resolution.

The Secretary read as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Seattle, Wash., April 15, 1918.

Hon. MILES POINDEXTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR. Please find inclosed resolutions which only in a very mild way indicate a strong undercurrent of dissatisfaction and unrest caused by what the workers have grown to look upon as unwarranted persecution of their fellow unionists in California.

At this time an appeal has gone to all local unions in this city requesting that a referendum vote be taken upon the question of declaring a strike on May 1, to continue in effect until the victimized Mooney case defendants are unconditionally freed.

Trusting that you will realize the seriousness of this acute situation and that you will be successful in precipitating action such as will make any move that will result in diminishing the productivity of the workers of the Pacific coast at this time unnecessary, I am,

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES A. DUNCAN, Secretary.

Resolution.

Whereas a widespread suspicion exists among the workers of the Pacific coast that the bomb explosion during the preparedness parade at San Francisco and other bomb plantings in the State of California are the result of a conspiracy on the part of big business interests and some public officials in the State of California in an effort to discredit organized labor; and

Whereas the belief is general that these crimes were committed with the full intention of fastening the guilt upon working men active in labor's interests, thereby creating a false public sentiment against the organized workers, thus hindering them in their efforts to improve conditions; and

Whereas this suspicion is causing a great deal of dissatisfaction and strife at a time when there should be the utmost harmony and co-operation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Hod Carriers, Building, and Common Laborers' Union, Local No. 242, request the Government to make a thorough investigation into these various cases and prosecute the guilty parties, whoever they may be; and be it further

Resolved, That we request the Central Labor Council of Seattle and vicinity to indorse this resolution and forward copies to the President and the Washington congressional delegation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have made some investigation of the evidence that was introduced upon the trial of the State of California against Thomas Mooney. I am familiar with the ground and the landmarks in the State of California where this heinous crime was committed. I do not claim to know as much about the evidence in the case as did the jury which convicted Mooney, but I do claim to know more about it than the writer of this letter or the authors of the resolutions which the Secretary has read. There were some seven witnesses—at least seven—who testified to personal observation of Mooney at and about the time these people were murdered. If the jury believed the testimony of any three of them, in my

judgment there was sufficient evidence, connected with the circumstances of the case, to convict the defendant.

As I understand the defense in that case, it did not claim that this testimony, if true, was not sufficient to sustain the verdict in the case; but the defense was based upon an attempt to impeach the credibility of the witnesses. The theory of Mooney's counsel was, or at least that which they presented to the court was, that these seven witnesses were all perjurers.

I am not going in what I have to say about this remarkable threat from a certain labor union in Seattle to go into an analysis of the evidence in the trial of Mooney. I want to call attention, however, to a circumstance of that trial which has a great deal of cogency in my mind in convincing me that the verdict in that case was a just one. I do not think that the circumstance to which I refer has ever been called attention to. It was a very slight circumstance. It might very well have passed unnoticed.

There was a woman who testified in the trial of Billings, who was first tried, who was convicted, and who was sentenced to life imprisonment, by the name of Edeau, a woman who lived in Oakland. Later on, when Mooney was put upon trial, she testified in Mooney's case. Mooney had testified in the trial of Billings, the first defendant who was tried, and was present at his trial; he was charged to be his accomplice and was the principal defendant in the group of defendants who had been apprehended and charged with this wicked murder. When the Edeau woman testified in the Mooney case that at half past 1 o'clock on the 22d day of July—which was about 36 minutes before the bomb exploded, killing 10 people, and wounding 36 others—that she saw Mooney, Mrs. Mooney, and Billings get into an automobile, driven by a man by the name of Weinberg, in front of 721 Market Street, and proceed on Market Street toward Steuart Street, seven blocks away, at the corner of which the explosion occurred 36 minutes later, she was asked why, when she previously testified in the case of Billings, in the first trial, that she saw Billings get into the automobile in front of 721 Market Street and go toward Steuart Street she had not said at that time that she saw Mooney and Mrs. Mooney get into the same automobile which Billings got into. She said the reason she had not mentioned Mrs. Mooney and Mooney was because no one had asked her if anyone else got in with him. Mooney knew whether he got into that automobile or did not; he was sitting present at the trial of Billings and testified in that trial; and I believe that the reason that Mrs. Edeau was not asked the question of who else got into the automobile with Billings was because Mooney knew that she would say, "You got into it with him," and the failure to ask that question of that witness by his counsel when that trial was on has a great deal of weight in my mind. It demonstrated the fact that Mooney did get into the automobile and did not want to have that fact disclosed in the trial of Billings, and that that was the reason that question was not asked and that the testimony of this witness—this Edeau woman—was true. Her testimony for that reason bears the marks of truth.

Mr. President, having made that preliminary remark about the testimony in the case, I want to speak about this rather remarkable production which was addressed to me and, I understand, was addressed to my colleague [Mr. JONES] and perhaps other Members of the delegation from the State of Washington, which has been read at the Secretary's desk.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator takes up the discussion of the resolution, will he give an answer to a question with regard to the witness whose testimony has been discussed in the public prints more than any other one witness, and upon which the defense relied more apparently than upon anyone else, and they relied on that for a new trial? I ask this question because I see the Senator has studied the case, and I know that this particular point is one which has been accentuated throughout the country.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I know what the Senator from Idaho has in mind.

Mr. BORAH. I have reference to a man who testified, and who was the main witness—so designated by the public prints—and who afterwards in a letter seemed to confess that he had testified falsely, and asked a friend of his to join with him in corroborating his testimony, and so forth, and stating to him—I can not use the exact language, but in substance—that he would be taken care of. That man was a farmer, who had formerly lived in Illinois and who wrote back to his friend in Illinois with reference to that. I confess that that letter had considerable effect upon me when I read it. I have not studied the evidence of the trial, but for a man, upon whose testimony they

mainly relied for conviction, to have written a letter practically admitting that he testified falsely and asking a witness to come in and to corroborate him because he was being attacked, would have an effect upon any man who believed in the integrity of the courts. I know the Senator's capacity for judging evidence and his experience in that matter, and I should like to know if he has reviewed that branch of the case at all?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have.

Mr. BORAH. What is the Senator's opinion of that?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing in that circumstance which would change my opinion as to the guilt of the defendant upon the entire evidence that was introduced in the case. There has been a great deal of false impression—I had that myself—in regard to the conduct of this man Oxman, who is the witness to whom the Senator from Idaho refers. Oxman was a cattleman in Oregon. He was visiting in San Francisco on the day of the parade; he stopped at one of the hotels about two blocks from the ferryhouse where the parade started. He testified that he saw Mooney and his associates in and about the scene of the murder. After the trial it was disclosed—and a great sensation was made of that—that this man Oxman had written letters to an acquaintance of his by the name of Rigall in Illinois, asking Rigall to come out and corroborate his testimony, stating that he needed some corroboration, having been attacked as having testified falsely in the case. I read those letters very carefully, and I got a different impression about the matter from reading the letters themselves than that which I had received from reading certain magazine accounts of them. While the letters of Oxman to Rigall are the letters of a very ignorant man, being badly spelled, poorly expressed, and very foolish, there is nothing in them that I saw that could necessarily be construed as an effort upon Oxman's part to get Rigall to testify falsely or offering him any bribe or anything of that kind. There is no admission whatever in the letters that he himself had testified falsely and no intimation of any such admission on Oxman's part.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator if Oxman was not afterwards tried on a charge of perjury and acquitted?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The grand jury declined to indict him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Not for the discussion of the Mooney case, which I think will be appropriately taken care of, but in the interest of historical accuracy, may I ask the Senator if he recalls that after Oxman had written to Indiana to a man whom he knew was not present, asking that individual to come to California and testify he was present, and after the man whom Oxman knew was not there had come in pursuance of Oxman's letter, Oxman took that particular individual, Rigall, to the authorities in San Francisco and said substantially: "This is the man who was with me at the particular time and saw just exactly what I did." Does the Senator recall that as part of the testimony?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I am not aware that there was testimony of that kind. I was speaking of the letters that Oxman had written to Rigall.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In pursuance of which—

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will allow me just at this point to complete what I was about to say, then I will yield to him. There is nothing, so far as one can see from the letters, to indicate whether Rigall was in California or not at the time of the tragedy. Oxman testified that he added a postscript to the letter upon a separate sheet, in which he stated that if Rigall did not see him there, of course he would not be expected to testify; but what he held out as the inducement was not a bribe, or anything of that kind, but simply a rather glowing account of the fine trip he would have and the amount of mileage to which he would be entitled as a witness.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not defending the witness Oxman at all.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say that I take it the Senator relies upon the testimony as being sufficient outside of the Oxman testimony.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I certainly do not think anybody would want to convict a man upon Oxman's testimony after that statement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not, I will say, if the case depended solely upon Oxman's testimony; but the Senator will recognize that bad witnesses often tell the truth. Whether or

not Oxman saw these people at the time he said he did, I do not know, but whether he did or not, my opinion as to the guilt of Mooney is not changed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just one further circumstance. As I have indicated, this is a case which I have declined to discuss here and shall decline to discuss in the future, because of obvious reasons—obvious to me at least—but I wanted to call to the Senator's attention the further fact that Weinberg, the driver of the jitney bus, subsequently was tried, and Oxman after his letters were developed did not testify at the trial of Weinberg.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am aware of that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And Weinberg was acquitted. I am not speaking merely of Oxman's testimony—

Mr. POINDEXTER. If I may ask, inasmuch as the Senator has interrupted me on the subject, what is the opinion of the Senator from California as to the guilt or innocence of Thomas Mooney?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no opinion. The difficulty with the case, since the Senator asks me, I will state to him is this: The defendant is an unworthy man, capable of the crime; a man who has indulged in the past in practices in which he should not have indulged.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Who?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mooney.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What practices?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think that he was engaged in transporting on various occasions dynamite, and, in my opinion, he was capable of this offense. My opinion of Mooney is a prejudiced opinion; but, in my opinion, too, the testimony that contributed most to his conviction was the testimony of Oxman; and Oxman was not ascertained to be what he was until after the trial of Mooney. Mooney perhaps would not have been convicted but for Oxman's testimony. There you have the situation from my standpoint.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, Mr. President, that is an opinion, and there might be an infinite variety of opinions from different people even among jurors. Oxman was one out of some seven witnesses who testified as to the presence of Mooney and the conduct of Mooney in connection with the explosion.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, yes; but he was the witness who testified with greatest particularity, and his testimony, according to many of those who were present at the trial, was the convincing testimony in the Mooney case.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the Senator takes up the discussion I should like to ask him a question. I will first state that I have had a number of communications on this subject from various labor unions, some in my State and some elsewhere. Some suggest the calling of a general sympathetic labor strike on May day throughout the United States, one of which, I think, is now called in the State of Rhode Island. Most of them recite their conviction of the innocence of the defendant. The Board of Mediation, of which John H. Walker, president of the Illinois Federation, is a member, by the President, was dispatched some time ago to the Pacific coast to investigate labor conditions. The commission not only investigated labor difficulties but undertook to pass upon Mr. Mooney's case, and did so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have some quotations from their report, to which I will call attention later.

Mr. SHERMAN. They recommended to the President that he communicate with Gov. Stephens, of California; and the President, as I remember, did so, asking executive clemency. I was going to ask the Senator if he intends to take up that matter?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am glad of that, because I am interested in the matter, as it relates to my own section of the country, as well as to California.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad the Senator has made that statement, because it corroborates my opinion as to the importance of the question and the widespread movement which has grown out of it. It is a matter of paramount importance, in my judgment.

The letter and resolutions which have just been read by the Secretary of the Senate exemplify and illustrate a movement of certain lawless elements in the United States and in other countries, particularly in Russia, which if not arrested will plunge the world into anarchy and bloodshed. This letter and these resolutions, coming from the Central Labor Council of the important industrial city of Seattle, Wash., and from certain local labor unions affiliated with that council, are noth-

ing more or less than an attempt at blackmail of the Government, both State and National. It is a threat on the part of these false representatives of labor to take advantage of the desperate emergency of war in which this country is now involved, by shutting off production of needed equipment and supplies from our soldiers in the field, to coerce the authorities of the law into setting free Thomas Mooney and an accomplice, who have been convicted by due process of law, upon the unanimous verdict of a jury of 12 men, of the crime of murder.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield just a little later, if the Senator please. I would rather make this connected statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to any question that the Senator cares to ask.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that this was a prosecution entirely under State law, not in a United States court, no Federal question at all being involved, but entirely a matter of State jurisdiction?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is one of the main points to which I want to call attention.

The murders of which these men were convicted were out of the ordinary. The patriotic citizens of San Francisco, responding to the noblest emotion which civilized man has developed—patriotic love of country and of their fellowman—were marching in a so-called preparedness parade on the 22d day of July, 1916. Men, women, and children were taking this means of expressing their sympathy with the work of preparing their country to protect the rights, liberties, and lives of its citizens. They had committed no offense against the perpetrators of this crime.

Innocent and unsuspecting, they were engaged in a demonstration of loyalty to their country. While they were walking peacefully on the street in this parade a fiend, uniting the malice of the devil with the intelligence of the human mind which was given to him for a better purpose, exploded among these peaceful and innocent citizens a bomb which destroyed the lives of 10 people and wounded 36 others.

Thomas Mooney, the man mentioned in the letter and the resolutions which have been read, was put upon trial for this offense. He was defended by the ablest counsel that influence and money could procure. Every protection which our most liberal and considerate judicial system casts around the person of a prisoner was given him. A judge, sworn to enforce the law and subject to the review of a higher court, ruled upon the evidence that was introduced and kept it within those humane lines which the Anglo-Saxon people have devised for the ascertainment of the truth and the protection of the rights and liberties of the individual. A jury of 12 men of the vicinity, ascertained under oath to be without prejudice or preconceived opinion or interest in the case, were sworn to render a true verdict. The defendant, through his counsel, introduced his evidence, cross-examined the witnesses of the State, had a full hearing upon every clue, phase, and argument which the ingenuity of brilliant lawyers employed in his defense could devise. The jury of 12 returned a unanimous verdict that the defendant, Thomas Mooney, was guilty of the cowardly and infamous crime.

The writer of the letter which has just been read and those who are responsible for the passage of the resolutions attached did not hear this evidence nor the arguments in the case and, of necessity, under the circumstances in which they are situated, can not possibly be in a position to render judgment upon it. The jury and the court which tried the case concentrated their attention upon every minutia and detail to which their own minds or those of the lawyers engaged could direct their consideration. Mr. Duncan and the so-called labor leaders who induced the membership of the organizations named to pass these resolutions can not possibly know as much about the case as the jury which heard the evidence. Furthermore, they are partisans of the defendant, and for that reason not in a position to render an unbiased judgment. The resolutions on the face of them do not purport to recite facts. On the contrary, they are based expressly, by their own terms, merely upon "suspicion" and "general belief." Upon this suspicion and general belief, so stated, certain leaders of these organizations have induced their membership, or a certain portion of the same, to make the astounding charge that these murders in the State of California were committed as "the result of a conspiracy on the part of big business interests and some public officials in the State of California in an effort to discredit organized labor." As stated above, it is not claimed in putting out this scandalous, blasphemous, and wicked charge that it is based upon any information or facts, but is stated, on the contrary, to be suspicion and general belief. Such a charge in itself is a crime

against decency and all proprieties of organized society. The suggestion is unreasonable and preposterous on the face of it, suggesting a repulsive crime committed without sane motive or rational purpose.

There is no doubt that in California particularly, as well as in other States in times past, so-called "big business interests" have committed crimes of violence as well as of corruption; but always with an understandable motive, and under circumstances capable of proof. If such a suggestion as that which is boldly promulgated in this resolution were founded upon facts, a small part of the energy and resources which have been expended by the advocates of dynamite and "direct action" in the defense of Thomas Mooney would have discovered the proofs and presented them to the court. The absence of any intimation even that such proof exists shows conclusively that none does exist.

When these interests referred to were guilty of such crimes they were likewise subjected to due process of law through the courage and ability of public-spirited lawyers, such as the distinguished gentleman [Mr. JOHNSON], now junior Senator from that great State, and the fearless lawyer, Francis J. Heney. Some of the defendants were subjected to the penalties of the law. Some of them may have escaped the hands of justice, just as many others in our times have so escaped.

The business of government is to wield the sword of justice with impartiality against the offenders of the law and the enemies of society, whether they come from the ranks of big business or from corrupt and vicious so-called leaders of labor.

What is it that labor, whether it was the serf bound to the soil in the Dark Ages or the struggling mass of mankind of an industrial day, groped and struggled for but the protection of law against the hand of the tyrant? What other refuge can the oppressed have? The only other recourse is to the discretion, the humanity, the charity of a ruler; and, sad to say, the tragedies of mankind are proof that this dependence, when subjected to the temptations of self-interest, of ambition, or of hatred, is utterly in vain. The shield and protection of the weak, the poor, the man who labors with his hands, the employee of every kind, against the oppressor, the employer, the rich, the powerful, the ambitious, the wicked, is the law. The attack which the writer of the letter and the author of the resolutions introduced just now are making upon the law and upon the courts is an attack upon their own temple of safety. If the authority of the courts should be destroyed, if their carefully determined decrees are arbitrarily and without investigation, merely upon "suspicion" and "general belief," set aside; if recourse is to be had to such blackmail as that that is proposed in this communication or to terrorism, to sabotage, to dynamite and murder, to the doctrines of "direct action" of the bolsheviki and the I. W. W., the weak are the ones who will suffer in any such decision.

I venture to say that with all of the imperfections of human nature, from which we can not escape under any system that the wit of man ever devised, and with all of the mistakes which the mind of man, however well intentioned, may sometimes make, there is not a State nor a city between the two oceans in this great Republic where an honest laborer seeking protection or justice can not find a judge somewhere who will zealously guard his rights, his liberties, his property, his life, with theegis of the law against the hand of the despoiler.

Take this away, and, more than all the rest, the weak will suffer; the strong and the powerful can find means of protecting themselves; those who are vicious among them—and there are always such—will gratify their desires upon the helplessness of those who are weaker than they. Tear down the courts and the law, and there is left the spectacle of a bloody tyranny; of ignorance, avarice, and cruelty imposing its brute will upon all who differ with it or stand in its way. We see that spectacle in Russia to-day, and those who are rioting there in the gratification of their lawless desire for power are the counterparts and coworkers against law and established government of the authors of these resolutions and of the propaganda of murder, assassination, revolution, direct action, sabotage, and anarchy which is stalking through the land. The greatest issue that confronts not only the American people, but the western world, is the suppression of this arrogant, insolent, and tyrannical movement. Its leaders need to be subjected to the power of the Government.

The threat contained in these letters, to gratify their defiance of the law at the expense of our youth who are fighting for the liberty which these men enjoy, needs to be put down by the strong hand of the Government.

No one but a coward would commit such a crime as Mooney was convicted of. Those who are putting forward this propaganda are cowards in their hearts. They attempt to gain their

purpose by blackmail and stealthy secret attack. They are afraid to submit their cause to reason and the just judgment of their fellow men. They attempt by innuendo and concealment to avoid the law. They need to be dragged out of their cover and subjected to the light of public scrutiny and of judicial inquiry and to that punishment which blackmail and murder deserve.

These men do not represent labor. There is no element of our population which has more of human sympathy, more sense of justice, more love of country than the rank and file of labor and many of its true leaders. There is a vicious element in their ranks, largely composed of aliens, who are not only disloyal and seditious but enemies of the country and enemies of mankind. They preach so-called "internationalism," which is getting to be a very familiar word. They claim no country; they have and desire no fixed dwelling place; the institution of home, which is at the foundation of our social structure, has no sacredness to them; they blaspheme God and religion and set their ignorant and insolent judgment against the teachings of civilization. There are a few so-called labor leaders who take advantage of this element to advocate what they call "direct action," which means accomplishment of their ends by lawless violence. They propose to use violence upon others, and yet they cry out to heaven at any invasion of their so-called constitutional rights. They seem to have a one-sided and one-eyed philosophy. They propose sabotage and direct action against others, but claim that others have no right to use sabotage and direct action or force against them. They do not condemn, by whomsoever it was committed, the heinous crime by which the innocent citizens of San Francisco, marching in a preparedness parade, were hurled into eternity without the slightest cause, and yet even when a known advocate of such methods, like Thomas Mooney, has been given a trial in court—represented by counsel, cross-examined the witnesses for the State, given the right to testify himself, presented his own evidence—they object to his conviction and punishment. This philosophy is the same as that which lies back of the doctrine of force from whatever source it comes. The bolsheviks of Russia, the I. W. W., or direct-action Socialists of the United States are the brothers of the militarism of Prussia. All advocate and justify the doctrine that might is right, but all attach this condition—that the might must be exercised by themselves. They all object to the application of force by anyone else against them. The German tyrant contends that the submarine boat shall sink passenger ships and drown innocent women and children without notice, but objects to complying with the law of war because, as he expressly states, the submarine boats are thin and might be destroyed if they complied with the law. He believes that it is correct and proper to send a trunkful of bombs to Sweden but violently protests against the violation of diplomatic etiquette and ethics by the Swedish Government in seizing this trunkful of bombs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if he noticed, when the late industrial commission was conducting an investigation in the city of New York, that a Mr. St. John—a member, I think, of the I. W. W. cult—gave direct testimony to this effect: That sabotage is right, because the end justifies the means; that violence is right, because the end justifies the means; that murder is right, because the end justifies the means. Yet that man, after that testimony—the Senator will find it in the record—was allowed to march out from the room where the hearing was held, and join his compatriots in continuing the kind of thing that the Senator is so ably and properly presenting to the Senate to-day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator for calling attention to that evidence, and the fact that this man was allowed to walk out and is still walking about and carrying on his propaganda is the reason why I feel justified in making these remarks this morning and calling attention to this movement of certain so-called false representatives of labor. I did not see the testimony which the Senator from New Hampshire refers to, but it corroborates, and I suppose that was the reason why the Senator interjected it at that point, the comparison which I was making between the philosophy of the I. W. W. and that of the Kaiser as to the doctrine of the end justifying the means, force being right whenever it is necessary to accomplish their ends. There is no difference whatever between them.

Now, the Prussian Government plots with Mexico, or its representative in Argentina, to seize and partition the territory of the United States, or to sink ships without notice, but vehemently protests against the impropriety of the United States in exposing its correspondence on these subjects. The I. W. W. and their principal conspirators among the small percentage of so-called

labor leaders, who misrepresent labor, advocate such murders as that of which Mooney was convicted. They have committed or procured the commitment of many such murders, yet when, as a natural consequence of these acts, an outraged citizenry hang a few of them, they protest violently against the lawlessness of the acts. That is the worst consequence of their doctrines—namely, that it leads to lawlessness—though they themselves will be the victims of it. The prime essential for any state of human existence which those who are bred to American principles can conceive of, under whatever form of government may be evolved in the experience of mankind, is order and law—the government of lives and property by a settled rule, and not by the whims, caprices, and desires of individuals. The war which these men are making against the law is a war against organized society. The consequences of it, if it is not suppressed, will be general disorder, social anarchy, poverty, and distress, hunger, and cold, ignorance and vice—a return, in short, to a condition of primeval bestiality. Out of this, if every spark of human learning and virtue shall not be extinguished in the ordeal, will ultimately come the arbitrary and tyrannical rule by the will of strong men, subject to no law. In it all there will be no such thing as even the opportunity for decent labor, at decent wages, under decent conditions; no possibility of a home, however small it may be, with its unspeakable joys. In it all there will be no possibility of enjoying the fruits of one's labors, whether it be of the artist, of the plowman, of the mechanic, of the scientist, of the discoverer, of the inventor, of the soldier, of the patriot, of the statesman, or of the author, who have all contributed to the sum total of human civilization and of what we call the wealth of the world. This is contrary to the doctrines of these people I am talking about. They claim that the accumulated wealth of the world was the result of common laborers' work; still, as everyone knows, all the vocations which I have just mentioned have contributed to what we have and what we are to-day.

If the law and the courts are to be overthrown, there will be no security in the enjoyment of the fruits of labor, nothing but slavery and woe. That is the inevitable outcome ultimately of persistence in the doctrines of force that are promulgated by the authors of these papers which the Secretary has just read. They ought to be put down, in the interest of labor, whether organized or unorganized, so that a man shall be free from their tyranny and oppression; that a laboring man may join a union if he sees fit or stay out if he sees fit, exercising his own reason and intelligence in the matter; that he shall not be coerced by a lot of soft-handed, misnamed labor leaders into giving up his position or the wages of his toil at their dictation. Labor is to be protected in the right to organize, if it sees fit, with the same obedience and compliance with the laws of the land that is required of every citizen great and small. These men are to be subjected to the law. The writers of this threat to hold up the Government, to cut off supplies from those deathless heroes who stand between us and the German horror, should be visited not only with the just indignation of an outraged public but with the punishment prescribed for blackmail, disloyalty, sedition, and treason. Any such act as that threatened in these communications should be punishable by the most severe penalties. It combines in itself elements of not only blackmail and coercion of government but of threats against all organized authority and the courts, and indicates an utter lack of human brotherhood and a cruelty beyond conception. It is in itself a conspiracy to foment sedition and insurrection both by peaceful and violent methods, express or implied. It would be giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and hence would be moral treason. The act itself would be an unspeakable crime. It is aggravated by the motives which are here insolently set forth for it, the act itself being worse than murder, deserving the extreme penalty of death, if it should result in the death of our soldiers. The threat to commit it contained in these papers is a crime against the State and the Government and should be punished.

These men should be arrested and dealt with as disloyal traitors to the land which has given them more than they could have obtained from any other Government in the world. They are false to the land which has befriended them and given them their opportunities. They have perverted liberty into license, and should be regarded as what they proclaim themselves to be in this letter and these resolutions, namely, the enemies of organized society. I say that because it is expressly proposed here, by attacking the productive power of the Government to equip and feed its soldiers and the judicial decree of California, to not only oppose but defeat the processes of the law and the vital purposes of the State and Federal Governments. That makes the authors of this proposal enemies of the people, and it is my purpose to so designate and proclaim them. I repudiate their claim that they represent labor, whether organized or unorganized. They do not know what labor is.

Their hands are soft in the luxury which they secure by preying upon their dupes. This country is a country of labor. It is a new land, without caste or privilege, where labor stands upon an equal footing and enjoys equal rights with every other element of society. In our short history we have reclaimed a continental wilderness by labor. We honor labor. However poor a man may be in this country, however hard he may work, if he joins us as a brother in such support as he is able within his power to give to our Commonwealth in this experiment which we have launched amid the tribulations of the world, he will receive the warm hand of friendship and respect of every man worthy of the blessings of freedom. There can be no greater sacrilege or blasphemy than for red-handed criminals to be fattening themselves on the fruits of honest labor and carrying on their propaganda in its name. The sooner the lines are drawn against such threats as that contained in these papers which have been read and in countless circulars, books, and documents which have been circulated by this element, the sooner the country realizes that lawlessness and revolution are threatening our institutions, the more apt we will be to escape their awful curse.

It is my purpose to-day, in this place where one speaks with a sense of responsibility and where words uttered are heard by the great American people, to proclaim my belief that the greatest responsibility which rests upon the Government to-day, both that of this Federal Union and of the several States in fulfilling their sovereign responsibilities, as a vital and component part of the issues of the war which we are waging against the doctrine of lawlessness and blood abroad, is to put down with the strong hand of lawful authority the doctrine of unbridled force and lawlessness at home.

In the report of the labor commission appointed by the President to investigate labor conditions in the West, including a report upon the Mooney case made on January 16, 1918, there are some remarkable side lights upon the connection of Mooney and his prosecution with the revolutionary agitation now demanding the attention of the world. In the eleventh and twelfth paragraphs of the report it is stated:

It is well known that the attention of the situation—

This is quoting from the report—

It is well known that the attention of the situation in the East—

Meaning in the eastern part of the United States. I have interpolated that in order to explain it—

was first aroused through meetings of protest against the Mooney conviction in Russia.

I should like the Senate to note that. Continuing the quotation from the report:

From Russia and the Western States protests spread to the entire country, until it has gathered momentum from many sources. * * * However strange or however unexpected it may be—

Says this report—

the just disposition of the Mooney case thus affects influences far beyond the confines of California.

I might transpose that and say the attempt is made to direct the disposition of the Mooney case by influences far beyond the confines of California. It is not so much a question of the Mooney case having its influence beyond the confines of California as it is a question of a band of anarchists in Petrograd undertaking to hold up the Government of the United States.

The world now knows the true character of the Russian Maximalism. We know now from actual test and demonstration all of the sincerity there is in their claim as to liberty of opinion, in view of their massacre or suppression of all who dare to differ with them. We now see from the ruin of that great country, upon which they have gotten their clutches, the true extent of their genius for government and the practical good sense of their ideas for conducting the affairs of men. They have given a living demonstration, or rather a dying one, with the unfortunate Russian people as the subject of their experiment, of their conception of justice. Seizure and confiscation of property, murder of officers, denial of God and religion, and the substitution for the fundamental principles of morality—learned and adopted through centuries of experience, even before Moses formulated them for the children of Israel in the wilderness—the emanations of the wonderful brain of Trotsky, alias Braunstein.

And so it is from the anarchists and bolsheviks of Russia that this movement has originated, culminating in an organized threat at Seattle, Wash., to tie up the war industries of the United States on the 1st day of May, 1918. And so it is from Petrograd, with its profound knowledge of the principles of American justice and of Anglo-Saxon law and liberty, and with its intimate familiarity with the proof and the proceedings in the trial of Thomas Mooney at San Francisco, that has originated the demand, accompanied by a threat, that the decrees of the courts

of the sovereign State of California must be unconditionally set aside under the pains and penalty of bolshevik terrorism.

It is well to note, Mr. President, that this labor commission, reporting officially upon the Mooney case, officially state that it did not undertake to pass upon the guilt or innocence of this man. In the eighth paragraph they use this language in addressing the President [quoting]:

But it was not deemed the province of your commission to establish the guilt or innocence of Mooney and his associates. We conceived it to be our duty merely to determine whether a solid basis exists for a feeling that an injustice has been done.

Mr. President, of course the most important question involved in this whole matter is the security of the judgments of the law and the authority of the courts.

Everyone who is familiar with criminal proceedings in American courts knows the difficulties under which the State labors in enforcing justice against a criminal defendant. The cooperation of everyone of a host of officials is essential to the success of the prosecution, however guilty the defendant may be. Weakness or corruption on the part of a grand juror, a prosecuting attorney, the judge, any one of the trial jury, or even on the part of a clerk or a bailiff of the court may, and in some cases inevitably will, result in the acquittal of a guilty person; whereas, on the other hand, the defendant is surrounded by an almost fantastic series of defenses developed through the extreme jealousy of the Anglo-Saxon people for the rights and liberty of the individual. It is necessary for the State to secure the interest and efficient cooperation of every one of a host of officials, while the complicity or corruption of any one of them will result in the freeing of the defendant. That Mooney had the benefit of all of this is recognized by the official commission referred to in the following statement in the eighth paragraph of their report:

The convictions—

Quoting from the report—

of Billings and Mooney followed trials in accordance with the established course of American procedure. It is familiar to students of jurisprudence that no system of criminal administration in the world hedges such safeguards around a case as does an American trial. The conviction, in other words, was based on evidence narrowly confined to the specific issues. Furthermore, proof of guilt had to be established beyond a reasonable doubt and established to the unanimous satisfaction of a jury of 12 persons selected from among the people. Conviction by an American jury is guilt determined by a very democratic institution. There is no question but that the jury acted in good faith, upon the evidence as it was submitted.

That is the end of the quotation from the official report.

Nevertheless the commission proceeds to say that on account of subsequent developments, and notwithstanding the fact that it has not undertaken to investigate the question of whether or not Mooney was actually guilty, the President of the United States should step outside of the functions of his Federal office and use the enormous power and influence of his position to interfere with the judicial decrees of the State of California.

It is well to bear in mind the character of this defendant, as officially reported by this labor commission. To say the least, the membership of this commission, in view of their report and their association with labor organizations, could not have been charged with a hostile bias against Mooney. This is what they say of him in paragraph 4 of their report.

Mooney at the time of his arrest was a well-known labor radical on the Pacific coast. He associated with anarchists. He was a believer in "direct action" in labor controversies. He had once been indicted for attempted dynamiting of property of a San Francisco utility, but after three trials was acquitted.

As to Billings, an accomplice of Mooney, who was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment, this same report states as follows:

Billings, a youth touched by radical propaganda, was one of Mooney's friends. He, too, was a believer in "direct action." He had been previously convicted of carrying explosives on a passenger car.

What is the meaning of these statements? It is simply that these men were propagandists of murder and destruction of property by dynamite; that they taught and believed in as a principle of their lives just such murders as that with which they were charged and of which the jury convicted them. It seems that these men were a part of that organized army typified by the bolsheviks, the anarchists, the Industrial Workers of the World, and direct-action socialists, who at this moment are attacking by every means at their command the very foundations of the American Republic. And it is in the face of this menace which is stalking through the land and in behalf of self-confessed advocates of murder and rapine that this movement, originating with the anarchists of Petrograd and taken up in Seattle by the authors of the letter and the resolutions which have been read, is seeking, by the threat of cutting off supplies from our soldiers engaged in a desperate battle for the liberties of mankind, to coerce the Government of the United

States to invade the sovereign rights of the State of California and set these convicted murderers "unconditionally free."

This insolent threat to tie up the war industries of the United States is an outgrowth of a conspiracy which has its agents in every country and whose object is the terrorism of the world. It is time for the people of the United States to be advised. Liberty and civilization are at stake. While this propaganda is in partnership with the Prussian military autocracy, it goes further and is more deep-rooted even than that. It is a peculiar circumstance that a certain type of pacifists, who claim they are opposed to all war and for peace at any price, preach the doctrine and practice of the dynamiting of innocent people as a protest against preparedness of the United States to protect itself against foreign aggression. Others of the same type sell themselves for money to the most ruthless military tyrants and slave drivers in history, to preach peace at any price to the peasants of Russia. So works the devil in Petrograd and in San Francisco. In one form or another the same partnership between the war party of Berlin and the peace party of Lenine is at work to-day in every country in the world. Ruthless military power for Germany and helpless disarmament, anarchy, and disorder for the rest of the world is their plan.

The German militarists hired the syndicalists and bolsheviks of the United States, just as they did those of Russia. In the Literary Digest of April 20, 1918, on page 23, will be found the details of the intimate partnership and employment of the anarchists and bolsheviks of Spain by the German Embassy to carry on a secret war against the Government of that friendly neutral country whose hospitality and protection the embassy was at that time enjoying. Such is the false and traitorous heart of these people.

As showing the partnership existing between the Prussian advocates of lawless force and the dynamiters of the Mooney and the Industrial Workers of the World type, notice the detailed account of their joint labors in Russia and Spain, and bear in mind that a large part of the bolshevik and Maximalist agitators and criminals that delivered Russia, bound in slave chains to Germany, and who are now working for Germany and putting into effect in that country their syndicalist doctrines, went there from the United States, and many of them from San Francisco—and I will produce evidence to that effect whenever it is called for—and that a part of their equipment consisted of a large quantity of copies of a pacifist speech delivered in the United States Senate. Through these anarchists, syndicalists, pacifists, dynamiters, and murderers the German Embassy in Spain, wearing the mask of friendship, made secret war on the country to which it had been accredited. Von Bernstorff carried on the same Machiavellian tactics here, flourished under our protection, and stabbed us in the back. He hired men to commit arson—and there has been a great deal of proof of that published in the last day or two, in addition to what was already well known—murder, and rapine, and sardonically laughed at our innocent and rather stupid toleration. I have that from personal associates of his.

Men of the Mooney type were his tools and agents. Von Bernstorff should have been arrested here and put on trial for his crimes as any common criminal or enemy spy. When he openly advertised in advance that the *Lusitania* would be sunk without notice or opportunity for its passengers to escape he should have been held responsible as an accomplice in the murder of the women and children on board. Von Bernstorff has gone, let us hope, never to return, but his fellow spies are still plotting murder and sabotage in the United States. Every center of pacifism and bolshevism is fertile soil for their propaganda. The draft riots in Quebec were the result of their work and that of their Industrial Workers of the World and other dupes taking advantage of a situation preexisting.

If the author of this threat of a blackmail strike on May 1 and those like him are not satisfied with the principles of American justice, with the high wages that any man who works can receive in America, with the security which this country gives him in his freedom of lawful action, and in the possession of the wages of his labor, then they should look around the world and find a better place to live in. One of the blessings of American institutions is that these men are free to leave the United States if they do not like it. If they are so enamored of German autocracy as to work in its interest, they perhaps could find happiness by taking up their abode in that country, or possibly they would find more enjoyment in life in Turkey, or in Austria, or in Armenia—by contrast with the hardships which they have to endure in the United States. Especially in Russia it would seem that they could find happiness, as those who are in control advocate the same principles as theirs—of a government composed exclusively of "working men" and an army composed entirely of private soldiers.

In opening the argument for the defense in the trial in San Francisco on Friday last of Hindus and Germans charged with a conspiracy to overthrow British rule in India, Theodore J. Roche said to the jury that Capt. Fritz von Papen, military attaché of the German embassy in Washington, was the conceiving mind of this conspiracy, which, he stated, was world wide and world important. Quite a significant statement, coming from the attorney for the defense!

The attempted revolution and massacre in India; the riots and mob killings in Quebec; the tie-up of copper production in Butte; the sabotage in the wheat fields of Dakota and Washington—and I will pause at this point to say that after going to the labor and the expense of cultivating the ground and seeding the wheat, the farmers of eastern Washington last year had to organize themselves, to employ secret agents, and establish a system of rapid communication in order to protect the fruits of their labor from being burned up by Industrial Workers of the World; the "mysterious influence" which has blighted our aeroplane production; the anarchist attack upon Prime Minister Count Romanones in Spain; the colossal treason of Russia, in which—and this is one of the most remarkable things in history—a German agent, a spy, became prime minister of the country, disbanded the army, and surrendered a hundred million souls to a foreign tyrant; the burning and blowing up of factories in New Jersey and Pennsylvania; the anticorporation insurrection in Oklahoma; the murder in San Francisco of marchers in the preparedness parade; the propaganda of American bolsheviks in Petrograd to defy the judgment of the court by which the perpetrators of that crime were convicted; and the threat from Seattle to call a general strike on May 1 unless these convicts were "unconditionally freed," are all a part of one connected movement to overturn the foundations of society and set up a hobo government in its place. First, destruction; then loot and rapine; then military autocracy are the incentives and the objects of this insane program.

The intellectual vagaries of benign but irrational visionaries, the abysmal ignorance of masses of its innocent human tools, and the murderous instincts of the avowed criminal enemies of social order are the material with which it works. Many of its parts are not conscious of their connection with each other, but it all moves as a cohesive and coordinate whole from a lever which is worked by the master criminals of mankind. Their proposed prey is the human and material accumulated wealth of the world. It is an astounding occurrence, and to us, awakened from our long dream of peace, seems difficult of conception. These conspirators against the peace and happiness of mankind have taken the gifts of God—the intelligence that has come with civilization, the inventions of science, the products of modern art—and, turning them into instruments of destruction, have made war on their own Creator. Those good gifts, which were put into the hands of these men for good, have been perverted to evil purposes. It is as though they had eaten of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and that they will hear "the voice of God walking in the garden in the cool of the day" and saying unto this Adam, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." It is as though again the man be "driven out" and again be "placed at the east of the Garden of Eden cherubim, and the flame of a sword" which shall turn "every way to keep the way of the tree of life."

But strange as it may seem to us that such a madness should seize the world, it is not new. Many times before have tyrants and criminals conspired to subject the world to their lust. And many times have they succeeded. Civilization as we know it is but a recent acquirement and rests upon no immovable foundations. After all, its roots go no deeper than human nature itself. And it is with the follies and follies, the mutations and vices, of men's characters that this war for its preservation must be waged. H. Rider Haggard says that an ancient civilization once flourished in the heart of Africa and left vast monuments as proof of its power and science, but that it has disappeared so completely that no man knows whence it came or whither it went; and he remarks that our civilization, so far from being permanent, hangs upon such delicate balances that their dislocation might easily destroy it and utterly blot it from the face of the earth.

I will not tax the patience of the Senate to pursue that thought, but influences that are at work to-day easily demonstrate its truth. Careful and responsible statesmen have recently pointed out that a world famine is by no means a remote possibility. Some of the fairest regions which in 1914 smiled in the comfort and beauty of art and plenty are to-day but the abode of desolation. The most beautiful monuments of religion and art are but crumbling ruins. The fields are but barren craters of chalk and clay, and their forests but shattered stumps,

their people gone, victims of starvation, lust, mutilation, and slaughter. Whole races of men—as in Armenia, Poland, Serbia—have been literally wiped from the face of the earth.

Machinery, scientific instruments, libraries, architectural examples, every appliance and muniment of learning have been consumed in the tempest of hate. Already in large areas has supervened that aftermath of regular and organized warfare—an unorganized and ruthless anarchy, as in Russia, where roving bands of human brutes are exhausting themselves in the destruction of everything that stands for modern civilization and enlightenment. Means of transportation have been paralyzed, the material with which it can be replaced has disappeared, and the inevitable result of general hunger and poverty, of the removal of all security of property and life, is a quick relapse into a primitive mode of life.

The light of the world is not a continuous or permanent one. It has gained brilliancy at various times and places, as in ancient Egypt or Assyria, and then gone out as completely as though it had never been. These same Vandals who are attempting once again to destroy the world ravaged Gaul and pillaged Rome. They extinguished a more brilliant intellectual civilization than our own, and plunged the world into utter darkness, from whose Dark Ages the light of the Renaissance did not emerge for 1,000 years.

They extinguished the light of the world, and their very name became a byword for ruthless and senseless destruction even unto this day. Their present Emperor, speaking to his troops at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1896, adjured his soldiers to imitate the example of Attila and his Huns, and if his brutal hand is not stayed by the allied forces, if the devastation he has wrought should be continued, if his partnership with the dark forces of treason, anarchy, dynamite, and revolution should prevail it may well be that the light of the world, the light of liberty and of learning, will be again extinguished, and our race be even now in the penumbra of another approaching darker age of misery and ignorance. There is only one thing with which this threat can be averted and that is force. Some have believed that the armed forces of evil could be met and combated by an appeal to their better natures. They have no better natures. Some pacifists have deceived themselves into believing that by disarming and arguing with the enemy for peace we could better preserve our ideals. It would be just as effective to repeat the Beatitudes to a Bengal tiger crouched to spring—better, in fact, because a Bengal tiger might be so surprised at such a proceeding as to be frightened away. I heard a great orator among our pacifists, in arguing against preparedness, say that "we should take the money which war costs and build macadam roads, and that if the Kaiser made war on us we should say to him we had no time for war, that we had priceless ideals to preserve for the benefit of mankind." As a matter of fact, that is what France, England, and America, in substance, did say to him, with the consequences that we have seen.

Such is the issue of mankind to-day, and such are the stakes. There is a homely old saying of "fighting the devil with fire." If Mooney advocates force, give him force. If the writer of this letter, threatening a blackmail strike against our soldiers, wants coercion, give him coercion. Only let it be lawful force administered by established authority. They and all their kind from the Kaiser down understand and respect that argument. They neither understand nor respect any other.

Liberty is at stake, and the capacity of a free Republic to save itself from being destroyed by its own freedom is on trial. More than that is at stake, and more than that is on trial. It is whether this people, the coheirs of civilization, which we have received in common with our British, French, Italian, and Japanese brethren as a priceless heritage from all the mighty labors of those who have gone before—when it is attacked from within and from without by the mightiest forces of evil ever gathered together for the destruction of mankind—will bear our share of the burden of its defense.

The time has come for our people after a long era of ease and peace in the enjoyment of the blessings of liberty and the rich fruits of a great new land to realize the vision which Milton had of them: "Methinks I see a mighty and a puissant people rousing itself as a strong man after sleep, as a young eagle mewing his immortal wing and lighting his undazzled eye in the full midday sun."

Those who have seen the glory in the faces of our young men leaving for the front, and know the love in the hearts of our women working for them at home, know that our race has not deteriorated, as some have said, and that in spite of the treason and anarchy of a few—barring some fatal blunder or weakness of our leaders in dealing with the national assassins in our midst or in marshaling our resources—these soldiers, with their heroic comrades of other lands, will return, carrying in safety,

in triumph, and in honor the ark of the covenant of liberty and civilization.

There can be no holier obligation than that which this Government owes to these men who are giving their lives to this cause, to put down at once with an iron hand this propaganda of revolution at home and to strike dead as though with the thunderbolts of Jove every traitor who seeks to cut off supplies from our armies in the field.

HOUSING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the housing bill, H. R. 10265.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10265) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gerry	New	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Harding	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hollis	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Smoot
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Swanson
Colt	Kellogg	Pittman	Thomas
Culberson	King	Poindexter	Tillman
Cummins	Lenroot	Pomerene	Trammell
Curtis	McCumber	Ransdell	Underwood
Fall	McKellar	Saulsbury	Watson
Fletcher	McLean	Shafroth	Williams
France	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Sherman	
Gallinger	Nelson	Shields	

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HENDERSON] is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] are detained on official business of the Senate.

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce for the day that my colleague [Mr. JAMES] is absent on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have been off the floor for a few minutes. The morning business has been closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it has been declared closed. The Senator is recognized, however.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish the Senate would allow me, then, by unanimous consent, to offer a resolution about which I spoke to the Chair before I left the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the offering of the resolution at this time? There being none, the same will be offered.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I send the resolution to the desk and ask that the Secretary read it.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was read, as follows:

Whereas there is pending before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs a bill (S. 4364) to subject to trial by court-martial persons who endanger the good discipline, order, movements, health, safety, or successful operations of the land or naval forces of the United States by acting as spies in time of war in the United States, and for other purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and is hereby, instructed to report to the Senate whether or not in its opinion any of the provisions of said bill are in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. What is the request?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The resolution is a resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to report to the Senate whether any of the provisions of Senate bill 4364, providing for the trial of people accused of the violation of the espionage act and some other acts Congress has passed, by court-martial instead of in the civil courts, are violative of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution if it does not interfere with the few minutes I have for the consideration of the housing bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If there is any objection, I will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. NELSON. I would suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that a far better way would be to have the bill referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is in charge of the Committee on Military Affairs, and to have that committee discharged from the consideration of it and have it referred to the Judiciary Committee, I think, would be more appropriate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I agree entirely with the Senator that the bill ought to have gone to the Judiciary Committee origi-

nally. It simply bristles with constitutional questions and in my opinion is absolutely violative of every guaranty contained in the Constitution as to trial by jury and individual liberty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit an interruption by the Chair?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

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

Mr. SWANSON. Permit me to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the Senator will allow me to finish a sentence in response to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], then I will yield to the Senator. The only reason why I took this method was because the bill was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. It is his own bill and was referred to his own committee and I felt that it might be a little disrespectful to him to ask that it be taken away from his committee and sent to the Judiciary Committee. I am perfectly willing that that should be done, but the Senator from Oregon is not on the floor.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. THOMAS. I have requested a page to find the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and I think he will be here very soon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. In view of the absence of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, will the Senator permit the resolution to go over until to-morrow at any rate, so that he can be here?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think he is in his committee room. I saw him a few minutes ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been trying to find him and could not.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think he will be here before I complete my remarks. If not, I will be glad to comply with the request of the Senator from Tennessee.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs has already had hearings on this bill to some extent. I went there by invitation of one of the members of the committee on Saturday afternoon hoping to hear some of the testimony which was being given in favor of the bill, but there were no witnesses there. There was an informal discussion among members of the committee, and I was permitted to remain. There seemed to be some members of the committee who were earnestly in favor of the bill. It seemed to me that if we got the judgment of the Judiciary Committee as to its constitutionality and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs would defer action upon it until after the opinion of the Judiciary Committee could be had, the same result would be accomplished; but I am perfectly willing that any Senator should substitute another motion for this resolution or make an amendment to it, if he wants to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suppose the Senator knows from having heard some remarks I made in committee on this very subject that I am inclined to agree with him. I do not think the bill will have to be referred to any other committee to ascertain whether it is constitutional or not. It seems to me it is perfectly patent and plain that it is unconstitutional. However, it seems to me under the wording of the bill it was entirely proper that the bill should have been sent to the Military Affairs Committee, and I would prefer not to have its jurisdiction ousted until the chairman is here, at any rate. I hope the Senator will let the resolution go over.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, the reference was proper enough in a certain way; it has to do with military affairs, because it provides for the trial of civilians by courts-martial, a thing that has never been tolerated in a civilized community that I am aware of. With the country calm and the courts wide open and no invasion and not the foot of an enemy on the continent of America anywhere, to ignore the courts and pass a bill which will allow a file of soldiers to march into your library where you are reading in the evening and drag you out to a military camp and stand you up against a stone wall and shoot you or hang you because you may have said something disrespectful

of the administration or the form of government is a proposition so heinous and abhorrent to any Anglo-Saxon at least that I could not entertain it for a minute.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN entered the Chamber.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I see the Senator from Oregon is now here. I am offering a resolution to ask the opinion of the Judiciary Committee as to the constitutionality of the so-called Chamberlain bill. If the Senator has any objection to it, of course I will let it go over.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the bill that the resolution refers to has already been submitted to the Military Affairs Committee, and I do not see why the legal aspect of it should now be referred to some other committee. Without questioning the ability of any member of the Judiciary Committee, we have some very distinguished lawyers on the Military Affairs Committee. We have the benefit of the advice, if we want it, of the Attorney General of the United States, as well as the benefit of any opinion that we might want to call upon the Judge Advocate General for.

I think it would be rather a poor compliment to the Military Affairs Committee to have some other committee pass upon the constitutionality of an act that it has under consideration. I assume that the Military Affairs Committee would not knowingly report a bill that it thought was unconstitutional after hearings had upon it any more than the Judiciary Committee would report out such a bill, and I assume that in the discharge of its duty it would satisfy itself about that before it made any report at all.

I think Mr. President, I shall have to object to the resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am surprised, very much surprised, that the Senator would object to obtaining the opinion of the Judiciary Committee, which contains 18 of the lawyers of the Senate, upon a bill which proposes to revise the system of jurisprudence in this country, which changes the whole court system of the country. But if the Senator objects, of course, I can not control that, and the resolution will have to go over until the following day. I give notice that I shall call it up to-morrow morning and ask the Senate to act upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

HOUSING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who has charge of the pending unfinished business, if he will give way to take up what is commonly known as the housing bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. I would be glad to oblige the Senator, but I made a promise that if the Senate would give unanimous consent to limit debate on and after Wednesday I would keep the unfinished business before the Senate, and I feel compelled to keep that promise.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to give notice that as soon as the regular morning business is concluded to-morrow I shall move to proceed with the further consideration of the housing measure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yielded to the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I merely wish to say, in view of what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] said, that I shall insist on taking a recess in lieu of an adjournment to-day. I made the motion for an adjournment on Friday so that the Senator from Virginia could bring up his bill in the morning hour to-day, but, of course, the morning hour was taken up with speeches.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator will move an adjournment this afternoon?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I could not do that.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the agreement require the Senate to take a recess?

Mr. OVERMAN. I did agree that if the Senate would give the unanimous consent I requested, I would keep the bill constantly before the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. I can not consent that the bill I have in charge shall have no chance of passing at an early day. I consider it to be one of the most important measures demanding action. It will increase the production of munitions by 25 to 50 per cent, and prevent delay in the whole business of fulfilling contracts for munitions of all kinds. Do I understand that until the Overman bill is disposed of it is to be kept constantly before the Senate?

Mr. OVERMAN. Unless there is some objection, I shall have to do it. If there is any objection—

Mr. SWANSON. I shall object, and there will have to be a quorum to vote on the question if the Senator insists upon a recess rather than an adjournment.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator has that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has the floor.

WAR AGAINST BULGARIA AND TURKEY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Before we become further involved in a dispute between the two bills, I ask the consent of the Senate to offer a resolution, which I ask the Secretary to read. I will let it go over until to-morrow morning, when I give notice that I shall call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 229), as follows:

Whereas S. J. Res. 145, to declare a state of war between the United States of America and the Governments of Bulgaria and of Turkey, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 2, 1918; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is requested to give said resolution its early consideration and report thereon to the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will let the resolution go over until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over under the rule, without prejudice, until to-morrow.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 20th instant, approved and signed the act (S. 383) to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 10854. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT OF ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Alaskan Engineering Commission for the year ended December 31, 1917.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1918.

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, the present Congress has made a record in the multiplicity, variety, and importance of legislation enacted never before accomplished in threefold the same time. The work it has done has not been equaled by any preceding Congress and will not be surpassed by any future Congress in volume and importance. The laws imposing taxes and providing for revenue and the appropriations for the current expenses of the Government, civil and military, not only exceed those heretofore imposed and made by the United States but those of any nation in the world within the same limited time. The laws for raising, equipping, and arming an army and providing a navy, for constructing a large merchant marine and fleets of airplanes are without a parallel in military affairs. In addition to these, many important bills concerning and affecting the personal conduct and property rights of the 110,000,000 of American citizens and of vital importance to good government in peace and war and necessary for the perpetuity and maintenance of our free institutions and the independence of our country, have been carefully considered and placed upon the statute books. The splendid manner in which the President and executive departments have met the responsibilities imposed by this legislation and discharged the numerous, varied, and important duties required of them can not be too highly commended.

Mr. President, when we consider the magnitude of the work of transforming a great Nation, engaged in agricultural, manu-

facturing, commercial, and other industrial pursuits, developing the great natural resources of their country, fostering education, advancing civilization, the cause of humanity, religious and political liberty, with their hearts filled with the love of their fellow men and the fear of God, from the paths of profound peace to a state of war, full of personal and financial sacrifice, and impending loss of the health, limbs, and lives of hundreds of thousands, and even more, of their best and noblest young men, we wonder how it has been within the power of men to accomplish it within so short a time and with the marvelous efficiency it has been done.

History will record this wonderful achievement as the greatest and most important ever accomplished by any nation so thoroughly and successfully within the compass of a year.

I will not go into the details of this stupendous work of the President and Congress, for the facts are known to all well-informed Americans.

Mr. President, while this great transformation of our country from peace to war has been in the main successful, there have been some serious mistakes and delays and some want of efficient management that have unhappily occurred in the preparation of our country for national defense and carrying on the war against Germany, and extraordinary legislation is required to meet the situation.

The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, after examining many civil and military officers and advising with a number of distinguished citizens, members of the advisory board of the Council of National Defense, framed and reported to the Senate a bill commonly known as the war-cabinet bill, which they believed would prevent the delays and the inefficiencies found to exist and afford relief from those conditions.

The bill under consideration, commonly known as the Overman bill, as I understand the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], in charge of it, to state, was prepared under the direction of the President and introduced by that Senator for the same purpose.

The war-cabinet bill has been recommitted, and the other is now before the Senate for final action.

These bills propose extraordinary legislation demanded by extraordinary and crucial conditions confronting the country. They seek to accomplish the same ends, differing chiefly in the repository of the powers to be conferred for those purposes.

It will be somewhat tedious to the Senate, but I believe the importance of this legislation will justify a brief analysis of these bills and a comparison of their respective provisions.

I will first call attention to the provisions of these bills separately and discuss some general objections that have been made to their constitutionality and the policy and necessity for such legislation.

THE WAR-CABINET BILL.

Mr. President, I think that the provisions of the war-cabinet bill violate the fundamental law by encroaching upon the constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I will read so much of the bill as bears upon the questions I will discuss:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a war cabinet, to be composed of three distinguished citizens of demonstrated executive ability, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, through which war cabinet the President may exercise such of the powers conferred upon him by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, as are hereinafter mentioned and described.

SEC. 2. That said war cabinet shall have jurisdiction and authority as follows:

(a) To consider, devise, and formulate plans and policies, general and special, for the effectual conduct and vigorous prosecution of the existing war, and, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, to direct and procure the execution of the same.

(b) To supervise, coordinate, direct, and control the functions and agencies of the Government in so far as, in the judgment of the war cabinet, it may be necessary or advisable so to do for the effectual conduct and vigorous prosecution of the existing war.

(c) To consider and determine upon its own motion or upon submission to it, subject to review by the President, all differences and questions relating to the conduct and prosecution of the war that may arise between any such departments, officials, and agencies of the Government.

(d) To require information from and utilize the services of any or all executive departments and executives, officers, and agents of the United States and of the several States and Territories, and of the District of Columbia, or helpful in the proper performance of the duties of said war cabinet.

(e) In the exercise of the jurisdiction and authority hereby conferred to make, subject to review by the President, the necessary orders to any such departments, bureau, official, or agency of the Government, and such decisions as the matters under consideration may require or warrant.

(f) To make rules and regulations governing its own procedure; and said war cabinet shall, upon completion of its membership, immediately organize and thereupon and thereafter proceed to an expeditious disposition of all matters coming before it.

The first section provides for the creation of a war cabinet, through which "the President may exercise such of the powers conferred on him by the Constitution and laws of the United States, as are mentioned and described in the bill."

The word "may," as the context and subsequent provisions of the bill clearly show, is used in the sense of "shall," and the powers of the President referred to are those conferred upon him by the Constitution in general as Chief Executive and specifically as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The second section provides that the war cabinet shall have jurisdiction and authority to consider, devise, and formulate plans and policies, general and special, for the effectual conduct and vigorous prosecution of the war, and to direct and procure the execution of the same; and to supervise, coordinate, direct, and control the functions and activities of all executive departments, officials, and agencies of the Government in so far as, in the judgment of the war cabinet, it may be necessary and advisable so to do for the effectual conduct and vigorous prosecution of the war.

The powers here conferred are absolute, without reference to the views or will of the President, and would entirely supersede him in the conduct of the war.

The war cabinet could take absolute charge of the conduct and prosecution of the war. The President would not have the authority to initiate or formulate any plans or policies for its prosecution. His power as Commander in Chief would be destroyed. He would be subject to the orders of the war cabinet.

The Constitution declares that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States"; that "all executive powers shall be vested in the President"; and that "judicial powers of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and it is familiar law that these three departments are separate, coordinate, and independent and their respective powers can not be exercised or limited by the others.

The Constitution does not define legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and they must be determined by their inherent nature and the principles of our institutions. Certain powers are also specifically mentioned and conferred upon each of the departments, although they would have them under the general terms used, thus emphasizing the intention of the framers of the Constitution that the particular department should have those powers.

Among these specific powers expressly conferred is that contained in Article II, providing that the "President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States."

It will not be out of place to read in this connection from a commentator whose opinions on American constitutional law are accepted as authority by all branches of our Government.

In Black's Constitutional Law (sec. 69) it is said:

In time of peace the President has two sets of duties to discharge with reference to the Army and Navy. First, he is the Commander in Chief, and as such must exercise supreme and unimpeded control. Secondly, he "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed," and in pursuance of this duty he must give due effect to the acts of Congress which concern the Military and Naval Establishments. Congress has power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain the Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulations of the land and naval forces. Under these grants of authority it may clearly regulate the enlistment of soldiers and sailors, prescribe the number, rank, and pay of officers, provide for and regulate arms, ships, forts, arsenals, the organization of the land and naval forces, courts-martial, military offenses, and their punishment, and the like. And all these laws and regulations the President is to carry into effect not in his character as Commander in Chief but as a part of his general executive duty, and with as great or as little choice of means and methods as Congress may see fit to confide in him. But, again, in virtue of his rank, as head of the force, he has certain powers and duties with which Congress can not interfere. For instance, he may regulate the movements of the armies and the stationing of them at various posts. So also he may direct the movements of the vessels of the Navy, sending them wherever, in his judgment, it is expedient. Neither here nor in a state of war is there any necessary conflict. The President has no power to declare war. That belongs exclusively to Congress. But when war has been declared, or when it is recognized as actually existing, then his functions as Commander in Chief become of the highest importance, and his operation in that character are entirely beyond the control of the Legislature. It is true that Congress must still "raise and support" the Army and provide and maintain a Navy, and it is true that the power of furnishing or withholding the necessary means and supplies may give it an indirect influence on the conduct of the war. But the supreme command belongs to the President alone. In theory he plans all campaigns, establishes all blockades and sieges, directs all marches, fights all battles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SHIELDS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask my colleague whether he considers that the powers granted to the President under this bill are powers that pertain to him in his executive capacity

or powers that pertain to him in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy?

Mr. SHIELDS. I understand the powers proposed to be conferred to the President under the Overman bill are chiefly executive powers and not those which he has as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. What I am now especially discussing are the provisions of the war-cabinet bill, which cover the authority of the President as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The authorities conclusively show that while Congress has the power to declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and to enact laws for the organization and discipline of these forces and of the militia, the power to command, control, and direct them is executive and is by the Constitution specifically vested in the President as Commander in Chief, and, further, that this power is plenary, absolute, and supreme, and can not be taken from him and conferred upon others or in any way limited or controlled.

It has been said that the provisions of the first section, that the President "may" exercise such of the powers conferred upon him by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, through the war cabinet, applies to all subsequent sections of the bill, and therefore the war cabinet acts merely as his agent, and he is not limited or superseded in the exercise of his constitutional powers.

I do not think this construction can be sustained, because subsections (a) and (b) expressly confer upon the war cabinet the authority to initiate as well as to supervise, direct, control, and execute all plans and policies for the vigorous prosecution of the war.

The word "may," as here used, must be construed to mean "shall," because the clear intent of the language of the bill is that the war cabinet created shall exercise the functions and activities therein outlined. The President is left no discretion concerning the conduct of the war or the instrumentalities he shall use or the plans he shall pursue. He must act through the cabinet upon plans and policies initiated and to be executed by it. Clearly this would allow the war cabinet to share with the President the executive powers conferred upon him by the Constitution.

But if the construction placed upon the bill by its authors be conceded to be true, or if amended so as to provide that the President shall exercise all the powers proposed to be conferred upon the war cabinet through that body, the infirmities I have pointed out will not be cured. The powers conferred by the Constitution upon the President as Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy are, as I have stated, plenary and absolute, and he can not be limited or restricted in the execution of them; but he has the right to determine the manner and instrumentalities through which he will discharge the duties of his high office.

This is eminently true concerning his powers as Commander in Chief, because the very nature of this office imperatively requires that in the exercise of the powers conferred and the discharge of duties to be performed he shall have unlimited discretion and supreme power. The framers of the Constitution clearly intended to centralize all the power over our armed forces in the Chief Executive by expressly providing that he should be Commander in Chief, thus recognizing the experience of all nations that war can not be conducted without absolute, if not despotic, power being concentrated in one single head.

If Congress had the power to create a war cabinet to initiate and formulate plans and policies for the President and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in the discharge of his duties it could do so itself and thus assume all of his functions and powers and exercise absolute control of the Army and Navy and the conduct of the war. There can be no distinction between partial limitations either as to the means and instrumentalities used by the Chief Executive in the discharge of his duties and the absolute control of them.

The absolute power of the President as Commander in Chief is vital to the very existence of the Nation and must not be interfered with in any manner.

But it may be said that the powers proposed to be conferred upon the council or cabinet are not directly over the President, but the heads of the departments and subordinate officers. This position is not tenable. The provisions of section 1 and subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 directly affect the powers of the President and supersede them.

The other sections of the bill do directly authorize the war cabinet to adjust all differences that may arise between the departments, officials, and agencies of the Government and utilize the services of any and all executive departments, executive officers, and agents of the United States and the several States, and to make and issue orders for the control of

all of the departments of the Government, subject only to review by the President. In other words, the President is deprived of the power to control the executive officers and departments and to initiate plans and policies for the prosecution of the war, and can do nothing more than approve or disapprove those formulated by the war cabinet. What sort of a Commander in Chief would he be with such limited powers?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SHIELDS. I do.

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not suppose the Senator contends that Congress has not power to create Cabinet officials and to define their duties?

Mr. SHIELDS. Certainly not.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then, if this war-cabinet bill should be construed to be simply permissive—in other words, if the word "may" is given its natural meaning—the bill would be constitutional, would it not?

Mr. SHIELDS. That would relieve to some extent the encroachment upon the powers and prerogatives of the President, but not entirely, because there can be no restriction and no limitation and no embarrassment of the absolute powers vested in him.

Mr. KELLOGG. But if the President is left free to exercise his powers as the Executive, and simply to use a war cabinet the same as he uses any other members of the Cabinet, there can not be any doubt about the power of Congress to create such a Cabinet official.

Mr. SHIELDS. Certainly not. That is the question the Senator from Minnesota asked me a few moments ago, and to which I made the same answer; but such are not the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well. The Senator from Tennessee is aware of the rule of construction, that such a construction will be placed upon a law as to make it constitutional if it is possible to so construe the language. If the construction is placed upon this bill simply that it is permissive; so far as the President is concerned, to exercise his powers through this cabinet, then the bill would be constitutional. I say nothing about the wisdom of it, but simply speak of its constitutionality.

Mr. SHIELDS. The Senator is correct in his statement of the rule of construction. The rule announced by him is well established, but still his suggestion does not meet the infirmities of this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

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

Mr. SHIELDS. I do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. By the expression "this bill" I take it the Senator from Tennessee does not refer to the so-called Overman bill, but to the war-cabinet bill?

Mr. SHIELDS. I have so expressly stated. I am now discussing the war-cabinet bill.

There can be no doubt but that these sections of the bill also directly affect and limit the powers of the President. The broad language of the provisions conferring powers on the war cabinet cover both civil and military establishments, and include the Secretaries of all the departments, all generals and admirals, and other officers of the Army and Navy. These are all the agents of the President and through whom he must exercise his authority.

As said by Judge Miller in his lectures upon the Constitution:

The Secretaries of the War Department and the heads of all other departments are the executive managers and agents discharging the function of the executive office under the control and with the consent of the President.

The control of these agents would be the control of the President, for the control of the agent necessarily is the control of the principal.

The President was clearly right in objecting to this bill. While chosen by the people to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the highest office in their gift, and charged with the faithful and efficient execution of them, he would, under its provisions, be unable to do so in this great emergency confronting the country, and would have no part of consequence in conducting the war for national defense. The creation of a commission with such high and sweeping powers would, in effect, abolish the office of Chief Executive and Commander in Chief, change our form of government, and create intolerable conditions.

THE OVERMAN BILL.

Now, let us examine the provisions of the bill under consideration which are intended to concentrate all administrative powers into a single executive head to secure unity of plan and promptness of decision and execution.

Its effective and operative sections are much the same as those of the war cabinet bill, and are as follows:

That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this act, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary.

Sec. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof, or any part of it, either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

Sec. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said function.

Mr. President, the first question I will consider is whether legislation is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this bill. There are distinguished Senators who think it is not, but, as I understand them, their conclusions are based on widely different views of the source of the power of the President in such matters. There are those who believe that the President has the right to exercise all the powers proposed to be conferred in the bill and much more under what they call "the war power" supposed to be vested in him as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and there are others who, I understand, think he has these powers as the depository of all executive power under article 2 of the Constitution and perhaps some existing statutes.

I can not agree with any of these views, and believe that the purposes and objects for which the bill was introduced can not be effected without its enactment into law.

I can not agree with the distinguished Senators who, in substance, express the opinion that the President, by virtue of his constitutional position as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, in time of war is vested with all the powers of government to enable him to successfully prosecute the war. The Senators interpret the provision that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into active service of the United States," to confer these extraordinary and absolute powers. They seem, in reading the clause of the Constitution ordaining that "the President shall be Commander in Chief," to have stopped with these words and not observed that such authority is confined to the Army and Navy and the militia when in Federal service. The President is not made Commander in Chief of any department of the Government.

Mr. President, that President Lincoln exercised powers for which he, as Chief Executive of the Republic or as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, had no warrant under the Constitution, as stated during the progress of this debate, in the conduct of the Civil War, does not justify his successors in doing the same thing. President Wilson will follow no such precedent; he will usurp no power. When he finds that he has no authority to do things which conditions and the vigorous prosecution of the war require to be done, he comes to Congress, as in this case, and asks for the authority, and I believe that in every instance it has been granted.

Mr. President, I do not agree with those who are of the opinion that republics are not so constituted that they can successfully make war and certainly that is not the case with our form of government. History, past and current, has proven and is now demonstrating that we can successfully wage war upon a large scale and with efficiency never excelled by any nation in any age. I believe this can be done within constitutional limitations and with due regard to the separation of governmental powers into three distinct and independent departments.

The Constitution was made for peace and war. The Colonies or States had just emerged from eight years of bloody and exhaustive war when it was formulated, and those who gathered together to do this great work were familiar with all the difficulties the Continental Congress and our military commanders had encountered in the conduct of that war and had in mind future wars with which they were threatened, and years of peace which they hoped for, as well as the development of the commerce and great natural resources of this great country. They provided a Government for the contingencies and necessities of peace and war, combining the necessary powers for both conditions in the same instrument. The provisions for government in peace and those for command in war come from the

same high source. They are of equal dignity, of equal authority, and are equally sacred and independent in their respective spheres and jurisdictions and must all be construed together, harmonized, and executed without encroachment on each other.

There is no question in my mind that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, under the Constitution and statutory authority given him by Congress, and that which should and can be given him, will have all the powers necessary to enable him to conduct this great war to a victorious conclusion without the violation of any principle of the Constitution. If he has not now sufficient authority to prosecute the war with that speed and efficiency necessary to victory, Congress has the power to give it to him and should do so ungrudgingly and promptly.

There are other Senators, who, I understand, are of the opinion that the President as the Chief Executive of the Republic and by statute has power to do the things provided in the pending bill, but so far they have not given any definite statement of their views nor pointed out the statutes which they think confer this power.

The President has very large powers over the heads of several executive departments, as the Chief Executive of the Nation, whether in war or in peace, and they and their subordinates where not otherwise provided by law are subject to his direction and control.

But the executive heads of departments have other powers than those which they obtain as the representatives and agents of the Chief Executive. Congress has, from time to time, conferred upon them and, in many instances, their subordinates or chiefs of bureaus powers which the Secretaries must execute independent and free from the control of the President, and which the chiefs of bureaus are bound to perform independent of the will of the head of the department, and are responsible only to the law for their action.

In the case of the *United States v. Symonds* (120 U. S., p. 30, L. Ed., p. 558) it is said:

The authority of the Secretary to issue orders, regulations, and instructions, with the approval of the President, in reference to matters connected with the Naval Establishment, is subject to the condition, necessarily implied, that they must be consistent with the statutes which have been enacted by Congress in reference to the Navy. He may, with the approval of the President, establish regulations in execution of, or supplementary to, but not in conflict with, the statutes defining his powers or conferring rights upon others. The contrary has never been held by this court.

And in the case of *Kendall v. The United States* (12 Pet., 610), where the direct questions arose in a mandamus proceeding against the Postmaster General to compel him to exercise a power and perform a duty imposed upon him by Congress, it was said:

The executive power is vested in a President, and as far as his powers are derived from the Constitution he is beyond the reach of any other department, except in the mode prescribed by the Constitution through the impeaching power. But it by no means follows that every officer in every branch of that department is under the exclusive direction of the President. Such a principle, we apprehend, is not, and certainly can not be, claimed by the President.

There are certain political duties imposed upon many officers in the executive department, the discharge of which is under the direction of the President. But it would be an alarming doctrine that Congress can not impose upon any executive officer any duty they may think proper, which is not repugnant to any rights secured and protected by the Constitution; and in such cases the duty and responsibility grow out of and are subject to the control of the law and not to the direction of the President. And this is emphatically the case where the duty enjoined is of a mere ministerial character.

Now, let us briefly examine the statutes creating the several executive departments, their officers, subordinates, and employees and conferring upon them general and special powers and duties, and see how far these departments and their officers are subject to the direction and control of the President and how far they are controlled by statutory law which neither they nor the President can ignore or violate.

The original statute creating the War Department was enacted August 7, 1789. It was provided in that statute:

The Secretary of War shall perform such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President relative to military commissions, the military forces, the warlike stores of the United States, or to other matters respecting military affairs; and he shall conduct the business of the department in such manner as the President shall direct.

Thus absolute power was by the original statute given the President over the Secretary of War and the War Department, but subsequently, by express statutes amending it, much of the power of the Secretary of War has been conferred directly upon him and, in some instances, upon his subordinates, so that in these matters these officers are not subject to the control or direction of the President. One of these was passed in 1814, and is found as section 219 of the Revised Statutes. It reads:

SEC. 219. The Secretary of War shall from time to time define and prescribe the kinds as well as the amount of supplies to be purchased by the Subsistence and Quartermaster Departments of the Army, and

the duties and powers thereof respecting such purchases; and shall prescribe general regulations for the transportation of the articles of supply from the places of purchase to the several armies, garrisons, posts, and recruiting places, for the safe-keeping of such articles, and for the distribution of an adequate and timely supply of the same to the regimental quartermasters, and to such other officers as may by virtue of such regulations be intrusted with the same; and shall fix and make reasonable allowances for the store rent and storage necessary for the safe-keeping of all military stores and supplies.

SEC. 220. The transportation of troops, munitions of war, equipments, military property, and stores throughout the United States shall be under the immediate control and supervision of the Secretary of War and such agents as he may appoint.

The statutes creating and fixing the duties of the Secretary of the Navy closely follow the same lines as those creating the War Department. I will not consume time to read them.

The validity of these statutes and their force and effect have come before the courts in a number of cases in mandamus proceedings instituted against the Secretaries or some subordinate to compel them to perform some duty imposed, and the proceedings were sustained over the contention that it was an executive power or function of the President and could not be controlled by the judiciary, because it was a duty fixed by statute which Congress had the power to enact.

It will be found upon examination of the statutes that the heads of all the executive departments have their duties fixed by statute, and in order for the President to control them there must be some legislation of the character proposed by the present bill.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BILL.

But the able Senator from Iowa [MR. CUMMINS] says that the blanket power proposed by the bill to authorize the President to coordinate the powers and duties and transfer the functions of officers and agents in the several departments of the Government can not be legally conferred; that it would be a delegation of legislative power to the Executive.

The Senator is a very able lawyer and his opinions are always entitled to the greatest respect and most serious consideration, but I think he has fallen into error upon this question.

I agree with the Senator that the powers of the Federal Government are by the Constitution divided into three great coordinate and independent departments, and that no one of these departments can be given or can exercise those powers solely confided to either of the other departments.

Theoretically, the legislative power is that to make, amend, and repeal; the executive, that to administer and enforce; and the judicial, that to interpret and apply laws.

In the writings of Montesquien and other political scientists much consulted when the first American constitutions were framed and adopted, it is said, in substance, that the absolute separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments are essential to a republican form of government and necessary for the perpetuation and maintenance of the political liberties of the people. But the framers of the Federal Constitution and those of a great majority, if not all, of the States departed from this theoretical division of the powers of government, and in many important matters vested in each of them powers and authority that in strictness would belong exclusively to the others; and in some instances all departments are vested with the same power to be exercised concerning different matters, and this is especially noticeable in the vestiture of political and administrative powers. This is obvious from an examination of those several instruments, and has been frequently referred to in judicial decisions.

There are also powers which partake of the nature of both the legislative and executive, and may be conferred upon and exercised by either of these departments with equal propriety and equal safety to the rights of the people.

Judge Cooley, in his *Constitutional Limitations*, page 157, says:

If it is difficult to point out the precise boundary which separates legislative from judicial duties, it is still more difficult to discriminate, in particular cases, between what is properly legislative and what is properly executive duty. The authority that makes the law has large discretion in determining the means through which they shall be executed, and the performance of many duties which they may provide for by the law they may refer either to the chief executive of the State, or, at their option, to any other executive or ministerial officer, or even to a person specially named for the duty. What can be definitely said on this subject is this: That such powers as are specially conferred by the constitution upon the governor, or upon any other specified officer, the legislature can not require or authorize to be performed by any other officer or authority, and from these duties which the constitution requires of him he can not be excused by law. But other powers or duties the executive can not exercise or assume to except by legislative authority, and the power which in its discretion it confers it may also, in its discretion, withhold or confide to other hands.

In *Hovey v. State* (119 Ind., 395, 21 N. E., 21), it is said: The boundaries which separate the functions of the different departments are broad, clear, and distinct, as applied to matters affecting property rights or private concern, or the execution or enforcement of existing law; but it is not easy, where the Constitution is silent, to discriminate or formulate definitions as to what constitutes legislative,

executive, and judicial authority when questions of public policy, or which relate to the best means and agencies for accomplishing a governmental end, or of executing the law, are involved.

While the Congress has the sole power to legislate, and can not delegate it, it has other powers in their nature administrative and political which it may confer upon the Executive or the judiciary, or upon commissions or other agencies created by it.

POWERS CONFERRED ARE ADMINISTRATIVE.

The constitutional principle which the Senator from Iowa relies upon does not refer to administrative powers. These may be delegated to whomsoever and in such form as the Congress may deem wise and proper. Whether the power is legislative or administrative depends upon its nature and substance and not upon the manner and form in which it is conferred. The Congress acts in the form of joint and concurrent resolutions and bills, but these are not always legislative acts.

The powers proposed to be conferred upon the Chief Executive by the provisions of the pending bill are not legislative in their character and effect, but clearly administrative. They are very similar to the authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations for the government of the forest reserves, which was attacked upon the ground that it was a delegation of the legislative power. The validity of the legislation as an administrative measure was upheld in the case of *The United States v. Grimald* (220 U. S., 563), from which I will read briefly:

Congress was merely conferring administrative functions upon an agent and not delegating to him legislative power. The authority actually given was much less than what has been granted to municipalities by virtue of which they make by-laws, ordinances, and regulations for the government of towns and cities. Such ordinances do not declare general rules with reference to rights of persons and property, nor do they create or regulate obligations and liabilities, nor declare what shall be crimes nor fix penalties therefor.

By whatever name they are called, they refer to matters of local management and local police. They are "not of a legislative character in the highest sense of the term, and as an owner may delegate to his principal agents the right to employ subordinates, giving to them a limited discretion, so it would seem that Congress might rightfully intrust to the local legislature (authorities) the determination of minor matters."

It must be admitted that it is difficult to define the line which separates legislative power to make laws from administrative authority to make regulations. This difficulty has often been recognized, and was referred to by Chief Justice Marshall in *Wayman v. Southard* (10 Wheat., 42; 6 L. Ed., 262), where he was considering the authority of courts to make rules. He there said: "It will not be contended that Congress can delegate to the courts or to any other tribunals powers which are strictly and exclusively legislative. But Congress may certainly delegate to others powers which the legislature may rightfully exercise itself." What were these nonlegislative powers which Congress could exercise but which might also be delegated to others was not determined, for he said: "The line has not been exactly drawn which separates those important subjects, which must be entirely regulated by the legislature itself, from those of less interest, in which a general provision may be made, and power given to those who are to act under such general provisions to fill up the details."

From the beginning of the Government various acts have been passed conferring upon executive officers power to make rules and regulations—not for the government of their departments but for administering the laws which did govern. None of these statutes could confer legislative power. But when Congress had legislated and indicated its will it could give to those who were to act under such general provisions "power to fill up the details" by the establishment of administrative rules and regulations, the violation of which could be punished by fine or imprisonment fixed by Congress, or penalties fixed by Congress, or measured by the injury done.

The bill does not propose to empower the President to create new functions or do other things than are now provided for by law, but merely to provide agents, agencies, and methods for the performance of functions, the discharge of duties, and the execution of things already authorized and provided for. No rights are created, no liabilities are imposed, and no penalties denounced. Every element of authority proposed to be vested is absolutely administrative and within the power of Congress either to exercise directly or indirectly, through any agent or agency it may select or create.

The powers here proposed to be conferred on the President are not as broad or as important as those conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission and upon the Federal Trade Commission, which are a combination of the legislative, judicial, and executive, and materially affect the conduct and the property rights of thousands of people. They are no broader than the powers which were conferred upon the President over the State, War, and Navy Departments when they were first created, for in these departments he was authorized to do the very things proposed in this bill. Indeed, this bill merely restores to the President the power over these departments which was originally conferred upon him when they were first organized.

I will read from the Revised Statutes. Concerning the State Department:

Sec. 202. The Secretary of State shall perform such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President relative to correspondences, commissions, or instructions to or with public ministers or consuls from the United States, or to negotiations

with public ministers from foreign States or princes, or to memorials or other applications from foreign public ministers or other foreigners, or to such other matters respecting foreign affairs as the President of the United States shall assign to the department, and he shall conduct the business of the department in such manner as the President shall direct.

Concerning the War Department, it was provided:

Sec. 216. The Secretary of War shall perform such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President relative to military commissions, the military forces, the warlike stores of the United States, or to other matters respecting military affairs; and he shall conduct the business of the department in such manner as the President shall direct.

And concerning the Navy Department, we find:

Sec. 417. The Secretary of the Navy shall execute such orders as he shall receive from the President relative to the procurement of naval stores and materials, and the construction, armament, equipment, and employment of vessels of war, as well as all other matters connected with the Naval Establishment.

The powers which the bill proposes to confer upon the President are no broader than those given to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy over their departmental affairs and agencies by the statutes creating these offices in 1789, shortly after the Constitution was ratified by the States. I will read from the Revised Statutes sections Nos. 161 and 166, applicable to all departments:

Sec. 161. The head of each department is authorized to prescribe regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the government of his department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it.

Sec. 166. Each head of a department may from time to time alter the distribution among the various bureaus and offices of his department, of the clerks allowed by law, as he may find it necessary and proper to do.

Again, the authority proposed to be given is more of the nature of the appointive power, which is peculiarly executive, than the legislative power, for the substance and effect of the bill is to authorize the President to appoint agents or agencies already existing, to perform certain functions and duties now provided by law.

The power to transfer functions of one department or bureau to another department or bureau is nothing more than the appointment of the head of the department or chief of the bureau to which the same are transferred to perform those functions.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is clearly mistaken in his conception that this bill delegates legislative powers and for that reason would be violative of the fundamental law. This bill creates no rights, it creates no offenses or penalties, but merely provides for the appointment of officers to discharge certain administrative duties already created and fully defined.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHIELDS. I do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have listened with great interest to the very able argument that the Senator from Tennessee has just made touching the constitutionality of this bill. Anything that the Senator has to say upon a constitutional question always invites my very studious attention. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think the constitutionality of this bill rests—I think he perhaps indicated this—more strongly upon the last point he has just made in arguing the question than upon the first; that is to say, it rests more strongly upon the power of the President to appoint to office than upon the power of the President to confer administrative powers in the way of making rules, and so forth? My thought, as I have considered this bill, was about as follows: That when we speak of transferring a function from one officer to another it is tantamount to saying that, conversely, instead of taking the function to the officer the President is directed to take the officer to the function, namely, to appoint the officer to do that particular thing, and under the Constitution, of course, the President may be vested with authority to appoint without the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I think the legislation can be sustained upon either ground—that they are merely administrative powers or that the power is that of appointment.

Mr. President, I have read the war-cabinet bill and the Overman bill, and to some extent compared and explained their provisions. I do not deem it necessary to make any elaborate comparison of the powers proposed to be conferred by these bills, respectively, nor to point out in detail wherein those provided for in the war-cabinet bill exceed in importance, force, and effect those found in the Overman bill, for they are obvious to all Senators. I will direct attention to only some of the points of similarity and difference.

The war-cabinet bill proposes to vest great and extraordinary powers in three distinguished citizens to be appointed by the

President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who are now unknown to anyone and yet to be selected, while the powers proposed to be conferred by the Overman bill are confided to the Chief Executive of the Nation, in peace and in war, charged with the responsibility and duty of the faithful execution of all the laws of the Federal Government, chosen by the expressed will of all the people, the personnel of the present incumbent being well known and trusted by everyone.

The war-cabinet bill authorizes the members of the cabinet to consider, devise, and formulate plans and policies for the conduct and prosecution of the war and procure the execution of the same. No similar provision is found in the Overman bill, because the Constitution vests these powers in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The war-cabinet bill empowers the members of the cabinet to supervise, coordinate, direct, and control the functions and agencies of the Government as in their judgment may be necessary or advisable for the conduct of the war, which is practically the same power proposed to be given the President in the Overman bill.

The war-cabinet bill authorizes the members of this council to consider and determine, subject to review by the President, all differences and questions relating to the conduct and prosecution of the war that may arise between the departments, officials, and agencies of the Government, to utilize the services of executive departments, officers, and agents of the United States, and even of the several States, and to issue orders to any such department, bureau, official, or agency of the Government necessary to enforce their decisions, which is far more comprehensive and drastic than the power given the President in regard to the same things in the Overman bill.

The war-cabinet bill, in section 3, requires the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assign to duty with the war cabinet such commissioned officers as it may request, and authorizes the war cabinet to also employ all clerical and other employees required for its services—powers not given to the President in the Overman bill.

Mr. President, when the powers conferred in the Overman bill are reduced to the concrete it will be found that the President is merely authorized to coordinate and redistribute the functions and duties of the various executive departments, bureaus, commissions, and other agencies of the Government, and to transfer them and their officers and employees from and to departments, bureaus, commissions, and other agencies of the Government as he may deem best to promote expedition, economy, and efficiency, all of which and more is conferred upon the war cabinet in the bill providing for it.

Mr. President, those Senators who favored the war-cabinet bill, unless they wish to press it further, can not fail to support the Overman bill upon the ground that it confers too much power without being subject to the charge of inconsistency. The Overman bill confers less power and provides for fewer changes in the organization of the executive departments, bureaus, commissions, and other governmental agencies than the war-cabinet bill, and will afford relief from the conditions now existing.

Mr. President, the plan for a division of the control and direction of the conduct of the war as proposed in the war-cabinet bill is also unsound in policy. Combining the authority of a cabinet or commission with the Executive in control of armies divides the responsibilities, produces division of counsel, indecision, and almost invariably disaster. There is not found such a system in any well-organized government of the world, and for us to now change the policy which we have so long pursued would be a dangerous experiment and fraught with most disastrous consequences.

I believe that legislation of the character contained in the bill under consideration is necessary to authorize the President to coordinate and redistribute the functions of the executive department and administrative agents and agencies of the Government, and that it will aid materially in centralizing these powers into a single head, demonstrated by experience in all ages and in all countries to be necessary for the vigorous and successful prosecution of war.

I can do no better than quote from one of the greatest jurists this country has produced upon this subject. In Story on the Constitution, volume 2, section 1491, it is said:

The command and application of the public force to execute the laws, to maintain peace, and to resist foreign invasion are powers so obviously of an executive nature and require the exercise of qualities so peculiarly adapted to this department that a well-organized government can scarcely exist when they are taken away from it. Of all the cases and concerns of the Government, the direction of war most peculiarly demands those qualities which distinguish the exercise of power by a single hand. Unity of plan, promptitude, activity, and decision are indispensable to success, and these can scarcely exist except when a single magistrate is intrusted exclusively with the power. Even the coupling of the authority of an executive council with him, in the exercise of such powers, enfeebles the system, divides the responsibility, and

not infrequently defeats every energetic measure. Timidity, indecision, obstinacy, and pride of opinion must mingle in all such councils and infuse a torpor and sluggishness destructive of all military operations.

CONFIDENCE IN THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. President, there has been much said about the possibility of the abuse of the powers proposed to be conferred upon the President by the Overman bill. Woodrow Wilson needs no defense from Senators in this Chamber, and no eulogy of him or his public record as Chief Executive of the Nation is necessary. The people of the United States expressed their confidence in his integrity and ability when they called him to the greatest executive office not only in their gift but in the world, and, after four years' service, reaffirmed their confidence and approved his administration by reelecting him to a second term. I hardly need recall to Senators that during these four years more constructive legislation was enacted and more reforms successfully inaugurated than in any period of our national existence.

When we were compelled to enter this fearful war we are waging with Germany our people were contented, happy, and prosperous beyond all reasonable expectations. Our farmers and manufacturers were realizing higher prices for their products than before known; our laborers were earning the most remunerative wages of any in the world, and our domestic and foreign commerce had doubled and trebled and was increasing by great leaps and bounds.

President Wilson's administration of the affairs of the country during that period can not be successfully assailed and there are none who deny his patriotism and devotion to the interests of the people. He is recognized as one of the greatest Chief Executives that ever adorned the great office he so ably fills, and by his countrymen and all civilized peoples as one of the ablest statesmen and rulers of the world. If the personality of the present Chief Executive is to be decisive of the wisdom of the proposed legislation, there is no reason why it should not be enacted.

But, Mr. President, we should take a broader view of the question and be governed by a higher principle in determining the wisdom of conferring these great governmental powers and should ask ourselves whether we can trust the integrity, patriotism, and ability of the Chief Executive of the Nation, whoever he may be, for no man knows, in the uncertainty of human events, who may occupy that high office and administer the law. We must trust some one in all relations of life—social, business, political, and official—and there are comparatively few cases where confidence has been misplaced. God so constituted men that when they are called to positions of great power and responsibility they seldom fail to rise to the occasion and exercise those powers honestly and faithfully.

The powers proposed to be here conferred are large and vital to the interest of the public; they must vest somewhere and in some officer. Where, Mr. President, I ask, can they be placed with more confidence and with more safety to the interest of the people than in the hands of the President of the United States? Will we in this great crisis, when the freedom and happiness of our people, the perpetuity of our free institutions, the lives of our soldiers, and civilization itself are at stake and trembling in the balance, dependent upon the uncertain fortunes of war on the battle fields of France, say to the world that we are not willing to trust the integrity and ability of our Chief Executive?

Chief Justice Taney, in the great case of Luther versus Borden, which practically involved the form of government of the State of Rhode Island, concerning the act of Congress empowering the President to call out the militia of the States in cases of insurrection, said:

"It is said that this power in the President is dangerous to liberty and may be abused. All power may be abused if placed in unworthy hands. But it would be difficult, we think, to point out any other hands in which this power would be more safe and at the same time equally effectual. * * * And the elevated office of the President, chosen as he is by the people of the United States, and the high responsibility he could not fail to feel when acting in a case of so much moment, appear to furnish as strong safeguards against a willful abuse of power as human prudence and foresight could well provide."

Another great American, a profound student of history and political science and a constructive statesman, with no thought of the application I am making of it, wrote of the confidence and trust to be reposed in high officials as follows:

"If there be one principle clearer than another, it is this: That in any business, whether of government or of mere merchandising, somebody must be trusted in order that when things go wrong it may be quite plain who should be punished. In order to drive trade at the speed and with the success you desire, you must confide without suspicion in your chief clerk,

giving him power to ruin you, because you thereby furnish him with a motive for serving you. His reputation, his own honor or disgrace, all his own commercial prospects, hang upon your success. And human nature is much the same in government as in the dry-goods trade. Power and strict accountability for its use are the essential constituents of good government. A sense of highest responsibility, a dignifying and elevating sense of being trusted, together with a consciousness of being in an official station so conspicuous that no faithful discharge of duty can go unacknowledged and unrewarded, and no breach of trust undiscovered and unpunished—these are the influences, the only influences, which foster practical, energetic, and trustworthy statesmanship. The best rulers are always those to whom great power is intrusted in such a manner as to make them feel that they will surely be abundantly honored and recompensed for a just and patriotic use of it, and to make them know that nothing can shield them from full retribution for every abuse of it."

Mr. President, while I believe in constitutional government and strict observance of constitutional limitations, this is a time when we must liberally resolve all doubts concerning the validity of measures and legislation intended to strengthen the executive branch of our Government in the performance of the great, responsible, and solemn duties which it is called upon to discharge. I do not fear that the President of the United States will abuse the great powers proposed to be conferred by this bill. We are involved in the greatest war of all history, with the best prepared, most efficient, and powerful nation of the world, and we must use all our resources and devote all of our energies to bring it to a successful and victorious conclusion. There is no middle ground and no compromise—it is war to the knife and knife to the hilt; it is victory or subjugation. The indomitable spirit and unchangeable determination of the American people are aroused and fixed. We will fight to the end and we will conquer. There can be no safe and enduring peace but one made in Berlin and dictated by the President and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the proposed committee amendment to insert the words "or administrative" after the word "executive" in line 23, page 2 of the bill, I desire to submit some rather general observations upon it.

As to how long this war will last, no one who cares for confidence in his judgment dares prophesy. Recent developments indicate a prolonged struggle. The fact that the conflict will be long drawn out is no reason for taking our own time in furnishing men, munitions, and transportation, the three prime factors in the achievement of success. Every means for hastening the work of getting ready these essential agencies consistent with reasonable thoroughness should be employed. Every diligence should be practiced in every sphere of preparation. Everything should be done by public officials and by private citizens "for the successful prosecution of the war." At the same time we should look ahead and plan for the future on the assumption that there will be no let up for years to come in the task before us, which calls for meeting force by force to the limit.

There is nothing in the history of our enemy that would encourage us to believe that after being driven back across the Rhine he would be inclined to sue for peace. The record of Germany is 30 years in one continuous war. The loss of 40 per cent of the population is none too great for those in power. The making of war has been the business of our enemy. It has not been without profit. Denmark will testify to that when reminded of Schleswig-Holstein. France knows it full well, and by daily symbol of mourning placed on the Strasburg monument she kept her people aware of it. Alsace-Lorraine and a billion of gold were the profits of 1870 to her then and now unrelenting enemy. That enemy will be slow to acknowledge defeat. All the more necessity for making that defeat so complete that it will be impossible for that enemy who typifies the Iliad, with the Goddess of Discord brandishing torch and spear, to ever again jeopardize the peace of the world and imperil civilization.

It must be determined now whether selfishness and hate shall be the rule among nations or justice and good will. It must be settled whether the policy of aggression shall be recognized as the sound one or the policy of equality and self-development shall prevail among nations. It must be established once and for all whether a nation's greatness and strength shall hereafter depend upon its mobilizing the most terrible force and employing it in the most savage way or on intelligence, enlightenment, love of liberty, due regard for the rights of others, progress in science, art, and industry, and setting free every man to be his best and do his best. It is to be decided now and finally whether the world is to be dominated by an autocracy, under some pretense of Divine right, sustained by military power, or

whether peoples may continue to have a voice in the Government under which they live and which they support, and which is to exist for the benefit of the people at large rather than for a chosen class—whether the people are to be vassals or freemen. In brief, the issue is whether might shall conquer and control right, and that question must be settled before this war can end. It will not be settled until it is settled right, and that, we may expect, will take time and call for supreme effort.

We take one side of these questions and we realize that the cost will be stupendous, but we have always known that the price of freedom is sacrifice. Not merely giving up surplus, but giving of energy, money, and resources to the extent of all we have, if need be, is the call. We realize the undertaking is a difficult one, and therefore we are reconciled to the difficulties. If we can remove any difficulty, that helps. If we can smooth the way by displacing a single obstacle and substituting an improvement, we render real service.

No matter what the cost, irrespective of the sacrifice, without regard to the time required, we are driven to match force by force to the bitter end, that our institutions, our national life, may be preserved and the world be assured that hereafter—

Nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

If disaster follows disaster in this mighty enterprise to our arms, who will be held primarily responsible before the people of this country and before the world? Who will go down in history as having failed in the greatest war of all time in which was involved the welfare of the human race?

In case of conclusive victory, which we confidently expect and are determined to gain, who, with others associated with him in similar positions, will receive and deserve the confidence and commendation of mankind?

Plainly, the answer is, the President of the United States.

Since the responsibilities, therefore, rest on his shoulders, can there be any justification for withholding from him any power or any authority which may strengthen his arm, relieve his difficulties, or open his pathway? Why withhold from him any assistance that may be serviceable in meeting his unequalled responsibilities?

That assistance we can render, and I am sure we ought to do all we can in that direction.

I am therefore in favor of the speedy passage of this measure.

It is plain, not ambiguous or lengthy, and will accomplish these results:

First. It will enable the President to proceed at once to the very heart of the matter in hand and conclude it without any circumlocution.

Second. It will make it possible for him to make the direct and best use of all material at hand.

Third. It will facilitate the elimination of delay, duplication, and lost motion.

Fourth. It will give undoubted authority to use each and all the departments, bureaus, commissions, created by law, and all officers in the most advantageous and effective way for the successful prosecution of the war.

Fifth. If a thing should be done by the process provided in this bill to count in winning the war, he can proceed to do it on the instant, without stopping to investigate whether some statute does not project across his pathway.

Sixth. It centralizes authority where chief responsibility rests, which in war times is essential.

Objection has been raised, not, I am moved to believe, because of any lack of confidence in the President, but rather in apprehension that the authority granted may be delegated, will have to be delegated by reason of the multitudinous demands on the President, and thereby duties may be assigned to some incompetent or unfaithful hands.

It is contended by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], for instance, that—

The extreme authority in the bill is to take every function of the Government, save the legislative branch and the judicial branch, and to consolidate all powers, all duties, all responsibilities, in one man, unknown, unnamed, without the consent of the Senate.

This construction is most extraordinary. The express language of the bill is, "the President is hereby authorized" to do the things set forth.

It can not be said that the President is either "unnamed" or "unknown." All the authority expressed or implied in the bill is given directly and solely to the President. He is to utilize the existing agencies. He is not empowered to create a single new agency.

The authority covered by the bill is centered solely in the President, who is named and who is known.

Arguments have been made here by members of the Committee on Military Affairs, beginning with its distinguished

chairman [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and including the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], in favor of coordinating and consolidating authority. They favored a single director of munitions and a war council of "three distinguished citizens of demonstrated ability."

We know of one possessing these qualifications in full measure. The people of the whole country have twice so declared. We might miss it as to the other two. We appeal for vesting that authority in that one—the President of the United States. This bill will accomplish that. If it is to be opposed, let it be done frankly on that ground.

In the meantime let it be remembered that we are just pulling ourselves together to play our part in the mighty struggle, just moving into action, while anxious eyes the world over are looking to us, and while Danubies of blood are being poured out in Europe, the air resounds with the roar of guns and the earth shakes "under the swiftly passing feet of men."

Mr. President, I raise no objection to criticism when it is intended to be constructive and helpful.

Criticism just for the sake of finding fault, just because it can be sustained in whole or in part, just for the reason that grounds for it exist, will not help us and is inexcusable. The effect of that sort of criticism is to discourage and demoralize. It is destructive criticism and ought to cease.

Pointing out blunders in order that they may be cured, calling attention to mistakes and shortcomings in order that they may be corrected, I make no complaint against, since, stated in good faith, that may lead to stimulating diligence and bring about changes which would result in more efficient service.

But the changes or reforms recommended I do not, in some instances, believe would result in the benefits their advocates suppose. That there have been some mistakes made in almost every department of the Government during the past year in the solution of the new problems which confronted us, under the most terrific pressure and with the untested means at hand, we may freely admit.

We may fairly claim, however, that such mistakes were comparatively negligible in quantity and in seriousness of consequences. We can fairly assert that where they were serious they were corrected, and none of them have been repeated.

I do not expect that we can hope to avoid completely mistakes in the future. We are not infallible; we can not achieve the impossible.

Every country, including "efficient" Germany, has made many mistakes. They continue to make them. They learn by experience—and we have been able to profit by their experience. The Government cabinets of England have changed twice, radically, and just avoided others. Those of France, four times; Italy, several times. They had labor troubles, too, and suffered from "profiteering" as well.

There has been no occasion for a single Cabinet change here. There are united, earnest, capable heads of departments in cordial cooperation with the President, without a break, and a Congress which has ever been ready to do its patriotic part.

We may differ among ourselves as to how best to do that part, but whatever conclusion is reached it becomes the conclusion of all.

I do not agree with some of my brother members on the Military Affairs Committee that there is or has been the need of successful business men, captains of industry, to have charge of the Ordnance Department, or, in fact, any section, bureau, or division of the War Department.

I make no reflection on business men. Many of them have been of great assistance in mobilizing the industries of the country. Others have hindered and hurt.

This getting ready for a war on a gigantic scale and conducting that war is not a business man's job. This is the people's war and the soldier's fight.

It is the trained soldier's work to get ready to fight as well as actually engage in the battles.

Our need was in the outset for soldiers in command—not business men. When a country's business becomes that of waging war, the soldier's must take charge.

The business man's training and experience have been along different lines. He is accustomed, in a manufacturing enterprise, for illustration, to consider, first, what amount of capital is invested; second, what are to be the overhead expenses; third, what is the output to be and its value; fourth, what can be reasonably expected as profit.

I do not agree with the criticism that West Point makes a good soldier but a poor business man. In the sense that "business" plays any part in the work of preparation for war, the West Point soldier is fully equipped. He does not have to trouble with profits—there is to be none. He need not consider

overhead expenses as against requirements; he must not delay while entering into refined calculations as to expense.

He knows that no fixed amount in dollars and cents is involved—something vastly more important than that must be considered.

The soldier lays all these "business" items to one side. He risks all—fortune, reputation, life—to win.

Like the Stoic of old, he does not jubilate, he does not whine—he fights. The battle begins with him when the war is declared. He knows what he wants—leave it to him and he will get it. He knows how to use it when it is ready.

In my judgment, the criticisms would more justly lie against calling in too many "business men" and giving them too much latitude to interfere after the flag was raised and the sword unsheathed.

It then became a military matter, and trained military men should have been left free to plan, direct, and manage the assembling, equipment, and training of the military forces, under the supreme command of the President and his aids, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, both having demonstrated preeminent abilities.

The report respecting the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps, submitted recently to the Senate, supports this view and condemns, in effect, the idea of civil control of important branches of the military operations. Here was a splendid illustration of the folly of placing civilians in practical control of the air service. I did not favor either the majority or the minority report, although both together may be held to fairly give the facts, allowing conclusions to take care of themselves.

The facts condemn civil or "business men's" control of that service which experience abroad has shown to be highly important.

The chairman of the Aircraft Board and civilian associate members have been in control of recommendations for production; and there is where humiliating disappointment has resulted. The training operations under military control have been all that could be asked.

Your "captains of industry," your successful "business men," have failed in that unforgiving delays have resulted from their conduct of affairs. No finer body of courageous and fit young men can be found than those enlisted in that service; and all they need are the machines which will enable them to "fight out the issue of right and wrong far beyond our vision."

They are ready to join what Mr. Lloyd-George describes as the "cavalry of the clouds." They are worthy to be classed as the "knighthood of this war"; they are fit to constitute the "chivalry of the air," whose "every flight shall be a romance and every report an epic."

Your civilian control makes them wait. It is claimed, I know, that the Aircraft Board has no power other than advisory. I do not so read the act of October 1, 1917. It is possible that some confusion of services, some overlapping of authority, some lack of more definite modification of the act of July 24, 1917, gave trouble in operation under the two acts.

There is need for exercise of just such powers in this connection as the pending measure contemplates. Civilians in direct charge of the work of production and a separation of production from operation—and both from the work of engineers and designers—all under one general head, would doubtless greatly improve the aircraft situation. Liberty motors have been tested in France as well as here, and are found to do all that has been claimed for them. They are coming out in satisfactory quantities. Raw materials should go forward to the factories of England and France as well as be supplied to our own factories. Our motors should be shipped abroad as well as used at home. Production will shortly meet the demands. There have been most unfortunate delays, and the causes thereof should be removed and a recurrence avoided. It must be remembered that the industry is new and those connected with it have had less than one year's experience, except that Gen. Squier has been a student of the subject and has had practical experience extending over some years. A very great deal has been accomplished, it is but fair to state.

With other branches of the service we should be fair, when disposed to criticize, by calling to mind the tremendous and important achievements to their credit.

Take the Army. Much of the criticism is about as reasonable as the Irishman's comment that the British Army was being ruined by taking in so many civilians. No country ever treated its soldiers better at any time than has the United States as directed by the Secretary of War. At the camps and cantonments the officers and men have been provided with excellent food, good accommodations, the most modern laundries, refrigerators, cooking utensils, light, fuel, recreation facilities, reading rooms, athletic field, entertainment, and the very best in-

fluences for the promotion of their physical, mental, and spiritual welfare.

The camps and cantonments have been arranged in accordance with scientific sanitary requirements and have been extraordinarily healthy and wholesome.

The details of the "First year of America's participation, reviewed by department officials," will be found in the Official Bulletin of April 8, beginning with page 9 and ending with page 16.

Just for illustration and as examples of such proof I am tempted to quote from a letter, sent to me by a valued correspondent in Chicago, from a soldier "in active service with the American Expeditionary Forces" in France to his home folks. He says:

You will note that I am somewhere in France. This is not as definite as it might be, but inasmuch as I have to be in France anyway, it doesn't make a great deal of difference just where I am. There is nothing much to be said about the Army, except that we are remarkably well treated—so much better than I ever imagined that I am agreeably surprised. The food is excellent, and our officers are continually looking out for our welfare, not only physically but morally. There are going to be a good many more real men made in the Army and by the Army than have ever been made by one institution before, and if a good percentage of us come back you are going to see a changed code for young men, I really believe. Another thing, coming down from more or less fancy salaries to the Army pay has a tendency to teach one the value of a dollar in a way peculiarly impressive.

Am enjoying the best of health, and considering that I am about 5,000 miles away from everyone who is near and dear to me, might be considered contented. Some day the Kaiser is going to get his, and we are going to help do it; and then I hope it is written that I may return to my own, perhaps a little older—but I'm still pretty young, at that—doubtless a little wiser, but surely more appreciative of the things with which we are blessed in our own land, and perhaps a little prouder if I may have helped to preserve that which we now realize is so dear to us—our liberty.

Also one from a Florida boy to his father from a training camp last March:

DEAR FATHER: Please excuse me for not writing sooner, but, as you know, moving is no small job. We arrived here Monday, and everything is very nice. Wednesday I was given a pass and called on Cousin Tommy. He took me out to supper, but as I had to be back in camp at 11, we could not take in a show or anything else.

Our section of the division is now doubly anxious to get "over there" since the sinking of the *Tuscania*, and our boys will surely avenge the cowardly murder of our comrades. When we leave no one knows, as orders come when we least expect them, but we are always ready; our training is perfect.

I had the pleasure of stretching my limbs on Florida soil, and I am sure I could have walked home if I could have obtained permission to go. Gee, being so close to home and my dear ones and not able to see them certainly gave me the blues until our train got out of Florida.

I am glad you, mother, and I don't write any doleful letters like some of our boys get; it does no good. What the boys like to receive from home are cheerful letters, letters that tell them that all is well at home, etc.

This may be my last letter until I get "over there." Remember me to all my friends and give them my best wishes. Tell them we soldiers all like to receive letters, even "P. C.'s" are prized.

You want to let everybody know that Uncle Sam takes good care of his soldiers and none of us can find any cause for complaint—plenty to eat, good and warm clothing, and the best medical care in case of sickness.

Don't forget to tell everybody of the great and noble work of the Red Cross.

I am well and happy, and I hope this will find you and all in like condition. With best love, etc.

Your devoted son.

These letters are illustrative of conditions which may be said to be characteristic in the Army.

The expansion of the Army has been a huge undertaking, admirably executed.

Just a brief reference to the figures will show that in April, 1917, there were in the Regular Army, 5,791 officers and 121,797 men. In April, 1918, there were 10,698 officers and 503,142 men.

The National Guard, April, 1917, had 3,733 officers and 76,713 men, and in April, 1918, 10,803 officers and 431,503 men.

The Reserve Corps—in service—in April, 1917, had no officers and 4,000 men; in April, 1918, there were 96,210 officers and 77,360 men.

The National Army had no officers or men in April, 1917, and in April, 1918, it had 516,839 men.

Total, April, 1917, 9,524 officers and 202,510 men, and in April, 1918, 123,801 officers and 1,528,924 men.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator is in possession of the information and it is proper to divulge it, can he tell me approximately how many men we have now in France?

Mr. FLETCHER. I could not attempt to be absolutely accurate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the question for the reason that I have been asked to-day by a letter from a valued constituent to give that information if obtainable. I have not applied to

the War Department. As the Senator was discussing the matter I did not know but that he or the chairman of the committee might possibly be able to give me approximately the number.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be very glad to give it to the Senator, but I could not do it with absolute accuracy; and even if I could I would hesitate to name the figure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thought likely there might be an objection to doing that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would prefer that the chairman of the committee should make a statement on the subject.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I can not answer the question definitely at this time, but I agree with the Senator from Florida. I question the propriety of answering it just at this moment. I will say, however, that in discussing the matter with the Secretary of War a few days ago he said, "I know you will be agreeably surprised at the rapidity with which we are getting men to France." I am sure he would advise the Senator confidentially just what the status is.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it would be more satisfactory for the Senator to get the information direct from the Secretary of War.

Mr. GALLINGER. I quite agree that that would be the proper procedure.

Mr. FLETCHER. Referring now to what I was saying, the first thing to be done was to get the men; the second was to provide for munitions, and then transportation.

I will not go through the various activities which are set forth in the Official Bulletin mentioned; and a most interesting and creditable showing is there made.

The absence of scandals, which make their appearance in all wars, big or little, is marked.

The mobilization of the military and naval forces within a year has been wonderfully successful.

The personnel of the Navy has grown from 4,792 officers to 20,664, and from 77,946 men to 329,333.

The increase in the Army has been 700 per cent, and in the Navy 400 per cent.

We have safely landed in France, beginning July 3, 1917, 88 days after war was declared, an American Army exceeding in strength greatly that which existed when we entered the war. Actually engaged on the front are more American soldiers than we had a year ago. That Army is fully equipped and has supplies sufficient to sustain it for six months of fighting.

The Medical Corps has increased its personnel from 8,000 to 106,000; officers from 900 to 18,000; Army nurses (women) from 375 to 7,000; ambulance service (in training) from nothing to 6,000; hospitals have been constructed and equipped; behind the lines in France the Medical Service has constructed hospitals for 200,000 sick and wounded.

The Marine Corps has grown from 426 officers and 13,266 enlisted men to 1,389 officers and 38,629 men.

Every department of the Government was confronted with new problems and new duties requiring enormous expansion of force and vast responsibilities. There has been a clear conception of these responsibilities and a spirit of patriotic fervor and absence of discord which ought to be reassuring in the highest degree.

There is no cause, so far as the administration of national affairs is concerned, for pessimism. Considering what is happening on the other side, we can not feel that there is reason for optimism. Our attitude should be one of consecration and determination.

I desire to insert in the Record an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of April 6, entitled "New conditions of the war," as a part of my remarks and at the close thereof without reading; also an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 1, entitled "The lesson of the iron ramrods," with the same request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lenroot in the chair). It is so ordered, without objection.

GERMAN EFFICIENCY.

Mr. FLETCHER. Sometimes we hear comparisons drawn between the efficiency of government under a democracy and that of a military autocracy, to the disparagement of the former.

Taking Germany as typical of the latter, let us get a glimpse of what it means.

In 1912 the greater portion of the farm work in Germany was done by women. A woman farm laborer was paid from 38 to 48 cents a day. Children over 12 years of age earned 24 cents a day. Male farm laborers were paid 72 cents a day. Engineer's and conductors on State railroads were paid 70 cents a day. The State paid skilled railway shop workers about \$1 a day.

Gustavus A. Myers characterized the German industrial system as marked by these characteristics:

Oppression of the farmers, underpaid labor, industrial enslavement of women and children, shocking housing conditions, growing pauperism.

This was the price the German people paid for militarism, and it was against these that they revolted in 1848. Prussia put down that revolt when it threatened the old conditions, and thus Prussia made herself acceptable as the leading State of the Empire instead of Austria. As a result, a great emigration began led by Carl Schurz.

Here we have an indication as to the cost the people of Germany have paid for the military efficiency of which they boast. We can understand when the bottom stratum bears so large a proportion of the burden what opportunity is given to the surface for a display which so long deceived the world. How would the American people like the German system as an economic foundation for an American structure?

Mirabeau said 125 years ago:

War is the national industry of Prussia.

Later Napoleon said that Prussia "was hatched from a cannon ball."

The French military attaché, shortly before the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, wrote:

Other countries possessed an army, but in Prussia the army possessed the country.

Waging war has been the chief industry of Germany. The people have been made to believe it paid. The policy of aggression has been maintained, and in 1914 undoubtedly the plan was to acquire new territory and unlimited treasure.

Former Ambassador Gerard tells us in his book, *My Four Years in Germany*, page 76, that there have been many instances in Germany where officers having a slight dispute with civilians have instantly cut the civilian down. Witness the so-called Zabern affair.

Lieut. von Forstner had an altercation with a lame shoemaker and cut him down. He was tried by court-martial for striking and wounding an unarmed civilian and sentenced by the lower court to one year's imprisonment, but was acquitted by the higher court as having acted in "supposed self-defense" (p. 86).

The matter was a subject of debate in the Reichstag December 4, 5, and 6, 1913. The war minister in a bitter speech before the Reichstag justified and defended the lieutenant, who was only 20 years of age.

This Zabern affair and the consequent attitude of the whole nation, as well as the extraordinary vote in the Reichstag, greatly alarmed the military party. It was perhaps the final factor which decided the advocates of the old military system of Germany in favor of a European war.

The Social Democrats remained in their seats and refused to rise and cheer the Emperor when the Reichstag adjourned. It seems they have that custom in Germany, and that the Social Democrats had previous to that time retired from the Chamber, but on this occasion, notwithstanding they remained in their seats, they refused to cheer the Emperor.

Mr. Gerard says (p. 91):

This occurrence I know greatly incensed the Emperor and did much, I believe, to win his consent to the war.

This system results in raising up murderers of innocent women and children, breakers of solemn treaties, bombers of occupied hospitals and churches, and a monster capable of planting his tyrannical heel in the face of fair Belgium.

Against that sort of savagery, against that kind of brutal disregard of every civilized impulse, against that inhuman machine, we are forced to contend with all our might.

The people of the United States have given us the leader in that vital undertaking. He is the people's chosen commander of the land and naval forces of the country, and they trust him and they will follow him. Will Congress do less?

Will the Senate deny to him full and unquestioned authority to make the best possible use of the agencies created by law and the resources at hand "for the successful prosecution of the war?"

I hope and believe you will not.

Let us come to a decision on the measure. Delay is dangerous. Senators are unstinted in their criticism of delays holding up the work in various governmental activities, overlooking the fact that they appear to take their own time when it comes to enacting needed legislation.

For days bills reported by committees as urgent have been debated and opposed, as if Senators were perfectly willing to sacrifice liberty in re for liberty in verbiis.

The Constitution is invoked as if the country was made for the Constitution rather than the Constitution for the country.

The "all highest war lord" is not halting or hesitating in his operations.

The experiences at Saloniki, Gallipoli, and in Mesopotamia must not be repeated, and the tragic cry, "Too late," must not go up in France!

There can be no justification for marking time or killing time here when guns and gas bombs and bayonets are settling the world's future on the battle lines.

It is claimed by some that the President has all the power given by this bill under his constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] observed that it is claimed that the President has the power under some statute, but it is claimed that he has such power under his constitutional prerogative. If so, why object to repeating the authority and having it specifically delegated by Congress instead of asserted with some chance of contest? Except where statutes, regulations, or court interpretations stand in the way, the claim may be admitted. The trouble is there are such obstacles.

Quick decision and quick action are often important and situations arise when there is no time to examine statutes and regulations or to ask and secure their modification when found.

The President should have this delegation of the power to coordinate the executive and administrative agencies of the Government whenever and wherever he finds it advantageous for the uses of war on the instant.

Many existing executive and administrative processes of the Government are complicated and cumbersome. The necessary readjustments to meet war conditions can only be effectively obtained by a blanket authority to the President such as the bill provides.

It is contended that the bill creates an autocracy, but it is well said that "an autocracy is defined by the source, not by the extent, of power. No authority which is given and can be taken away by the people is autocratic."

There is full recognition of the power of Congress by the very proposals of this bill.

Congress has not hesitated to grant arbitrary power to executive departments. For instance, the power to issue fraud orders and deny citizens the use of the mails and the censorship given the Post Office Department. March 3, 1863, Congress passed an act (12 Stat., 775) which provided as follows:

That any order of the President or under his authority made at any time during the existence of the present rebellion shall be a defense in all courts to any action, civil or criminal, pending or to be commenced for any search, seizure, arrest, or imprisonment made, done, or committed, or acts omitted to be done under and by virtue of such order or under color of any law of Congress, and such defense may be made by special plea or under the general issue.

The Supreme Court upheld this statute in the case of *Mitchell v. Clark* (110 U. S., 633).

Any order for "search, seizure, arrest, or imprisonment" would seem to be fully as comprehensive and drastic as any action that would be possible under the provisions of the pending bill.

The bill expressly provides the normal peace status of affairs shall be resumed at the close of the war.

It is strictly a war measure, and there ought to be no hesitation about its enactment. No authority heretofore given the President has been abused and it is absurd to assume that the authority here granted would be. We are warranted—indeed, obliged—to do things in abnormal times which would not be considered under ordinary conditions. No more argument is required to sustain this bill than is needed to sustain that proposition.

APPENDIX I.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., Saturday, Apr. 6, 1918.]

NEW CONDITIONS OF THE WAR.

After three years of a war whose issue will shape the destinies of humanity for many years of the future, the enemies of Germany now present a front which has changed in many respects from the one that had grown familiar. Heretofore Germany defended herself in a large degree by the mobility of her forces, and this was made possible by the fact that all her strength could be directed by one mind. If that mind be capable, it is always possible for such a body to present a superior or effective force at the vital point chosen for action. Mr. Lloyd-George says the attack now wearing itself out employed "overwhelming numbers" against the British trenches. This does not mean that Germany had a superiority in men or guns in France, but that she collected her strength at the point of contact while no such concentration had been accomplished by her enemies.

At last the enemies of Germany have now taken a like measure, and Gen. Foch can direct without hindrance the movements of 5,000,000 men to secure an effect proposed. This change in conditions implies a radical change in the plans of campaign. Concentration can now be met by concentration, or a proposed attack may be diverted by an attack in another quarter so strongly pushed as to compel an abandonment of the proposed action of the enemy; when the tactics of Ludendorff can be met by the tactics of Foch, it will be a meeting of two minds as well as two bodies.

Now, let us apply the lesson to our own country. The resources of the American people are boundless as the world is generally used, and their whole strength has been loyally devoted to this war; so was the strength of France and of England and of Italy and of Belgium. But we have seen how the greater strength of one body could be attacked alternately with more or less success by the weaker body whose forces

were more easily handled, capable of swifter motion and quicker concentration. This activity of the German forces was possible because the organization had been carefully perfected by years of drill and the constant enforcement of rigid discipline for many years. It is the absence of such training that has made it impossible to collect all the force of Germany's enemies into one effective blow which, striking a vital organ, would paralyze the whole machinery of her life.

This inability to handle her power effectively on the spur of the moment forced France to abandon some of her most valuable Provinces to the enemy; it entailed the loss of England's expeditionary force, one of the finest armies ever sent to battle; even after a year's diligent preparation Italy felt the need of it in the successful raid of the enemy, which held a portion of the Lombardy plain for a time. But these, our friends, could mobilize their strength faster than we for many reasons. In the first place, they had lived for years in the constant anticipation of such a need as now comes to them; their plans had gone much further than their preparedness, although their preparation had progressed far beyond ours.

Moreover, their strength was concentrated within a comparatively small area, thickly inhabited and served by a better developed and better planned system of highways. Their highways were built with an eye to military uses, while the projectors of our roads had no thought or comprehension of military needs. Upon a war basis their Governments reach individuals immediately; ours must pass to the citizen through an infinity of laws, political organizations, and popular opinions as to what might be desired or permitted.

Let us now consider results. Attacked at her heart, the first year of the war showed France still unprepared because she had not provided effectively against a strike of railroad employees whose refusal to perform their appointed duties would isolate her armies and starve them into retreat or surrender. Her Government was republican, like ours, but she was compelled to place all the employees of her public-service plants under military law; after this to proclaim a strike was to propose a mutiny, and the individual became in law a deserter from the ranks. One year after a foreign enemy struck boldly at the gates of her capital the strength of France was still unorganized.

Two years after she had declared she was fighting for her life England found her power of attack threatened with dissolution by the danger of a strike from the coal mines and the munition factories. It was the organization of the fighting forces of industry that made Lloyd-George the directing mind of his country. If England did not reach this stage until two years after she declared war, she can not claim that her progress has been faster than ours.

Italy began to mobilize her forces when the German armies crossed the frontiers of Belgium in August, 1914. Perhaps she did not decide for some months on which side she would fight, and certainly others were in doubt, but she knew she must fight and devoted all her energies to the work of preparing for taking part in the war. She had achieved her preparedness in great measure when she cast in her lot with the entente powers, but more than a year after reaching that decision the Bolsheviks nearly broke down her strength in the trenches and her troops were compelled to abandon positions won at great cost of blood and treasure because she regarded them as threatening to her national life while they remained in the hands of the enemy.

Can it be said that, with all their advantages of propinquity to the war and of a greater concentration of population and political powers, our allies have done more in a year than we have accomplished? In a like period they had not prepared adequately for their defense—we speak not of a military defense exclusively, but of all the forces that make defense effective—their credit was largely exhausted, their supplies of food and munitions had become inadequate. That this was true of the enemy nations also should not conceal from us the fact that it was equally applicable to our friends, who had every advantage they could derive from that command of the sea which had been supposed to exert a commanding influence on such a struggle. Even without the interposition of the submarine, the entente powers were in danger of defeat for lack of supplies which could not be secured from neutrals without the money or credit which was rapidly falling from them because the financial burden must be carried in great part by one of them.

Now, what has the United States accomplished within a year? We who would be glad to find she has done the impossible need not be ashamed to declare the result in plain language. It is objected that our Army at the front is small, that our guns are few, and our air service in embryo—allowing the weight of these facts, what have we on the credit side of the ledger?

We have been in the war for a year. We found our friends asking for money, first of all; we have given it ungrudgingly, in full measure, and running over. The resources at the command of the enemies of the central Empires now embrace the wealth of the world subject only to the dangers of transportation across an ocean which a friend proposes to command, to protect, and to police. It was supposed that Britain would provide the navy and the shipping to make our aid effective.

We found our allies in immediate need of food and raw materials for the manufacture of munitions. In large measure we have provided these in unprecedented quantities for a year; from the lack of these defeat was imminent when we entered the war.

Britain, France, and Italy together have a force of 10,000,000 soldiers; unaided and alone we have a like number subject to call and nearly 2,000,000 already in the service or in preparation. Does it encourage Germany to know that when she has wiped from the face of the earth all the soldiers now in arms against her, she must meet an American Army of like numbers, as good in every sense, on the same ground? The soldier is the power that comes next after the provision of supplies that can alone make his bravery and skill effective; we have provided the money, the food, and the raw materials for this war, and we have the men in evidence.

Now, when we were asked for billions in money and millions of tons of provisions as the immediate necessities of our friends, we could not perform every service at the same moment. But the plans were then laid for the contracts under which we have secured the machinery for the production of shipping of aeroplanes; all this machinery was non-existent when the demand for their use was made. The reports from the Departments of the War and Navy show notable progress; show the confident expectation that within another year we shall provide as much of all these as our three friends produce after their third year; we shall show our grand total with a whole year saved. Is this an achievement in which we can take no pride?

Let us recapitulate. Within a year we have organized the military resources of a population of 100,000,000 of people on a war basis—of a people trained only to peace—which had never been so organized before, since the demand made upon it during our Civil War was on a

smaller scale, was immediately released and had been completely forgotten except as ancient history. To do this every existing industry must be put upon a new footing—our highways, our finances, our manufacturing industries, and our occupations must all be made over. The new demands were so heavy that every element of strength broke down under the strain as truly as these had broken down in England, France, and Italy, whose resistance met the original demands. Now we find that what they have done in three years we have done in one, because we have taken up their crushing burdens of money and food under which they were falling down so as to relieve their fighting strength of this incubus, and we are prepared, within a less time than they needed, to duplicate their production of men and fighting machinery.

Criticism that shows defects in the working of this vast machine may prove of service and is justified in so far as they are intended to correct faults, relieve undue strain at particular points, and show the possibility of even greater efficiency for the whole; but those who say America has done less than her duty in the common cause lack the vision which takes in the whole plan covered and must have failed to study the fruit already maturing to the harvest. It is for the American to take pride in his country instead of apologizing; it is for our friends to see what is behind America at war rather than to confine their consideration to the trench war only.

APPENDIX II.

[From the Christian Science Monitor.]

BOSTON, U. S. A., Monday, April 1, 1918.

THE LESSON OF THE IRON RAMRODS.

It is a regrettable fact that just at the present moment there should have sprung up in the United States a controversy, indeed, a heated controversy, over the war. Some controversy there has always been, a controversy which has at times threatened the national unity. But it has generally calmed down as those engaged in it have had time to think again, and have recognized the vital necessity of unity in the present crisis. No doubt there have been faults on both sides, but equally no doubt in any great war it is easy to criticize the party in power. Everybody knows that in spite of determined efforts to maintain harmony, dissatisfaction grew so violent at one time that a change of government took place in the United Kingdom, whilst there have been certain other individual resignations arising out of individual differences. In France, again, there has been a perfect succession of premiers, whilst in Italy also there has been change. It is not curious, then, that there should be considerable difference of opinion in the United States, but there is this excuse to be advanced for Mr. Wilson's government, which can scarcely be advanced for that of any other country, the excuse that the United States was not merely unprepared for war but that it did not possess any of the machinery by which wars are made.

It had not, that is to say, any great dockyards like the United Kingdom or any great arsenals like France and Italy. It was so unaccustomed to making munitions that when, as a neutral, its firms tendered to the allied Governments for munitions they found in numerous cases that they were unable to obtain the machinery to fulfill their contracts. Then, again, the American mercantile marine had been for half a century permitted to decay. Therefore when the demand for ships was made, not only was it necessary to increase the existing plants but it was absolutely necessary to build new plants and convert ordinary mechanics into shipwrights. These were difficulties that other countries had not experienced in at all the same degree, because other countries possessed numbers of trained mechanics, used to making munitions, and capable of quickly training others to increase the output. For this reason the Government of the United States was entitled to claim special consideration. But unfortunately what has taken place has been something more than an ordinary delay and has to be accounted for by some other means than a national inaptitude for specific work.

The old shipyards have not done badly. They have doubled their plants and set to work to turn out a considerable amount of shipping. This is largely true of the Great Lakes, for instance, where a considerable output is still locked up by frozen waterways. It is true in even a greater degree of certain large steel works. Nevertheless, on the whole, the Nation is distinctly disappointed with its own achievement and is asking how it is that a country which has done such marvelous feats of engineering and has been capable of such vast business organizations should be found so largely failing to justify its own reputation in so tremendous a crisis.

Now, curiously enough, the explanation largely is in the crisis. The people of the United States have lived so cut off from the world outside their own borders that when the war broke out they entirely failed to grasp not only what it meant but what it amounted to. It has taken the country years to begin to grasp something of the intricate political intricacies which made the incidents of the month of July, in 1914, inevitable. But there was something else that the country failed to understand even more, and that was the tremendous forces which had been unchained and the colossal preparations which had been heaped up against what Germany has always described as "der tag." The ordinary citizen of the United States scarcely understood, in the faintest degree, what the British Navy meant or what the German Army really amounted to. He had hardly begun to comprehend, when the war seized upon his own country, what it means to build a fleet or to muster, equip, and train an army. And it is perfectly safe to say that he had not the faintest idea of the amount of munitions which could be expended in a single day's fighting. When, consequently, the war came he imagined that he could proceed largely in the leisurely method of the old days. But just as Frederick, or perhaps one should say old Dessauer, taught Austria the lesson of iron ramrods, and just as Napoleon taught Prussia the obsolescence of the oblique formation, so the United States, in its turn, had to discover that it could not do in a year what it had taken the European nations centuries to acquire a mastery of.

That is the real secret of the failure of the United States, and it is not a failure to be altogether ashamed of. It would have been better no doubt if, when the cloud burst, the country had realized a little more quickly that it knew nothing of the game of war. Then there would have been no time wasted over trying to improve on mechanical masterpieces, like the 75-millimeter French gun or the Lee-Enfield rifle. After all, when a nation is at war, the great thing is to get into the war, and not to set to work to make experiment which, if they were going to be made, should have been made before the war. The people of the United Kingdom, like the people of the United States, are rather proud than otherwise that they were not ready for the war, and they hold their unreadiness the greatest proof of their love of and desire for peace. But when the war broke on them they knew enough about fighting to know what war meant, and to be aware that in war time counts for more than most

things. In the United States the Government officers imagined that they could settle down to perfecting aeroplane engines and quick firers with the same deliberateness as if they were plows and farm tractors. The United Kingdom and France, with their centuries of experience, knew otherwise.

Now, it is just here that the President's mistake developed. He showed, it is to be suspected, too much loyalty to his assistants. Everyone who knows the President knows one thing, that he gives his confidence slowly but that when he has given it, it is hard to destroy it. Loyalty is a magnificent quality, but there are moments in the history of nations when even loyalty may be strained too far. And some of the warmest of Mr. Wilson's supporters labor under the impression that in more than one instance his loyalty to his supporters has passed the bounds of wisdom. It is a peculiarly difficult thing to fathom the rights and wrongs of any complicated case, and this does not become less difficult when party feeling has entered into the discussion of it. But, brushing aside the details and the innumerable specific instances of failure which have been so largely in evidence in the debates of Congress, the fact remains that the output of the country has not been equal to what it should have been. It is, of course, equally true that swapping horses in crossing a stream is undesirable, and that even when the swapping is effected without disaster the new horse often does not exhibit a greater pace than the old one. Nevertheless, there are certain offices in the United States held to-day by gentlemen whose removal would not exactly destroy the confidence of the Nation in the President's ability to see the war through.

Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Senate. After having spoken for three-quarters of an hour,

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the Senator would prefer to finish in the morning.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I can finish in the morning, and very expeditiously, too.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator prefers that course, I will move an executive session.

Mr. SHERMAN. I prefer it, if it is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. OVERMAN. 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 8 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDITIOUS ACTS AND UTTERANCES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. OVERMAN. I submit a conference report on House bill 8753, known as the bill to amend section 3, title 1, of the espionage act, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will lie on the table and be printed.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8753) to amend section 3, title 1, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, 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 amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or attempt to obstruct"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the military or naval forces of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States, or any language intended to bring the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution of the United States, or the military or naval forces of the United States, or the flag of the United States, or the uniform of the Army or Navy of the United States into contempt, scorn, contumely, or disrepute, or shall willfully utter, print, write, or publish any language intended to incite, provoke, or encourage resistance to the United States, or to promote the cause of its enemies, or shall willfully display the flag of any

foreign enemy, or shall willfully by utterance, writing, printing, publication, or language spoken, urge, incite, or advocate any curtailment of production in this country of any thing or things, product or products, necessary or essential to the prosecution of the war in which the United States may be engaged, with intent by such curtailment to cripple or hinder the United States in the prosecution of the war, and whoever shall willfully advocate, teach, defend, or suggest the doing of any of the acts or things in this section enumerated, and whoever shall by word or act support or favor the cause of any country with which the United States is at war or by word or act oppose the cause of the United States therein"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That any employee or official of the United States Government who commits any disloyal act or utters any unpatriotic or disloyal language, or who in an abusive and violent manner criticizes the Army or Navy or the flag of the United States shall be at once dismissed from the service. Any such employee shall be dismissed by the head of the department in which the employee may be engaged, and any such official shall be dismissed by the authority having power to appoint a successor to the dismissed official"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 2. That section 1 of Title XII and all other provisions of the act entitled 'An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917, which apply to section 3 of Title I thereof shall apply with equal force and effect to said section 3 as amended.

That Title XII of the said act of June 15, 1917, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following section:

"Sec. 4. When the United States is at war the Postmaster General may, upon evidence satisfactory to him that any person or concern is using the mails in violation of any of the provisions of this act, instruct the postmaster at any post office at which mail is received addressed to such person or concern to return to the postmaster at the office at which they were originally mailed all letters or other matter so addressed, with the words "Mail to this address undeliverable under espionage act" plainly written or stamped upon the outside thereof, and all such letters or other matter so returned to such postmasters shall be by them returned to the senders thereof under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title, and agree to the same.

LEE S. OVERMAN,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
KNUTE NELSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

E. Y. WEBB,
C. C. CARLIN,
WARREN GARD,
DICK T. MORGAN,

Managers on the part of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1918, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1918.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

CLASS 4.

The following-named persons to be secretaries of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America:

Williamson S. Howell, jr., of Texas, formerly a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4, assigned to San Jose, Costa Rica.
G. Howland Shaw, of Boston, Mass.
Cornelius Van H. Engert, of Berkeley, Cal.
Curtis C. Williams, jr., of Columbus, Ohio.

Joseph W. Carroll, of New York City.
Walter C. Thurston, of Phoenix, Ariz.
Sam S. Dickson, of Gallup, N. Mex.
Nathan P. Stedman, of Aurora, Ind.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

George W. English, of Centralia, Ill., to be United States district judge, eastern district of Illinois, vice Francis M. Wright, deceased.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Joseph McEachin, of Reno, Nev., to be United States marshal, district of Nevada, vice A. B. Gray, whose term has expired.

Stephen J. Doyle, of Fargo, N. Dak., to be United States marshal, district of North Dakota. A reappointment, his term having expired.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Charles E. Harris, of Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Blackfoot, Idaho, his present term expiring April 26, 1918. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Henry Heitfeld, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Lewiston, Idaho, his present term expiring April 26, 1918. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICER.

To be brigadier general with rank from April 18, 1918.

Col. Frank T. Hines, General Staff, National Army, to be brigadier general.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 22, 1918.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Joseph McEachin to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 22, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, on earth, and in the hearts of men, we approach Thee with profound gratitude for life, liberty, truth, justice, mercy; and all that makes life dear.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; a lesson which we are learning anew in the world's present crisis. Help us to realize that eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, but it is the price of all that makes for righteousness in the soul.

Make us, therefore, we beseech Thee, zealous in all good works, that we may be strong to resist evil and to defend our rights against all intruders; and bring us in Thine own good time unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, and we will ascribe all praise to Thee, in His Name. Amen.

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

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 218).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 20, 1918.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I have the honor to inclose herewith, for the information of the House of Representatives, a copy of a dispatch from the American ambassador at Paris, covering a copy and a translation of a letter from the secretary general of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, whose permanent bureau is ordinarily at Brussels, requesting the ambassador to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress of the United States the fact that the fourth general assembly of the conference has been postponed from the first days of May until the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th days of July next.

It appears from the ambassador's dispatch that Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have already been invited to attend by the executive committee of the conference.

A letter similar to this has been addressed to the President of the Senate.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

FRANK L. POLK,
Acting Secretary of State.

(Three inclosures: From France, No. 6100, Mar. 20, 1918, with two inclosures.)

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

PARIS, March 20, 1918.

Sir: I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy and translation of a letter from the secretary general of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, whose permanent bureau is ordinarily at Brussels, requesting me to bring to the information of the Members of Congress that the fourth general assembly of the conference is postponed from the first days of May to be held on the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th of July.

It seems from this letter that the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have already been invited by the executive committee of the conference.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

WM. G. SHARP.

(Inclosures: 1. From the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, postponing fourth general assembly. 2. Translation of inclosure 1.)

CONFERENCE PARLEMENTAIRE INTERNATIONALE DU COMMERCE.
BUREAU PERMANENT BUREAUX 18, RUE GRANGE BATELIÈRE,
DE BRUXELLES. Paris, 13 mars 1918.
Secrétariat Général.

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur: J'ai l'honneur de porter à votre connaissance qu'à la requête du Comité parlementaire italien d'accord avec le Gouvernement italien, la quatrième Assemblée plénière de notre Conférence qui devait avoir lieu à la Chambre des Communes, les 7, 8, 9, et 10 mai, est retardée. Elle aura irrévocablement lieu les 2, 3, 4, et 5 juillet. Notre Conseil a invité à ces réunions officielles les membres de la Commission du Commerce de la Chambre et du Sénat des Etats-Unis. Tous les Parlements alliés, et même le Japon, y prendront part officieusement. Notre Conseil devrait beaucoup de gratitude à Votre Excellence s'il lui plaisait de porter cette information à la connaissance des parlementaires Américains.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, l'hommage de mon profond respect.

Pour le Conseil Général: le Secrétaire-Général:

EUGÈNE BAIE.

[Translation.]

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE.
PERMANENT BUREAU OFFICES: 18 RUE GRANGE BATELIÈRE,
OF BRUSSELS. Paris, March 13, 1918.
General Secretariat.

MR. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to inform you that at the request of the Italian parliamentary committee, in agreement with the Italian Government, the fourth general assembly of our conference, which was to have taken place at the House of Commons on the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th May, has been postponed. It will be held, irrevocably, on the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th July. Our executive committee has invited to these unofficial meetings the members of Commission on Commerce of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States. All the allied Parliaments, and even Japan will take part therein unofficially. Our executive committee would be very grateful if it would please your excellency to bring this information to the knowledge of the American Parliamentaries.

Kindly accept, Mr. Ambassador, etc.

For the executive committee, the Secretary-General.

EUGÈNE BAIE.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. JONES was granted leave of absence for two weeks.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 19, 1918:

S. 3980. An act to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes.

On April 20, 1918:

S. 383. An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9163. An act to provide for reimbursement of actual expenses or flat per diem for enlisted men traveling on duty under competent orders; and

H. R. 9902. An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering District legislation which is on the Union Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter from the Attorney General of the United States on the subject of this bill to try everybody by a military court.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting a communication. Is there objection?

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. McARTHUR. To reserve the right to object, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether there will be any agreement as to time for discussion to-day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio had the floor and he asked unanimous consent to insert a communication from the Attorney General. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion which I just made I would like very much to come to some agreement as to general debate. It has been some time since we have had a District day and we have some little bills here which we ought to pass and should pass without much discussion unless we get into what might be called strictly a talkfest. There has been something said about the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] wanting 45 minutes. I would not object to agreeing that Mr. TILSON have 45 minutes providing we can agree on a short time for general debate.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. CARY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he could suggest about how much time would be necessary?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would suggest not exceeding an hour and a quarter. That would give the gentleman from Connecticut 45 minutes and would give half an hour for general debate, and the bills I think can be discussed amply under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What are the bills?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There are several little bills and, I might say for the information of the House, there are some minor bills which ought to be passed before we reach the more serious one. There are two bills on the calendar coming from the District Committee which will provoke much discussion, and they are the telephone bill and the bill for municipal ownership of street railways. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILLIARD] has charge of the telephone bill, and I am informed by him that he is not quite ready to take it up to-day, and I have no disposition to call up the street-railroad bill until we can have more time for it than we can give to-day, and I would say to the House those two bills which will make trouble, or at least provoke discussion, will not be called up to-day.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky which two bills he is going to call up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have seven here. One is known as the patrol drivers' bill, another is concerning the collection of garbage, another about the purchase of supplies by Government employees, and another changing the law relative to the establishment of the probate court, which is the creation of stenographers' places. One is to regulate the hours of the fire department, known as the double-plateau bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I make an inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman advise the House whether or not it is likely that the so-called rent-profiteering bill will be returned to the House in one form or another at an early date or a relatively early date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no information except what I see in the newspapers, which I do not regard generally as very reliable.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I congratulate the gentleman on his perspicacity. I have been very much in hopes, and I think the Members of the House have been in hopes, that that bill may become a law before the 30th of June. I may say, if I may be permitted, without any voluntary investigation on my part many facts have come to my attention, and doubtless to the attention of the other Members of the House, in the last 60 days in regard to the strained situation in the District of Columbia, and it is not unlikely when Congress convenes on December 1, unless this Congress takes appropriate action by legislation, the membership of this body and the Senate will find no place in which to live. That seems like a strong statement, but—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The landlords of the District seem to be more than hopeful that the Senate will not pass a

bill with teeth in it. I do not share that with them, and I shall not believe such will be the case until the Senate actually passes a bill which will not meet the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If I may be permitted to make one further statement in this same connection, a great many officers have been brought here on duty, who must come under the mandate of the Commander in Chief, of their superior officer, and are likely to be put in a still more serious condition that will greatly handicap this Government in carrying out its military work. I consider that any bill which the District Committee brings in or considers is worthy of attention, of course, and of early attention if possible; but nothing should be allowed to intervene to the extent of preventing early action on the profiteering bill, that will have all the teeth in it that anybody can desire, and then some.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WALSH. To ask the gentleman from Kentucky to yield. Is it his intention to call up as many bills as he can get considered to-day on the Union Calendar relating to the District of Columbia and restrict general debate on all the measures to half an hour in addition to the 45 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I desire that.

Mr. WALSH. And permit liberal debate on the measures?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Under the five-minute rule?

Mr. WALSH. Under the five-minute rule. Does the gentleman intend to restrict debate under the five-minute rule to the bills pending at the time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; I would be anxious to do that.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman might be anxious to do that—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And I would say to the gentleman that I would do the other most reluctantly.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that an hour and a half will be sufficient, from my information, on the first proposition and that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] be allowed one-half of the time in which to address the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is all right, Mr. Speaker; I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] will state his request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering District bills which are on the Union Calendar, and that general debate be limited to an hour and a half, and that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] have 45 minutes of that time, and that the remainder of the time be divided between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HILLIARD. To ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] to yield to me two minutes. I simply want to emphasize what the chairman of the committee has said, that there is an important measure, known as the telephone bill, looking to the governmental operation of the telephone system in the District of Columbia, to be considered by the House soon. It has been reported favorably by our committee. The chairman of the committee has assured me that we may have the next District day in which to consider that matter. It has been voluminously reported on in Report No. 379, Parts I and II. If the Members are sufficiently interested to look at those reports, they will find much useful information. In Part II of the report there is an exhaustive study which was made by the engineers of the Bureau of Standards. The situation is fully set forth there and explained in correspondence by the Postmaster General and others.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does any of this legislation coming up to-day have anything to do with the prosecution of the war?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. None whatever. I believe, however, I will qualify that by the statement that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may make.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention, with the consent of the gentleman, to a bill which has passed the Senate and which has been asked by the Surgeon General, giving them the right to extend, during the period of war, a spur track into the medical distributing depot and for which they asked some time ago. The Senate has passed the bill, and the committee recommends that the bill be passed with an amendment which limits the time of the use of this track to 30 days after the declaration of peace. It is an emergency matter, because it is costing the

Government hundreds of dollars a day and, more than that, it interferes, under the present plan, with a distribution of medical supplies. They are all shipped into this large depot and distributed to the different hospitals. I had hoped that the chairman would make that his first bill, because it is a war measure, recommended by the Surgeon General, who appeared before the committee. It has passed the Senate and has been recommended by the House committee unanimously.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] intend to bring that measure up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is my purpose to bring it up, or at least give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] an opportunity to get it up, but I did not contemplate bringing it up to-day. I wanted to get out of the way some bills to which I thought there would be no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am in receipt of many postals with the following heading, "For God's sake, hurry up!" I expect the other Members of this House are in receipt of many of these postals. The great Committee on Naval Affairs, with the aid of the Members of this House, gave an example of hurrying up by passing the naval appropriation bill in two days. I think that committee deserves much credit for hurrying up. Now, if the other committees having important war legislation will follow the example set by the Naval Affairs Committee, this Congress can not be criticized for not doing its duty. It is our patriotic duty to expedite legislation as much as possible, especially war legislation. We have thousands of our brave boys in France, and we will have thousands more there before the summer is over, and it is our duty to stand right back of them and not waste our time here in talking. I hope the different committees of this House will heed the warning on the postal, "For God's sake, hurry up!"

And while I am not going to object at this time, I shall object in the future to anything but war legislation.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate matters, suppose we have the regular order.

ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on the Territories:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Alaskan Engineering Commission for the year ended December 31, 1917.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1918.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. WALSH rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WALSH. I desire to make the point of order on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], that it is not in order for him to make the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider District bills on the Union Calendar; that he must specify the measure which he desires to consider in the Committee of the Whole; that that motion would apply to bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion was to go into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider such bills as are on the Union Calendar reported from that committee.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and I make the point of order that that motion is not in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the customary motion.

The SPEAKER. That has been the practice ever since I have been here. The Chair will answer the gentleman further. The gentleman from Kentucky did state what bills he wanted to consider.

Mr. WALSH. A further parliamentary inquiry, pending the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Will it be in order for the Committee of the Whole to consider the bills which the chairman of the District Committee should call up in order without the committee rising and reporting each bill as it is completed?

The SPEAKER. That is exactly the reason for the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the customary procedure.

The SPEAKER. The committee itself disposes of one bill and lays it aside. Then the gentleman calls up another bill under this, and then the committee considers that and lays that aside, and when they get through with the whole batch—

Mr. WALSH. I submit that that is contrary to the rules.

The SPEAKER. That is in accordance with the practice of the House. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider such bills as are on the Union Calendar reported from the District Committee, and pending that motion he asks that the general debate be limited to an hour and a half; that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] shall have 45 minutes of it, and the other 45 minutes shall be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY]. Is there objection to that request?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills on the Union Calendar relating to the District of Columbia, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills on the Union Calendar relating to the District of Columbia. Which bill does the gentleman from Kentucky wish to call up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, under the arrangement I now yield the first 45 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Should not the gentleman from Kentucky first call up some bill before the committee goes into general debate?

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES FROM ARMY AND NAVY COMMISSARIES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I call up the bill H. R. 10894.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10894) permitting certain persons to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, under the arrangement entered into I now yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Members of the House for their very generous grant of this time in which to present some facts and some exhibits in connection with our gas-defense service. It is a most appropriate day for such a presentation, it being the third anniversary of that day of the Battle of Ypres in which gas was first used in the present war.

Prior to April 22, 1915, it was necessary to go at least as far back as the middle of the fourteenth century to find instances of the use of noxious gases in warfare. The Spartans used something of the kind against the Athenians in the wars between these two cities somewhere between 431 and 404 B. C. The method of using it was to saturate wood with pitch and sulphur and burn it under the walls of the defenders. Sometimes the fumes were blown over the lines of the enemy by means of huge bellows.

The Byzantine Greeks under Constantine Pogonatus, about the year 673 A. D., used against the Saracens what is known in military history as "Greek fire." For 400 years the secret of producing this substance is said to have been preserved in Constantinople as the palladium of that city's liberty. There must have been something wrong with the Saracen spy system. Finally the secret became known to the Saracens, who in their turn used it against the Christians during the Crusades, until the discovery of gunpowder made it obsolete. For centuries, however, the use of such means in war had fallen into disrepute among so-called civilized nations.

The first Hague conference pronounced against the use of such means, and Germany acceded to it.

On April 22, 1915, opposite the Ypres salient, near where the heaviest fighting has been going on for the last two weeks, the Germans liberated great clouds of chlorine gas, which by a favorable wind was carried over the British lines, causing most horrible casualties and considerable consternation. Being much heavier than air, it went down into the trenches and dug-outs and was difficult of removal.

Crude means of combating the deadly effects of the gas were soon improvised, and before very long each soldier in the front-line trenches was supplied with some sort of a gas mask.

The next stage of gas offense saw shells filled with the deadly stuff and projected from guns and mortars far back of the front line of trenches, making it necessary for all as far back as the

artillery positions to be protected by gas masks.

The mad race between the offensive and defensive in the use of noxious gases has kept up incessantly, and there is no indication of there being an end to it. The frequent and effective use made of deadly gases by the Germans in the present great offensive on the western front has been referred to quite frequently in the dispatches, especially the vicious mustard gas. This wicked concoction is projected in shells in a liquid or semi-liquid state and often in the nighttime. Being practically colorless, it adheres to branches, grass, or other objects until the sun comes up, when it volatilizes and becomes deadly. One of the worst features of it is that it is delayed in its action and is not felt for some time afterwards.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Nor seen and recognized?

Mr. TILSON. It is practically colorless and is not observed. I had a very interesting hour on last Saturday with a young man who was near the Ypres salient in August, 1917, about the time of the earliest use of this particular gas. He had been well trained in the use of the mask against chlorine and phosgene gases, but when it came to the use of the so-called mustard gas he could not tell me much about it, except that he got it. He could tell me only the effect it had on him, which was a very unfortunate one.

For the best of reasons I deem it best not to attempt to discuss the matter of our own use of noxious gases. While adhering to the opinion expressed at the first Hague conference that no such means should be employed in warfare, nevertheless by the act of the enemy the adoption of such means has been forced upon us, and I feel sure that those immediately responsible for the vigorous prosecution of the war are not neglecting the duty of making adequate preparation in this direction. I hope that we may not only meet fire with fire, but that our fire may prove the hotter.

On the other hand, it is altogether proper to discuss fully the subject of defense against gas attacks. In my judgment, no part of our preparation for this war is to-day in a more satisfactory state than our gas-defense service. The last three months have witnessed greater strides in this direction than the preceding nine months of the year since we entered the war, and those responsible for it are deserving of the highest credit.

On May 16, 1917, the Secretary of War directed that the Surgeon General should supply to the Army gas masks. The gas-defense service was organized as a part of the Sanitary Corps, and the first officer formally commissioned as major on June 26, 1917. From this small beginning the gas-defense service has expanded until at the present time it is an organization of 150 officers and a thousand enlisted men.

On June 27, 1917, the day the Belgian commission was received, I brought into the House samples of some of the gas masks that had been used up to that time by the French and British and one of the type we had just made to send to France for Pershing's first division. I gave the House the best information then obtainable to the effect that the mask then exhibited was effective against any gas theretofore used. Within 10 days from that day 20,000 of those masks were on the ocean going over. Before they reached the other side a new gas had been used, requiring a change of the hood fabric material as well as the chemicals in our mask, so that those 20,000 masks came back to us without having been opened.

No one can be sure that the masks we are now making, perfect as they are, effective as they are, against any known gas. No one can be certain, I say, that they will not be obsolete before midsummer. All we can say is that they are the best that can be produced now and that they serve the present purpose well. All we can do and the best that can be done is to see that our boys "over there" are well supplied with them, and this is now being done in a most satisfactory way.

It is well known to you all that the diffusion of gas by means of shells has become so general and so far behind the front lines that it is necessary for the horses to wear masks.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. McKENZIE. Can the gentleman give the committee any information as to the number of horses that have lost their lives on account of gas? Is there any available information on that subject?

Mr. TILSON. I have no absolute data on that subject, except to state to the gentleman that the number is considerable. It was considered by Gen. Pershing of sufficient importance to warrant him in asking for masks for the horses, not only on account of the loss of the horses themselves, but on account of the disarrangement of the transportation and the blocking of the roads in case a gas shell should drop near and a horse should fall down from the effects of it.

The French use dogs also for war purposes, such as carrying messages, and have made masks for their dogs. We have not yet started the manufacture of dog masks. Pigeons also are used for carrying messages, and I am told that gas masks have been made for them.

We now have in operation two large factories for the manufacture of masks for men, and one complete plant for making horse masks. The rapidity with which these plants and the organizations to run them have been built up is little less than marvelous. Recently I went through one of the plants where men's masks are being made, examined carefully all the various operations, including the numerous inspections made after almost every distinct operation, and came away more than delighted with what I had seen. The completeness and thoroughness of the organization running this plant was especially pleasing.

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

Mr. TILSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know anything about a million or more masks that were made and rejected by Gen. Pershing—that had to be thrown in the wastebasket, so to speak—and that the people in charge came here and asked for appropriations to make more masks, without submitting the specifications to Gen. Pershing?

Mr. TILSON. I think the gentleman is referring to the very thing that I adverted to a moment ago.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking if the gentleman knows whether any such thing as that happened?

Mr. TILSON. Not on the scale that the gentleman has indicated. The fact is that we made a considerable number of masks, the best we knew how to make up to that time, the best that Gen. Pershing or anybody else on the other side had indicated to us that we should make. We paid for them, and I guess they were expensive enough, and then we sent a part of them over. When they arrived they could not be used, and they were sent back. Those that were here had either to be changed so as to conform to the new requirements or else to be thrown away. That is the fact.

Mr. MADDEN. What happened? Were they thrown away?

Mr. TILSON. There was considerable salvage, as I understand, especially in the knapsack, which is practically the same as that now used. Doubtless the greater part of the entire mask was utilized.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman answer one more question? Did the parties having charge of the manufacture of the gas masks in the War Department submit the new masks to Gen. Pershing for his approval before they spent the money in making them?

Mr. TILSON. I can not tell the gentleman as to that. I know there has been some delay. There was plenty of time to go back and forth across the ocean a time or two, because this mustard gas was first used about the first of August of last year, and the preparation for the manufacture of our masks on a large scale was begun about the middle of January, 1918. It has proceeded since that time very rapidly.

Mr. MADDEN. If they have all been thrown away, what does the rapidity amount to?

Mr. TILSON. I can not tell the gentleman in actual figures, but I have no reason to believe that any great mistake has been made in this matter, beyond the natural mistake of making at first masks which were inadequate to protect against the newly discovered mustard gas.

Mr. MADDEN. The making of a million or two and throwing them away seems to have been a rather serious mistake.

Mr. TILSON. I am sure the gentleman is not accurate as to the number.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Connecticut said 20,000. There is a good deal of difference between 20,000 and a million.

Mr. TILSON. I said 20,000 were sent over. But I prefer not to digress into a discussion of what is comparatively an insignificant matter when considered in connection with saving of the lives of our soldiers.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I decline to yield further.

Mr. GORDON. I think the gentleman ought to make plain his answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. TILSON. I am unable to answer the figures given by the gentleman from Illinois by giving the exact number of the old type of mask that was manufactured, but I feel confident that the number stated by him is altogether too large. Otherwise, I think my answer is plain.

Just a few words as to how the organization of the plant visited was brought together will serve as typical of all. A very able business executive was found, and two other men of large business affairs, who were thoroughly skilled in two lines of

business most nearly analogous to the work required in making gas masks. Of course, no one could be found who was experienced in making gas masks, for there were no such. You might not be able to guess the two lines of industry chosen as the most nearly analogous, but the gas-defense service guessed right the very first time.

One of the two men drafted for this most important work was a large manufacturer of corsets, thoroughly skilled in the use of the sewing machine, with all its accessories and possibilities. His resourcefulness as an office manager and planner soon demonstrated the wisdom of his selection. The other was a packer from Chicago who knows more about tin cans and how to handle them expeditiously and economically than any other man I ever saw. You see there is a tin canister containing the chemicals in each mask, and an extra one for each mask is provided.

Under these men are a number of able organization assistants, selected in many cases from among the business lieutenants of one of the three. The employees are carefully selected, those having immediate members of their families in the war being given preference.

Some of the signs displayed throughout the plant were interesting and impressive. They were for the most part superimposed upon appropriate liberty-loan posters, usually pictures of soldiers, and calculated to impress upon the workers the importance of dispatch and care in making the masks. One sign read, "Your loved one may not return unless he has a mask." Another read, "The mask you make may save his life."

The inspection throughout the many different operations impressed me as most thorough. I shall refer to only two specific instances. The first is of the rubber making the face piece. In a sheet about 30 inches wide on a roll, it is run between two steel rollers charged with high-voltage electricity. If there be the most minute pin prick the electric charge arcs through it, making it quite obvious to the eye of the inspector. The other is the final inspection, made by carefully selected enlisted men in a room which other persons are not permitted to enter. The masks are then placed in sealed packages and packed in heavy wooden boxes, ready for shipment to the battle front.

I have here a well-arranged exhibit, showing every part and operation in the manufacture of the mask. I shall not attempt to describe in detail the various parts which go into it, but you will readily see that it is no simple matter to make one of them.

There are 12 different types of masks here in my collection—10 for man and 2 for beast. I shall take them up one at a time.

First, let me show you the one now being turned out in large quantities for our troops. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FRANCIS], has volunteered to be the victim. He will put it on so that you may see it at close range as it is used in and near the front-line trenches. [Mr. FRANCIS puts on the mask.] It is known as the box respirator type, and is almost identical in outward design with the one shown here by me last June. It differs in the hood material and in the chemical used. The hood is now made of a rubber fabric that the gas can not penetrate. The eyes are of glass instead of celluloid, but the glass is made in layers, with celluloid between, so that it will crack but not shatter. The nose pincers are here to prevent breathing through the nose. The rubber mouthpiece goes in the mouth between the lips and the teeth. The breath comes out through this one-way flutter valve. This flexible tube extends from the opening connecting with the mouthpiece to the canister here in this knapsack affair, containing the neutralizing chemicals. The gas-charged air enters through the bottom of the canister, where it is filtered and purified, and reaches the mouth through this tube. After aerating the lungs it passes out through this flutter valve.

This is the way soldiers are equipped in order to fight or live at all when they are under gas. It is said that with their masks on the soldiers can live for at least 10 hours. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York how long he would like to live in it.

Mr. FRANCIS. About 10 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. It is in fact very uncomfortable to wear. When shells containing gas fall unexpectedly, as they often do, it is necessary to put on the mask very quickly. The soldier is trained to do it very expeditiously. Three soldiers, brave and true, now in the south gallery, will show just how it is done. They are Sergts. Day, Kirkham, and Emmens, of the gas-defense service. "Squad, attention." [The soldiers stood at attention.] The knapsack is now at the slung position in which it is carried from the time soldiers come within 10 or 12 miles of the front. Even at this distance gas shells may fall. In that case the command is given, "Gas."

At the command of Mr. TILSON the soldiers in the gallery put on their masks.

[Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. There being gas in the neighborhood to cause the alarm they would undoubtedly get some gas inside the mask, so it is necessary for them to empty the mask. Before I give that command I should, however, give another command, as it is very uncomfortable to carry the mask in that position. I shall now give the command, "Complete the adjustment." That is in order to make it more comfortable. Otherwise they must carry the weight of the mask from the mouthpiece in the mouth between the teeth and the lips, and it is a very heavy pull on the mouth unless the knapsack is strung up. Having completed the adjustment, the position which the men are now in is what is known as the "alert" position. I omitted giving one command, "Take off masks." [Soldiers removed masks.]

When they come within a distance of 2 miles of the front line they must carry their masks all the time in the alert position, which these men are now doing, the flaps of the knapsack open, so that they can get at the mask easily. Being already at the alert position, which they always take within 2 miles of the front line, from this position they are supposed to put on the masks in less time than before. They are supposed to do it in six seconds, and gentlemen can take the time if they wish. I shall now give the usual commands: "Gas." [The soldiers quickly put on masks. Applause.] "Empty masks." [The soldiers execute the command.] The gas soon dims the eyepiece and it must be cleaned. "Clean right eyepiece." "Clean left eyepiece." [The soldiers execute the commands as given.] No more gas shells having fallen, the commander comes to the conclusion there is no more gas, but he wishes to be sure of it, so by having them slightly release the nose clamps and raise the hood a little they can ascertain whether there is any gas still in the neighborhood. I shall give the command and the squad will illustrate it: "Test for gas." [The soldiers execute the command.] Having now ascertained that there is no more gas in the neighborhood, I shall give the last command: "Take off masks." [The soldiers remove masks. Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How can the commanding officer give the order that the gentleman has just given with these masks on?

Mr. TILSON. He can do it. It is a very mumbling sort of order, but it can be understood by seeing what the commander himself is doing about this time. Then they also have signals, and along the line they have regular automobile horns.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. We have all heard of the form of gas that blisters not only the face but the body. What protection, if any, has been taken against that?

Mr. TILSON. They are making a sort of sou'wester suit that incloses the soldier all over, from head to foot, with straps under the boots, with a hood that goes over the head—in fact, a complete suit. It seems to me it would be very uncomfortable in hot weather. Certain men who have to handle the guns or anything where that substance is will have to wear that suit. It seems to me that soon there will be so many things necessary to be carried in order to protect a man's life that they are going to finally reach an impasse.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. And we are manufacturing those?

Mr. TILSON. A limited number of the oil suits, but we are manufacturing the masks in great numbers. It is the belief that we shall be able to manufacture without difficulty all that we need for ourselves and all that our allies may need.

Mr. GARNER. That is, the gas masks?

Mr. TILSON. The gas masks.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman says they are manufacturing the improvement of the mouthpiece, the second one to which he pointed?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And they are experimenting with the other?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; the hard rubber.

Mr. GARNER. And if they fail to manufacture the second in order to get the third, we would criticize. If they failed to get the third and throw the others away, we would still criticize.

Mr. TILSON. I shall not criticize if they go on making the second till the third is ready to make. If the third is better, I

shall not criticize if they throw away a few of the second when they get the third.

Mr. GARNER. I just want to mention that to show what an awful fix they are in.

Mr. TILSON. As I said on another occasion, in accordance with the scriptures, we ought "to prove all things," and improve everything we can, but we should not neglect to "hold fast that which is good," and which we have tried and know to be good. I think that has been one of our difficulties. We have been trying to get the absolutely ideal, and meanwhile we have not gotten anything at all, always looking forward to the time when we could have the very best.

Mr. GARNER. Then, the gentleman is not inclined to criticize if they go on and manufacture something they have, but afterward throw it away?

Mr. TILSON. To a reasonable degree; no. I do not think anybody is subject to that criticism. They would be subject to criticism if they did not take every precaution to have enough masks and to be sure they did have enough masks to protect all of the men they are going to send within the danger zone.

The gas is heavier than air, so it goes down into the dug-out or trench. It is so heavy that it stays there on the bottom, so they have invented this tool which I show you to take up the gas. It takes quite a little knack to use it. The idea is to bring the tool up flat, so as to bring the gas up with it.

I wish to spend the rest of the time allotted to me in a description of these masks. This one which I show you now is a French mask, the same as I presented to you almost a year ago, except that the face piece has better material in it, to keep out the new gas, and it has been impregnated with the new kind of chemicals, to take care of the new gas. I am informed that the French are also making some of the box-respirator type.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman one question. Do our people understand the component elements of the "mustard" gas?

Mr. TILSON. I could not inform the gentleman as to that. I suppose they are studying it. Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois, Dr. FOSTER, could tell the gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. They have analyzed it here.

Mr. HARDY. I shall not ask whether they use it against the enemy, but I hope they do.

Mr. TILSON. Here is the Italian mask, which is much like the French mask, except that they carry it in a tin box. Upon it in large letters in Italian is a warning to the effect that he who leaves off this mask dies, and that he should always keep it with him.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell us what mask our men are now using?

Mr. TILSON. Our men are now using the middle one on the board, the same one the gentleman from New York wore. It is the middle one on the board here [pointing].

Mr. SNYDER. That is of our own manufacture?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNYDER. And they are not using masks other than our own manufacture?

Mr. TILSON. Well, I can not tell the gentleman, but I know that January last marked the beginning of a large manufacture of these masks.

Mr. SNYDER. But just previous to that they were using masks made also by France?

Mr. TILSON. I am not quite sure as to that, but I think we had some from Great Britain.

Mr. SNYDER. They are as well fixed for masks as any of the other armies at this time?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. So they are not without proper protection as far as masks are concerned?

Mr. TILSON. Probably what the gentleman has in mind is that they were not masks of our manufacture.

Mr. SNYDER. What I had in mind was to be sure our men did have protection of masks, notwithstanding the fact they did not have those of our manufacture.

Mr. LOBECK. Is the mask the soldiers in the gallery used the one our soldiers are using now?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. The mask the soldiers used in the gallery is the same one I have in my collection. It is the one the gentleman from New York put on. The third one on the board has only a very slight improvement, making it fit the head better, but it is really the same thing.

Mr. HARDY. Was the masks used by the soldiers made in America?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes; they were made in America.

Unfortunately for the rest and comfort of the soldiers, the gas shells are about as apt to fall in the night as in the day, so that it often becomes necessary for men to sleep in their masks, if they sleep at all. I believe the gentleman from New York will testify that it would be very difficult for anyone to sleep in that mask. In fact, no one could sleep with those clasps on his nose; therefore this mask [indicating] has been devised for that purpose. You will note the air ducts leading to the eyes and the breathing arrangement here. This is known as the Tissot mask. It is made out of very soft, pliable rubber, and has ventilation to the eyes so that the eyepiece will not dim and the breathing arrangement here so that nothing has to go into the mouth. It is so soft that a man, if he is sufficiently exhausted, can lie down and sleep in it.

This one is known as the P. H. helmet, which the British were using as a secondary mask and which I showed here last June. It is not considered now as proof against gas for a very long time and is rapidly going out of use.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What does the enemy use?

Mr. TILSON. I am going to show that in a moment. Here is something which will throw a little light on an international matter of considerable interest in this country. We all wondered why the Russians completely broke down. I have wondered if it were not, when they discovered that they had to wear such things as this [illustrating] in order to live at all, that the Bolsheviki decided they had better quit. This is a Russian mask.

Here is a mask taken from a captured German a very short time ago. The receptacle which contains the chemicals is very much smaller than ours and lasts a shorter time. Therefore each man has to carry an extra one of these lamp-body affairs with him. You will note that the face piece is made of leather instead of rubber. The German mask that I saw last year had rubber of a rather poor quality, but the masks they have been taking from the Germans recently have no rubber at all. They use leather for the face of the mask. The elastic bands that hold the mask to the face and make it conform to the shape of the head instead of being rubber are made of wire spring sewed up in cloth. That would indicate that there is a shortage of rubber in Germany. I am glad to see a shortage of something over there. [Applause.]

As I told you a few moments ago, horses also must have masks, and we have one complete factory in this country now turning out horse masks. I have one here, fully impregnated, that will protect a horse. It is the one now on this horse's head. Unless you were close to detect the odor you would not realize a great difference between the mask we are now making for our horses and the British horse mask. Here is the British mask. It is sewed instead of riveted. It must be entirely impregnated, including the elastic band, which soon puts the elastic band out of business. Our mask is riveted, so that this part which goes around the bridle is not impregnated, neither is the elastic band, which I think is an improvement. You will notice that the upper part of the horse's nose is all that is necessary to be covered.

A MEMBER. What about the eyes?

Mr. TILSON. You have often heard of a horse laugh, but never of a horse cry. The eyes of a normal horse do not lachrymate. A horse has the good sense to breathe through his nose. There is no necessity of putting a mask over his mouth, which materially simplifies the problem.

The captain in charge of this particular work is as proud of it as a pair of newlyweds of their first baby; and well he may be, for it is a necessary as well as humane work, being done most efficiently and in the finest possible spirit.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman care to say anything about what we are doing offensively, as to the character of the gas?

Mr. TILSON. As I said earlier in my remarks, I thought we had better not discuss that at all, because even the dropping of a hint might be of advantage to the enemy if communicated to him. I feel that we are doing the work properly, and owing to the peculiar nature of the work I think we ought not to talk about it. [Applause.]

It is a great satisfaction to be able to speak so favorably, so enthusiastically, of the progress being made in this highly important field of defensive preparation. Fortunately, the gas mask is not made of metal, except to a minor degree, and does not require the special tools, dies, jigs, and gauges necessary to make arms, ammunitions, and airplanes. This fact detracts in no way from the credit due to those who have had this work in charge. In my judgment, the gas-defense service is now justifying its name. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the wolf still yelps at my heels. Two years ago, using the fable of the Wolf and the Lamb as an illustration, I spoke of the real cause of the opposition to me. As I then said, I am the Representative of the whole people of my district, but I wear the collar of none; I refuse to submit to the dictation of selfish interests or to be the tool of big business; I am too much interested in the cause of labor and the oppressed, too much the friend of the common man, to be acceptable to those in my district who consider themselves as belonging to a superior class. In the words of Mirabeau, "In all countries, in all times, the aristocracies have implacably pursued every friend of the people." The shoddy American aristocracy of riches is the most vindictive of them all.

Two years ago the people of my district passed judgment upon me in an election in which I was opposed by two popular men, with the result that I received 76 per cent of the total vote, while my opponents together received 24 per cent. I carried every voting box in Jefferson County.

Confronted with this evidence of the people's approval, the wolves slunk away temporarily, but soon returned to snarl at my heels. They have hounded me persistently since my first election. They have criticized me; they have nagged me; I could do nothing to please them. They have sought to distract my attention from my duties. I have had to stop from time to time to kick them away. Now, confronted with the prospect that I will again be reelected, they gnash their fangs in desperation and would tear me limb from limb. They fear that it is now or never; that I will soon become so well entrenched that it will be hopeless to drag me down. They are making a last desperate effort, sparing no pains nor trouble, regarding neither honor nor truth in their attacks.

I proved that I did not muddy their water and that neither I nor my brother insulted them, and now they say that I am not a real lamb. These wolves in sheep's clothing with lamb's wool in their teeth—they claim that I am not a real lamb, and that therefore they should devour me.

They say that I am not good enough American for them—not a patriot. The News and Age-Herald say that I am not patriot enough for them and the mammon worshippers for whom they speak—not good enough for Editor Glass and Editor Barrett, twin pickles, one in conceit and alcohol, the other in his own venom—Glass and Barrett, neither of whom ever had a patriotic thought or ever did a patriotic deed—Glass and Barrett, who hate each other with all the bitterness of their small souls, who feel for each other merited and measureless contempt. Heaven help me if I be not good enough for such as they!

And little "Me, Too," the Ledger, peeps out of its hole to squeak at me. The weakest of the lot—but I pause, "Brave spirits war not with the dead."

PAYING FOR THE WAR.

Next to soldiers, money is the most needed thing to win the war. Lloyd-George said that the war will be won with silver bullets, and this is nearly true. Our brave soldiers will die in France in vain if by unwise financiering we bankrupt our country and become unable to supply them with munitions of war. Every true patriot is concerned in seeing that proper financial measures for the support of the war are adopted. The Congressman who does not interest himself in this question is lacking in a proper sense of responsibility.

The question of financing the war was one of the first to which President Wilson gave consideration. In his war message of April 2, 1917, after advising a declaration of war against Germany he proceeded to discuss what the war would involve. He said:

It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well-conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

President Wilson warned Congress against "the inflation which would be produced by vast loans." He held that the financial burden of the war should be sustained so far as equitable "by the present generation, by well-conceived taxation."

I approved the President's reasoning. Though not always willing to go blindly where he points, I respect his master intellect. And as the financial view which he expressed agreed with my own I was glad to support his plan for financing the war. The war-revenue bill presented by Secretary McAdoo was framed on the plan to pay half of the war cost by bonds and half by taxation. This bill had the President's approval, passed with my support, and is the law now in effect.

However, the cost of the war began to run higher than had been calculated. An additional bond issue was authorized by Congress last fall, and recently the third liberty loan was authorized. This brings the total bond issues up to the stupendous sum of \$14,000,000,000, or \$140 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. But notwithstanding the repeated bond issues and the many billions increase of the public debt no increase in taxes on profits has been made. Congress did not adhere to the President's plan of paying half the war cost from bonds and half from taxation. Whether the President changed his mind I do not know. I do not think that he did change. I rather think that the big business and financial interests who are making millions out of the war and who would have been compelled to pay the increased taxes are so powerful that Congress has been unable to carry out the President's plan.

Our present rate of taxation on war profits is much lower than the British rate. On concerns earning as much as \$500,000,000 our rate is roughly 32 per cent, the British rate is 25 per cent on profits up to the three prewar-year average, and 80 per cent upon war profits. Under our rates we will collect for 1917 \$3,500,000,000, which is less than one-fourth of our expenditures. Had we adopted the British rate our collections for the same period would have been from \$2,500,000,000 to \$3,000,000,000 more, or a total of not less than \$5,000,000,000. For instance, the United States Steel Corporation will pay for 1917 taxes \$233,000,000. Had that corporation been located in Great Britain it would pay on the same earnings \$387,000,000, so that the Steel Corporation by paying the American rate instead of the British rate saves \$154,000,000, and is able to pay its stockholders 49 cents on the dollar for 1917 alone.

I have viewed the repeated bond issues with great apprehension. I see the evils which the President predicted transpiring before my own eyes. Prices of all commodities have increased 21 per cent since we entered the war. This is the direct result of repeated bond issues. A great inflation of circulation has resulted, gold money has disappeared. The American dollar is now below par in foreign countries. Mr. McAdoo advises that we melt our silver money into bars as the silver in the dollar is worth more than 100 cents. The country's financial situation is rapidly growing worse.

Recently in voting for the third liberty loan I felt it my duty to call attention to the situation and to urge that taxes be laid upon the war profiteers. I supported the President's position as given in his war message. I was met by the assertion that greater taxes would cripple business, that business could not afford to pay more than was now being paid. I subsequently answered this by calling attention to the enormous profits that are being made by the great industrial concerns. I took up particularly the case of the Steel Corporation and showed that by its own admission it had made for 1917, after paying all taxes and charges of every kind, 49 cents on every dollar of the par value of its common stock; and pointed out that if the true facts were known it had earned perhaps 100 per cent on its common stock.

My exposure of the profiteering of the Steel Trust was in good faith. Perhaps I forgot for the moment that it controlled the press and powerful political influences in my district; perhaps I forgot or maybe I had courage enough to tell the truth in behalf of the public welfare, even though it meant my own ruin.

However that may be, I make no apology to the Steel Trust or to its hirelings, its editors, its sycophants, its parasites, its bootlickers, or its deluded friends, who can see no wrong in anything it may do. I did my duty as I saw it, and whether I shall sink or swim, it was a patriotic action and will redound to the Nation's welfare.

PATRIOTS AND PROFITEERS.

But it seems that I laid my hand upon the "Ark of the Covenant"; that is, the only ark of the covenant that a certain element in my district care about. I raised my hand against their idol, and I must be punished. There was scurrying to and fro, mines were laid, plans formed, and a plot concocted for my quick undoing.

My speech was made on April 6. On April 9 a notable gathering was held in the Tutwiler Hotel in Birmingham—that splendid hostelry, the center of extravagance and display of the swagger and fashion in my city. But this occasion was a worthy one. The object of the meeting was to promote the sale of liberty bonds. Numerous wealthy business men had gathered around the well-loaded board. It was a congenial and prosperous company, and soon speeches were declared in order. The occasion was a patriotic one, in which men's nobler and self-sacrificing instincts were to be appealed to. But always there are those who are willing to pervert a patriotic occasion to base

political ends. The Tutwiler luncheon was no exception. There were those present who were willing to endanger the bond campaign in order to do me an injury. When patriotic fervor had reached its height up rose the pastor of a fashionable Episcopal Church in my city and proceeded to climb the ladder of eloquent praise for America and denunciation of her foes. Evidently this gentleman of the cloth classed me as one of the latter, for he said:

We ought to conscript every man who is capable of working in the industrial plants or in the offices, at the lathe in the munition plants, or in the factory, or at the typewriter—every man in his place, taking everyone that is needed to win this war; and while we are at it we might conscript a Congressman who is in sympathy with the sentiment in this community and who will represent this people and that great sentiment in Congress.

And having paid me this tribute, he proceeded to demolish the Germans by saying:

America was buffeted on one cheek by German and she turned the other one. She was buffeted on that one, and then all scriptural law was fulfilled. And now, by God we are going to lick Germany.

The quotations are taken from the News's report of the speech. Still, I presume they are correct.

Evidently there were a number of conscriptionists at the meeting, for the News says that the pastor's reference to conscription, including the conscription of a Congressman, was cheered mightily. And so we have the key to the sentiments of the speaker and his cheerers and the platform of the candidate for Congress whom they will conscript. Conscription not only for the Army but for industry—dragging men from their homes to serve in the ranks and also to toil in the factories and on the farm. Conscription of men and women, too, not only for war service but for the service of the great profit-making corporations, so that millionaires may be multiplied and our Nation's resources monopolized. Conscription not only for times of war but to maintain vast standing armies even after peace has come, for that is what the Birmingham papers preach and the speaker and his cheerers want. They would not allow the humble workers of America to put aside the yoke of military service with the coming of peace, but would keep them trained for future wars and future opportunities for profiteering and plundering.

These conscriptionists believe in conscripting our boys for soldiers and men and women to toil in the factories and on the farm, but always they have in mind the conscription of the humble and the poor. They do not favor conscription for themselves. If it should be proposed to conscript one of them to follow a plow or roll a wheelbarrow or beat hot iron—to take him away from his luxurious home and to put him to doing some useful work for the country—he would resent it to the death. These conscriptionists believe in conscription of human beings, but not of dollars. They consider that they are making a sacrifice equal to that of the soldiers who do the fighting when they lend money to the Government at a good rate of interest in nontaxable bonds. If it should be proposed to conscript money and big industrial plants to carry on the war they would howl that the pillars of civilization were being pulled down. Human beings may be conscripted, they say, but property is sacred.

But the speaker went too far. There at least is no need to conscript a candidate for Congress to oppose me. Dozens of ambitious men want my job, dozens of them have had their lightning rods up for months, but they have been afraid. If only the small but powerful influences which were at work at the Tutwiler will give the word these would-be candidates will spring to the task. It is an intolerable evil of political conscription that the selection is made by the elect few, and the candidate when chosen knows well the source of the honor. The favored one will be the candidate not of the people but of his conscriptors. He will not stand on his own merit, but upon the support and money of the few who select him. The "hand-picked one," if he should succeed me, will be the Representative not of the people as a whole but of a few big corporations and their puppets. Oh, unhappy the day when the people of my district are thus mistreated, and when their Congressman is merely the tool of the selfish and avaricious.

THE PLOT THICKENS.

It is obvious that the attack on me was prearranged. Taking it as a text, the News followed with a column of coarse editorial abuse and dishonest criticism. Then the Age-Herald took the matter up with a report which deliberately misrepresented my speech exposing the Steel Trust, and at the next liberty loan luncheon a cut-and-dried resolution was sprung, condemning my speech and charging that I did not faithfully represent my constituents in my position. And on Sunday morning the

Age-Herald cartooned me on its front page as a Bolshevik, and the News reiterated its false criticisms.

The whole "flare-up" was obviously a conspiracy. Birmingham had been worked to a fever heat of patriotism in the sale of liberty bonds and was responding nobly to the call, but these narrow and venomous partisans had no respect for that. They would ruin the sale of the bonds if thereby they could injure me. I attacked their god—the Steel Trust. I questioned the good faith of the great war contractors. I criticized the profiteers and money worshipers. I said that no man has the right to come out of this war richer than he went into it. I sought to make the people who are making money out of this war devote their profits to paying for it. I tried to protect coming generations and babes yet for a hundred years unborn. Therefore I am unpatriotic, I must be politically sandbagged. The resolution condemning my speech was passed by men few or none of whom had read it.

MY RECORD.

The Birmingham papers from the very first have sought to discredit me. They have misrepresented and criticized whenever that course was possible. They have belittled and ridiculed whenever they could, and for the rest have ignored me altogether. During the trying times of last spring and summer they nagged and hectored me in nearly every issue. Whatever I did they criticized as wrong. They commanded me with threats what to do and scolded and misrepresented what I did. The pitiable Ledger, after remaining on the fence for weeks on conscription, came out just before the vote was taken with a bluster as to what would happen to me if I did not vote for it, and later ridiculed my speech against it and called it a "tirade." I sent out the speech to show my constituents the reasons for my vote, and now the Ledger and the News quarrel with me for sending out the speech. Had I had these papers' principles I would have waited to see which way the crowd went and then been the loudest shouter of them all.

The News and Age-Herald have steadily misrepresented me. Of the two perhaps the News has been the least despicable, for its editor has done his own lying, while the Age-Herald has set its hired slanderers to sandbag me. These papers have tried to create an atmosphere of disloyalty about me. They have reiterated that I was opposing the administration and had set myself up in antagonism to the President. There are honest people among my constituents who have been misled into actually believing such things. The assassin of political reputation is as despicable as the slanderer of private character.

The real fact is that in all respects necessary to stand the acid test of loyalty as described by the President in his recent letter on the Wisconsin situation, I have proven 100 per cent pure. Of the dozens of measures relating to the war, either directly or indirectly, in only three have I voted against what was reported as the judgment of officers of the administration. Those three are the conscription bill, the espionage bill, and the explosives bill. I challenge my critics to show to the contrary. I have been willing to vote for every soldier, every ship, and every dollar needed to carry on the war.

I will be frank. I have voted for the measures proposed, not because some officer of the administration advised it but because they met the approval of my judgment. I have not been a rubber-stamp Congressman, but have tried to weigh patriotically every measure presented and to vote for the best interest of my country. It is I who am Congressman. It is I who took the oath of office. It is I who must face my conscience and my Maker. And always I have felt that I must make the final decision for myself. For this frame of mind I offer no man an apology.

The Age-Herald libels me in a cartoon as a "Bolshevik." Poor dolt. He does not see that it is he and those for whom he speaks and the propaganda that he carries on that makes the Industrial Workers of the World possible. I am standing for old-fashioned Americanism, for the America of our fathers, and for American liberties, for freedom of speech, of conscience, and for real democracy. He would have all the vast wealth of this great young Republic collected into the coffers of a superior class and used by them with a free hand to oppress the great masses. He and his kind are driving for the same conditions in America that produced the Bolsheviks in Russia—he the bourgeois—while I would stay the rapacity of exploitation and strive toward conditions where there would be few millionaires and no anarchists, but reasonable plenty for all.

I pass by the coarse abuse of the News so far as it relates to my personal qualities. Such piffing and contemptible criticism is not to be dignified by notice. Glass criticizes me for having obtained the discharge from service of a number of soldiers. In every case the soldiers were boys of 16 and 17 or were physi-

cally unfit for service. The military laws required that they be discharged. As the servant of my constituents I merely presented the facts to the authorities. No favoritism was shown nor political pull exerted. These boys were unfit for service; they should never have been recruited. Glass's criticism is as dishonest as it is petty.

Glass says I am a Socialist. This is false, and he knew it was false when he wrote it. He says that consciously or unconsciously I have cooperated with German propagandism. There is only one answer appropriate to be made to such a statement. He lied. Lied deliberately and maliciously, not in heat, but cold-bloodedly and basely, to do me an injury.

I realize what power the press has; how it may mold public opinion; how, by base innuendoes, it may destroy the proudest reputation; how it may create around the noblest character an atmosphere of hatred and disgust. I realize what a load I carry in the united opposition of the Birmingham dailies; how I am cut off from my people and can not reach them except through an occasional speech, which my foul-hitting critics would deny me the poor privilege of sending. I realize how impossible is the task of my sending the truth to overtake their misrepresentations. But I am undismayed. I confront the plot against me with calm and untroubled faith that God is in heaven and justice will triumph.

The fight on me is not one in which I alone am interested. It is a fight against me because I am the people's Representative. It is a fight against the people and would deprive them of the right to choose their own spokesman. It is the fight of the selfish, the insincere, the false patriot, the money worshiper, the parasites of big business against the toiling masses. I have been selected as a victim because I have dared to criticize the profiteers and war contractors. I have dared to stand for the rights of men above the interests of property. I have dared to have humanity as my watchword instead of greed.

Let no man be deceived as to the issue. There is no question of my patriotism by any honest man who knows the facts. I have served my country as a private soldier in time of war, which not one of my critics has done. My life is an open book of service to my fellow man, and I appeal to that. The real question is whether the Steel Trust and the selfish interests and their hirelings shall have them a little Congressman of their own in the Birmingham district or will the whole people be represented.

The daily papers, except for the spleen of their editors, do not attack me because of any principles or convictions of their own, for they have none. They are merely the tools of those higher up, of the big business interests who are their masters.

THE BIRMINGHAM DAILIES.

How sweet it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Hating each other as only the jealous can, cutting each other's throats at every chance, feeling for each other the deepest contempt—the Birmingham dailies are united for the first time in opposition to me. Oh, happy I, that have enabled the rabbit, the monkey, and the serpent to sing in sweet harmony.

Barrett and Glass, what a fine pair they are to teach patriotism and high-mindedness to a community! And now they are united in libeling their Congressman. Happy they must be in such a genial association. Lately they were caterwauling at each other, and Barrett published his opinion of Glass in a double column, from which I quote these chaste extracts:

Frank P. Glass, the editor of the Birmingham News, whose principal object in life is to criticize others in the columns of his newspaper, who has always been the puppet of some politician, and who has always sought to be a political leader without achieving a iota of success, is out in a long diatribe in his newspaper yesterday afternoon criticizing an article over the signature of Ned Brace in Sunday's Age-Herald.

Again:

This man Glass, of the Birmingham News, has been dirty and sneaking so long that both the editor of the Age-Herald and the respectable public are disgusted with him.

Again:

The mighty Ned Brace to whom he refers was not in the Montgomery conference. There were some splendid gentlemen in that conference, into which that pirate of journalism, Frank P. Glass, injected himself. There were men in that conference who were fighting for a principle. Would that the editor of the Birmingham News had been doing likewise, rather than possibly watching for the shekels that might be strewn in this State by those with an ax to grind.

Frank Glass in his newspaper career has always had such a keen scent for campaign funds that it is difficult for him to distinguish the difference between the editor of principle and patriotism and the editor who merely follows the train of the dollar.

Again referring to the way in which Glass treated the administration's coal-saving order, he said:

Yet this man Glass, this venal editor of the Birmingham News, saw fit to criticize his administration vigorously when it endeavored to conserve coal by closing on Mondays industries and department stores

which advertise on Sundays. This editor was looking to the dollar in the advertising columns of his Sunday newspaper. When the dollar and patriotism were placed side by side—when the dollar and the support of the boys at the front were in parallel columns—he chose the dollar.

I have not at hand what Glass said about Barrett. I remember that he charged Barrett with having betrayed the whisky cause, which he had long championed. What each really thinks of the other would be unfit to print. God pity and save them both—if He consistently can.

From the very first the Birmingham dailies tried to bludgeon me into submitting to their dictation. They want a humble, servile Congressman whom they can dictate to and when I ignored their hectoring they split their lungs with criticism. The attack on me has been carefully planned for months. The papers suspended their criticisms last fall. They saw that the people were getting tired of their scolding me. I then predicted that they were waiting until the opening of the congressional campaign. The "flare-up" is merely the enemy's great spring offensive long planned and carefully prepared. They are dishonest in assigning my speech as the reason. It is merely a false excuse which they give for what they had intended to do had I not made the speech. I will send the speech they criticized to my constituents. I challenge any honest man after reading it to point out where I made any criticism of the President or of any officer of the Government. To the contrary, that speech advocated carrying out the financial policy favored by the President in his war message.

The Birmingham dailies evidently think the people are fools. I do not think so. To the contrary, I know that they are not fools and I know that the instinct for a square deal and fair play is strong in the hearts of my constituents. I know that they will resent the unprincipled attacks on me. I know that they will not allow my dishonest critics to intimidate them. The great mass of the people in my district look on me as their friend and champion. They will accept as an attack on themselves the efforts for my political assassination. I am receiving dozens of letters with promises of support. The people are with me.

My answer to the false criticisms of my opposition is my announcement for Congress. There will be no backdown on my part. We will put this thing up to the people and let them decide. I give fair warning to all if I should be again chosen as Congressman from the ninth district I will continue as I have in the past to do my duty as He gives me light to see it. I will be no rubber stamp. I will wear no man's collar. I will listen to advice from all and consider it carefully, but I will make the decision myself. I will not submit to dictation from any interest, no matter how rich or powerful, but prayerfully and humbly as a patriot should and with a just sense of responsibility in this hour of the Nation's peril I will serve my country and my people with the best that in me lies.

I have no support from the daily press, no way to reach my constituents except through my speeches. Therefore in order to answer my critics I am forced to use this method. I shall send this address to my constituents. The papers, of course, will criticize, vilify, and ridicule it and me, but I am willing to endure this for my convictions. If by making this fight for the people I may be of benefit to them and to my country, I am willing to suffer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the committee will have to rise about 3 o'clock for a most important matter, and for that reason I suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] that the remainder of the general debate be reserved until after that time, so that we may go ahead with the consideration of the bill now under the five-minute rule. I might say that when the committee does rise at 3 o'clock an important bill will be considered in the House, and after that I expect to go back into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of District legislation. If the gentleman has somebody that is anxious for time just now, I have no serious objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I want one minute of the time, if the chairman has no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, are we considering now the bill H. R. 10894?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We are under general debate.

Mr. WHEELER. Why does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] control the time on this side, when he is for the bill, and we have a minority report here against the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman was recognized because he is the ranking member on the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. He is not entitled to the division of time over here. He is for the bill. I do not want any time myself, but—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] wants time, he can have mine.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not want any time myself. I do not know whether the other Members who signed this report do or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. So far as I am concerned, the gentleman can have all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state that there was a unanimous consent conferring the control of half of the time on the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and half on the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY]. The Chair is given no alternative in the premises.

Mr. WHEELER. The chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Wisconsin are both for the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can only say to the gentleman from Illinois that we are operating under the unanimous-consent rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] desire recognition or does the gentleman from Wisconsin agree to accede to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] might use some of his time now.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the present regulations, as I understand it, all officers of the Army and Navy are permitted to purchase supplies at the departments suggested in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is my information.

Mr. DOWELL. This bill then is intended to cover officers outside of the Army and Navy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is intended to cover Government employees who are not in the Army or Navy.

Mr. DOWELL. Is there any reason, so far as the gentleman knows, why that will in any way assist in expediting the work in these departments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can say, in my opinion it will expedite the business very materially if the clerks who are working for the Government here in time of war can buy their groceries and supplies more cheaply in one place than in another. It will mean that more of them will be willing to work for the Government than otherwise would. I will say to the gentleman that we are not now discussing the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the gentleman suggest any reason why Members of Congress should be included in this list, as provided in section 2?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There may not be any reason for the gentleman to be included in it, but there is for me and others that I know, and that is that I can buy my groceries 33½ per cent cheaper than from a grocery without charging the taxpayers anything, and I want to do it because I need the money. [Laughter.]

Is it not correct that the gentleman is a bachelor and lives at a hotel?

Mr. DOWELL. That is immaterial. The question is whether Members of Congress shall do what other citizens of the United States shall not do. They ought not to be preferred. I am opposed to giving them any privilege that is not extended to all American citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We will come to that a little later.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members of the House have been very much interested in the remarks that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has made this morning on the subject of gas and gas masks. Most of the Members here will probably recall his speech on the same subject last June. I wonder if they remembered, as they heard the speech to-day, that the man whom the colonel used a year ago to exhibit the method of wearing the masks was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HEINTZ], whom we all love and who is now with the colors. I wonder if Members of the House have reflected that perhaps at this very moment he is putting to practical use, the most practical use possible, the lessons which we had together here in the House a year ago.

I rose simply to express the hope that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HEINTZ] in camp might read these words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and might know that his colleagues are still thinking of him and are still wishing him every success. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if there is nobody who desires to use time under general debate I ask that the bill be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and then if there is time we can resume the general debate.

Mr. CARY. I have the name of one Member who wishes some time on this side in general debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Let that be deferred until later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky requests that the general debate be now suspended, and that the bill be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, the general debate to be resumed on the completion of the bill under the five-minute rule. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers and employees of the United States who reside in the District of Columbia shall be permitted to purchase supplies from such commissary stores as may be operated by either the Subsistence Division of the Quartermaster Department of the United States Army or by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the United States Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I wish to say that I do not offer it as a committee amendment, but one on my own initiative.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Strike out the words "who reside in the District of Columbia" in lines 3 and 4.

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

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 14.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think we had better have tellers. The amendment has not been debated, and it is not understood. I did not understand it, and I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent, pending his demand for tellers, to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. This would make the United States purchaser for all of its employees, if this amendment were agreed to, everywhere, of every kind, in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It would.

Mr. CANNON. If this is not voted down, I am willing to move to strike out the whole thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois demands tellers, and the gentleman from New York makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Alexander	Dyer	James	Norton
Anthony	Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver, N. Y.
Bacharach	Estopinal	Jones	Osborne
Barkley	Fairchild, B. L.	Kahn	Parker, N. J.
Beshlin	Fisher	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.
Blackmon	Flynn	Kelley, Mich.	Porter
Bowers	Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Powers
Brodbeck	Freeman	Kettner	Price
Burnett	Fuller, Mass.	King	Ragsdale
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallagher	Kinkaid	Rainey, Ill. T.
Caldwell	Gallivan	Kreider	Ramsey
Campbell, Kans.	Glynn	LaGuardia	Rankin
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Larsen	Rayburn
Carew	Gould	Leshner	Riordan
Carter, Mass.	Graham, Pa.	Lobeck	Rodenberg
Cleary	Gray, Ala.	Lunn	Romjue
Coady	Gray, N. J.	McClintic	Rowe
Copley	Gregg	McCormick	Rowland
Costello	Griest	McCulloch	Rubey
Cox	Griffin	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rucker
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLemore	Russell
Curry, Cal.	Hamlin	Magee	Sabath
Dale, N. Y.	Haskell	Maher	Sanders, La.
Dallinger	Haugen	Mann	Scott, Iowa
Darrow	Hayes	Martin	Scott, Pa.
Dempsey	Heintz	Meeher	Scully
Denison	Hensley	Mondell	Shackleford
Dewalt	Hicks	Moore, Pa.	Sherwood
Dickinson	Hood	Moore, Ind.	Shouse
Donovan	Houston	Morin	Siegel
Dooling	Howard	Mudd	Slamp
Doremus	Humphreys	Neely	Small
Drukker	Hutchinson	Nelson	Smith, Idaho
Dupré	Igoe	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, T. F.

Snell	Sumners	Thompson	Weaver
Stafford	Swift	Tinkham	Webb
Stegall	Switzer	Vare	Winslow
Stelle	Tague	Vestal	Wright
Stephens, Nebr.	Tay or. Colo.	Voigt	
Strong	Templeton	Volstead	
Sullivan	Thomas	Watson, Pa.	

The committee rose; and Mr. GARNER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration H. R. 10894, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 286 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he presented the names of the absentees to be entered in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment proposed by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the enacting clause of the bill. Does the gentleman desire to debate his motion?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on my motion. There is not one-thousandth part as much reason or justice in permitting the employees of the Government to purchase their food and other supplies from the quartermaster stores of the Army as there would be to permit the men who dig the sewers and pave the streets and do the common labor of the United States to do that. They are the men who furnish the facilities, the transportation, everything that goes to make up the health of every community in the land, and they toil for not to exceed one-half the compensation that the Government employees receive. Why should we make the Government employees a preferred class?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MADDEN. Surely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that there are 9,000 men working in the navy yard here, and there will be more, who will need the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. That may be true; but there are 110,000,000 people in the United States, and they ought to be given consideration, and there ought not to be any law passed giving to any preferred class rights that do not go to every other class in the country.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I take it this bill is, of course, a war measure. I will ask the gentleman if he has any information as to whether or not the Quartermaster General of the Army or the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy has been consulted as to whether this is proper legislation or not?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no information, and I doubt if anybody else has.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I wish to say to my colleague, for the information of gentlemen of the House, that no such proposition as this has been submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know all the facts in the case, but I do know this, that we ought to maintain the War Department for those who are engaged in war, and we should in no instance pamper the civil employees of the Government and discriminate against every man, woman, and child in the United States who happens by some unfortunate chance not to be on the Government pay roll.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think the Quartermaster's Department and the Supply Division of the Navy Department would be unable to meet this increased demand?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no information on that. Whether they are able or not, it is not right, it is not fair, it is not just, to the rest of the American people, and we ought not under any circumstances to enact such a law.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct about that. I think the Government clerks ought to have better salaries, and I have voted for that. We have also appropriated \$10,000,000 to build them houses to live in here in Washington. I think that is enough. This proposition is to go still further

and give them grub at cut rates—and Congressmen, too. This will, of course, increase the expenses of the Government, and I am opposed to any such socialistic proposition.

Mr. ROSE. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he does not think that the second section of this bill is infinitely worse than the charge that was made that Congressmen had attempted to exempt themselves from taxation?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not going to criticize what Congress did with respect to taxation. I do not believe any Member of Congress ever thought he was voting for a law that did not tax him the same as every other man in the United States was taxed.

Mr. ROSE. They did not; and that is the point I want to bring out.

Mr. MADDEN. But whatever we do here, it ought to be universal. This law ought not to be enacted to give special favors to a special class. The men and women who are on the Government pay roll are receiving high compensation, much higher than the men and women who are working in other lines of industry throughout the United States, and I am against this special legislation.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that while Members of Congress did not any of them knowingly vote to exempt themselves from taxation, if we vote for this we do it with our eyes open.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course. You can not make any excuse at all that you did not know about it. And anyway, regardless of whether you vote for this or not, or whether you know about it or not, every man who is interested in the welfare of the Army of the United States, and who is anxious to promote the successful conduct of the war, and is anxious also to supply the needs of the men who have gone to the front would resent the enactment of any law to place the civil employees of the Government on a par with the soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am opposed to that provision in section 2 which permits Members of Congress to avail themselves of the privilege accorded by this bill. I hope that the motion to strike out the enacting clause will not be adopted, but that when we get to section 2 we may strike out line 10 in so far as it relates to Members of Congress.

It is all right to talk about the employees of the Government being a favored class. They are employees of the Government. They are here from all over the United States. This House has recently raised their salaries for the very purpose that they might live. The House has considered the question with regard to rents, so that profiteers might not take the rest of the money these employees earn.

This bill means nothing else than that the Government has these supplies, has the buildings, can get the extra assistance if it is necessary, and that these men and women who are here, who are as necessary as any other branch of the Government to assist in winning this war, may not be harassed, may not be driven from their homes, may have sufficient things to eat and to wear, and so that all the money you have provided for them may not be taken from them by the profiteer, not only in rents but in clothing, in groceries, and things that they live upon. Can there be any reason why the Government should not supply these things, when it will not cost the Government a cent? They will pay enough in addition to the cost of these things to pay the expense of the extra help; and instead of raising salaries in the Capital of this Nation, and instead of raising more money, you will simply say that these men and women, these girls and young men from all over the United States, may be recognized in their own Capital, and that they may get their money's worth here instead of being simply fleeced.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield now. There can be no argument, except the one that we are treating one class different from the other. These are Government employees. You furnish certain men in the Navy, do you not? You furnish certain men in the Army this right, do you not? Can there be any reason why you should not extend it to the rest of the Government employees in the District of Columbia in order that you may give them the same recognition and consideration?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I can not yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has asked the question himself.

Mr. RAKER. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman from California favor this bill if he knew that the War Department had stated that it was not advisable?

Mr. RAKER. Sure I would.

A MEMBER. Is it a war measure?

Mr. RAKER. No.
Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the gentleman favor it as a war measure?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. That is simple and easy. The trouble is that some gentlemen only look at one side of this. The War Department looks at one side of it, forgetting that there are 20,000 young men and women here whose help must be had, and there seems to me there can be no objection to it.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman think for a minute that the Commissary Department could supply all the employees of the Government at this time?

Mr. RAKER. Of course it could.

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the gentleman think that it has all it can possibly do now?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy your time a minute. I merely want to say that Members of Congress should not be given privileges not extended to everybody else. Surely this provision in the bill should be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, there is a gross misconception as to how this bill will work out. It is for the benefit of the employees of the Government in the District of Columbia, whereby they will be permitted to purchase supplies of the commissary, and exactly the same quantity of goods will come into the District of Columbia, but less of it will come into the hands of the local grocers. More of it will go to the commissary. The Government employees can go to the commissary and purchase at a lesser price than they can purchase of the local grocer. God knows they ought to have the right to do it. I wish the House would remember this one thing, that exactly the same quantity of supplies will come into the District of Columbia to be dealt out among the various employees here. They are now buying from the local grocer, and under this they will purchase of the commissary. The officers of the Army and the Navy who are getting big salaries can buy from the commissary at cost. The United States does not lose one penny by this, and I ask why in the name of common sense a man who is paid less for his work should not have the same privilege?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] showed his temper a little while ago about this legislation and what it results in by moving to strike out the following words, "Who reside in the District of Columbia," so that it would read, if that had been done—

That all officers and employees of the United States shall be permitted to purchase supplies from such commissary stores.

That is what the gentleman desires, but he saw as soon as the House understood it that there was trouble in the air, and he had unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Now, let us see. We are having trouble drafting people to go into the Army. We are commissioning men for the commissary service in the Army and the Navy and appropriating one billion, two billions, and it is said five billions toward financing our allies. We are increasing the salaries of the clerks and others that ought to have been increased in the District of Columbia. Do not you think that it is well enough, with our advances to the allies, with our friend Hoover and his followers and everybody else making regulations, saying what we shall eat and what we shall sell and what we shall produce, issuing licenses—do not you think it is well for us to go a little slower? Good God, let us do the necessary things to win this war and let these employees, who will never smell gunpowder and who are having their salaries increased, in the Postal Service and elsewhere—let us increase the salaries again, if necessary, but let us keep away from socialism in time of war. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that debate on the motion has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the rule:

When general debate is closed by order of the House, any Member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the Member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate has been almost entirely confined to those opposing the bill, except the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has alternated in recognition, and the Chair recalls distinctly that there were two gentlemen recognized who favored the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order on a motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Missouri say to that point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I move that the motion to strike out the enacting clause be laid on the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion can not be made in Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order in Committee of the Whole. The Chair thinks if the point of order is made and insisted upon, clearly under the rule debate has been exhausted.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the point of order is well taken, but I hope the gentleman will not insist upon it. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the committee recommend that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

PATROL DRIVERS, METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 9784) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman calls up the bill H. R. 9784, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan Police Department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

The CHAIRMAN. How much time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. All of the rest of the time, except that reserved by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY], so that that would leave the gentleman nine minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any time of the House. It is a very simple bill, and simply classifies the patrol drivers as patrolmen. Patrol drivers today are not entitled to any of the benefits of the pension act which was passed in the last Congress. If they are classified as patrolmen they will come under the benefits of that act. There are about 22 patrol drivers, and they are sworn officers when called upon to do duties of a patrolman. They work a great many hours more than the patrolmen do. Some of them have been in the service for over 25 years, and all of them for the past 15 years, at least. If they should become crippled or in any way disqualified on account of physical disability they will not be able, as the law now stands, to obtain any of the benefits of the pension act.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Will this increase their salaries?

Mr. WHEELER. Probably \$10 a month.

Mr. COX. I am glad of that.

Mr. WHEELER. I think their salary is about \$90, and this will increase it about \$10. But that is not the object of the bill. It is to bring them under the provisions of the pension act which was passed at the last session of the last Congress.

Mr. MCKENZIE. And this gives the patrol drivers the same status as other members of the police force?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does this bill meet with the approval of the police organization in the city?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; as I understand it. It is unanimously reported favorably from the committee. If these men should become disqualified by physical disabilities, as I said before, so that they could not perform their duties, they would receive none of the benefits of this pension act.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Of course the gentleman understands that when patrol drivers get the status of policemen they get the longevity pay, which they do not get now, which would vastly increase after a few years the compensation given them. The gentleman also knows that the examination which must be taken by a policeman to be able to become a member of the police force is perhaps the most rigid of all the examinations as to physical qualifications, and that is especially interesting to the police on account of the distribution of the fund which is in the nature of a pension to them. Have the policemen themselves, who have contributed for a number of years to this fund,

been consulted about putting all of the patrol drivers on the same basis as they?

Mr. WHEELER. I can not say as to that. I know that some of the employees of the fire department have said that this was a just measure and should be passed; and I also know, and so does the gentleman, that the patrol drivers put in far more time than do the patrolmen themselves. For example, every other Sunday they are on duty 24 hours. They have two shifts, while the patrolmen have three shifts.

Mr. Sisson. I understand; but the other feature of the matter was one that I was anxious to know about—whether the committee had thrashed out the matter. The benefits to which they will be entitled under the law, if it passes, have for a number of years been contributed by the policemen and firemen out of their salaries. The Government finally took charge of it, and it has charge now of the administration of that fund. Since we take the fund, it is in the nature of a trust fund for the benefit of the policemen and the firemen.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not a fact that these patrol drivers are sworn in as officers and have the power to make arrests?

Mr. Sisson. That is true.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. In other words, they can be called upon by the chief at any time to go out and make an arrest?

Mr. Sisson. I am not raising that question. I am raising this question, that the physical qualifications of a man to be a patrol driver are entirely different from the requirements for a patrolman, as to health, and so forth, and if he should become a pensioner on that fund you may put a burden upon these policemen which they ought not to bear. I was simply asking if the policemen themselves and the firemen themselves, who have to stand also an examination, are agreed to this.

Mr. WHEELER. There are a number of patrol drivers that have been in the service longer than the patrolmen have to-day.

Mr. Sisson. That is true, that may be true.

Mr. WHEELER. And on account of old age, they will be displaced in a few years.

Mr. Sisson. I do not think the gentleman understood the point of my inquiry. It was for the purpose of ascertaining whether as a matter of equity you are putting a burden upon the policemen and firemen—

Mr. WHEELER. I think not.

Mr. Sisson. That they ought not to bear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan Police Department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Sisson. Does the gentleman from Illinois know what additional expense that will place upon the Treasury—how much additional salary will be the total amount?

Mr. WHEELER. I should say \$10 a month for the patrol drivers—and I think there are about 22—that will be \$220 a month.

Mr. Sisson. I am inclined to believe the gentleman perhaps states a little too low what the expense will be. I thought perhaps he had the information.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE DEPARTMENT—TWO-PLATOON SYSTEM.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 11231) to regulate the hours of duty of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Sisson. I understand this bill is to be taken up under the five-minute rule and will be discussed by sections. There are several sections in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair takes that for granted, but he has not looked at it.

Mr. Sisson. It is not a very long bill, and I addressed the Chair at the close of the first section.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state I have absolutely no objection to the two-platoon system—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? The bill has not reached consideration under the five-minute rule.

Mr. Sisson. Have not we dispensed with the first reading of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been done.

Mr. Sisson. Then I ask unanimous consent, to save time, to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I have absolutely no objection to the two-platoon system, but I do have objection to arbitrarily in the law divide the firemen into two classes. I think it ought to be left as a matter of administration. Nor do I have any objection to its becoming permanent law, but the two-platoon system ought to be so liberal that the city officials administering the law would not be bound ironclad to two platoons. For instance, some cities have shifts of 8, 12, and 16 hours each. Now, the matter was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, but I do not think really that the law is absolutely necessary, because I think it can be accomplished by increasing the number of firemen, and I will state the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has reported and the full committee will report favorably an increase in the number of firemen to install the two-platoon system. Now, that can be done in several ways. In some cities they have 8, 10, and 16. The District Commissioners want to try out the 10 and 14 so that under this provision a fireman will be on duty 10 hours and off duty 14 hours. Then the other half of the time firemen would be on duty 14 hours and off 10 hours. Now, if this system does not work well the administration ought to have latitude enough to adopt, if they desire to do so, some different hours, for example, 8, 12, or 16. Any time that does not keep the fireman on duty a shorter time than 8 hours or longer than 16 has been the general rule that has prevailed throughout the country. I will say that the subcommittee went into this matter with some degree of care. For that reason I do object to that clause; I do not object to the law, but I would rather leave that more largely to the administration—

Mr. MADDEN. In other words, the gentleman from Mississippi, if I may be allowed, wishes to leave it discretionary with the chief of the fire department as to the hours of duty which the men should work, 8, 10, or what not?

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. I would ask for five minutes more, because I shall say all I want to say during that time, and I perhaps will not consume all of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. I do seriously object at the very outset to tying the hands of the District Commissioners so that they will be compelled arbitrarily to adopt the 10 and 14 hour system. Now, the words "two-platoon" system would perhaps carry or convey the idea that that is what it means, but it does not necessarily mean that.

Mr. VAN DYKE. In the first section of the bill it says, "which shall be designated as a day force and a night force."

Mr. Sisson. That is all right, I do not object to that in the shifting of the day force and the night force if we were to leave it discretionally with the administration to determine whether they should have them divided into three divisions—

Mr. VAN DYKE. Two divisions.

Mr. Sisson. That is generally what is meant by the two-platoon system, and we went into the matter with some degree of care in the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe the law is necessary to install it at all. I think the only thing necessary to do is to give the District Commissioners the number of firemen necessary to install that system. Now, you talk to some firemen about it and they will tell you that frequently they would rather have an eight-hour shift to-day so that they might have 16 hours at some other time, therefore the details of it can be worked out by administration. They never let a man work less than 8 hours except for special reasons and never force him to stay at the engine house longer than 16 hours, so some cities have 8, 12, and 16, so it is suggested by the addition of about a third, or 33½ per cent, to the number of firemen the fireman has an opportunity to remain with his family at least 8 hours a day.

Mr. VAN DYKE. Would you have any objection to so changing the first section that it would provide for two platoons,

but that the two platoons should either be in the 16 or 8, 14 and 10, or 12 and 12? What I object to is three shifts during the day. That brings one man 16 hours a day.

Mr. Sisson. If you go far enough into it it may be that this man, for a certain time, through the chief of the fire department, might for a special reason desire to have 16 hours off. It simply gives more latitude, and I think makes it more serviceable to the men and more serviceable to good administration. I have no objection to the two-platoon system being installed, because you are always going to have practically the same number of men on duty all the time.

Mr. VAN DYKE. Providing for a day and night force?

Mr. Sisson. I do not object to that at all. I think our committee agreed unanimously that the so-called two-platoon system was a matter of humanity as well as of getting more efficient service out of the fire department.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. MASON. The two-platoon system is the system which has worked so successfully in the city of Chicago, and I can not yet gather from what the gentleman has said—and perhaps it is my fault and probably is—in what way we could improve this.

Mr. Sisson. Because the law arbitrarily says there shall be only two divisions of them—the day and night shifts—working 10 hours and 14 hours. You see you absolutely crystallize it, and take from the commissioners and the fire department all discretion as to any other change in the hours that the men shall work.

Mr. MASON. I will say to the gentleman that, as I understand it, this two-platoon system, as applied in the cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Chicago, has worked very satisfactorily.

Mr. Sisson. I do not believe the gentleman was here when I began my remarks. The subcommittee on appropriations—

Mr. MASON. Yes; I heard them.

Mr. Sisson (continuing). Having charge of appropriating money, were convinced, as is the District Committee, that the two-platoon system is right and ought to be installed in the District of Columbia. But the only difference between my position and that taken by the committee is that I thought, as a matter of administration, they ought to have more leeway in fixing hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has again expired. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the hours of duty of the day force shall be 10 hours; the hours of the night force shall be 14 hours: *Provided*, That once or more every two weeks, for the purpose of alternating the day force with the night force, and vice versa, the number of hours of duty herein stated may be exceeded: *Provided further*, That one force shall be at liberty at all times except as otherwise provided in section 4 of this act.

Mr. Sisson. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we can perhaps agree so as to leave it in the discretion of the District Commissioners to fix the hours, provided they have the two shifts—the day shift and the night shift. I think we can perhaps agree on an amendment that might cure the condition. And I will say to the Chair that this morning is the first time I have seen the bill—

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is taking that up, may I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the subject of the two-platoon system?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Now, as to section 2, on the first page of the bill, I think if you will strike out the whole section it will leave it then absolutely within the discretion of the District Commissioners to fix those hours. You see the day force and the night force will alternate.

Mr. VAN DYKE. I wish to bring the gentleman's attention to line 4, where it says "that one force shall be at liberty at all times." That is an important part of the bill.

Mr. Sisson. My attention had not been called to that. I have no objection to that clause, except that in the event of a disastrous fire—

Mr. VAN DYKE. That is provided for in section 4.

Mr. MASON. That is provided for.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move we amend by striking out all of section 2, beginning on line 10, page 1, with the words "That the hours of duty," down to and including the words "Provided further," which occur on line 4, page 2; so that section 2 shall read:

That one force shall be at liberty at all times, except as otherwise provided in section 4 of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sisson: On page 1, line 10, after the figure "2," strike out all the language down to and including the word "further," on page 2, line 4, so that section 2 will read: "That one force shall be at liberty at all times, except as otherwise provided in section 4 of this act."

Mr. VAN DYKE. Mr. Chairman, I agree to that amendment.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are directed to appoint a sufficient number of men and officers in addition to the existing force to carry out the objects of this act.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill a question. How many additional firemen will this two-platoon organization require to be employed in the District of Columbia?

Mr. VAN DYKE. About 30 per cent.

Mr. Sisson. I can give you the exact figures. It will take 144 additional firemen and two additional officers. You understand that they have got all the force now on two shifts; that is, the officers; so by adding, practically, as the gentleman says, 30 per cent it will be 144 new firemen. It may seem strange to gentlemen that—

Mr. ROBBINS. Does not that seem like an enormous increase in the number of firemen?

Mr. Sisson. Not when you remember that you have in the neighborhood of 400 firemen in the service now. Every fireman has 3 hours off each day and is on duty 21 hours. He then has every fifth day and a half off. Therefore by catching up the three hours a day on each fireman, catching up the 24 hours and a little more each day in the week, and catching up half a day, it will amount to such a number of hours as that when you divide it into two forces it is only necessary that you keep one less fireman on duty than under the present system, and that fireman can be placed in the day shift instead of the night shift. In other words, I was very much surprised when I worked it out to find out that you can get two forces, one at night and one in the day, by adding 30 per cent.

Mr. ROBBINS. Right along that line, I do not see in the report of the committee any indication of how the firemen regard this and how the Commissioners of the District of Columbia regard this bill. Has it been submitted to them?

Mr. Sisson. They favor it.

Mr. VAN DYKE. It should be remembered that we are building millions of dollars' worth of additional buildings in the District of Columbia, and it will take more firemen to protect those buildings.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am simply seeking information, not being on the District Committee. But it strikes me that the first persons to be consulted about this would be the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the firemen. They have not expressed any approval, have they?

Mr. Sisson. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia were heard before our committee, and they were a unit in favor of it, and all the firemen were a unit on it. I was surprised at the situation when it was presented in the committee. Nearly all cities that have an up-to-date system have the two-platoon system. I was amazed when I found that many of these firemen for practically a week would never be able to see their families. They would live at some distance from the fire-engine house and be away for practically five days without being home.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am not opposed to this bill, but there is one other question that I would like to ask. How much additional cost to the District of Columbia will this be, either by the month or by the year, if this is put in force?

Mr. Sisson. I could tell exactly if I had before me the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. It will cost in a year \$150,000. My recollection is that it will cost about \$158,400.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the commissioners are all in favor of this bill. They are in favor of the two-platoon system.

Mr. ROBBINS. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman. I have obtained the information I desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That the provisions of this act shall not act as a repeal of any act or acts, or part or parts of any act or acts, and shall not annul, modify, or affect any city ordinance, or part or parts thereof, relating to the salaries, annual leave or vacation, sick or disability leave of absence of the officers and members of the fire-fighting force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CROSSER. Just for one minute, to urge the passage of the bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. I make the same request, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, after the word "that," insert the words "except as herein provided."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN DYKE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill as amended be laid aside with favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the bill as amended be laid aside with favorable recommendation. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PROBATION SYSTEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I now call up the bill H. R. 10891.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10891) to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia, approved June 25, 1910, be amended and reenacted by striking out of section 1 of said act the following words: "and one assistant probation officer at a salary of \$1,200 per annum," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "and two assistant probation officers at a salary of \$1,200 each, and one stenographer and typist at a salary of \$1,200 per annum," so that said section 1 of said act when so amended shall read:

"That the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in general term may appoint one probation officer, at a salary of \$1,800 per annum, and as many volunteer assistant probation officers, male or female, as occasion may require; and that the police court of the District of Columbia may appoint one chief probation officer, at a salary of \$1,500 per annum, and two assistant probation officers, at a salary of \$1,200 each, and one stenographer and typist, at a salary of \$1,200 per annum, and as many volunteer assistant probation officers, male or female, as occasion may require.

"All such probation officers and assistants shall be appointed for a term of two years, and may be removed by the respective courts appointing them. All such volunteer probation officers shall serve without compensation, and shall have such powers and perform such duties as may be assigned to them by said courts."

That section 5 of said act be amended by striking out of said section the words "five thousand dollars" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "eight thousand dollars," so that said section when so amended shall read:

"Sec. 5. That the chief probation officer of each court shall be entitled, for himself and his assistants, to a room in the building occupied by that court, and all necessary stationery and supplies for the transaction of the business of his office; and all the probation officers except volunteer officers shall be entitled to their necessary expenses in performing the duties of their office, under the direction of the court, the amount of the expense for such stationery, supplies, and expenses to be fixed and allowed by the court upon proper vouchers submitted to it by the probation officers, and accounts duly verified by their oaths; and for the purpose of this act there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$8,000, one half to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman from Colorado moves that the bill be laid aside with favorable recommendation. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

SPUR TRACK ACROSS FIRST STREET NE.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill S. 3476.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted the Surgeon General of the United States Army to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary single-track overhead siding across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the building or buildings in square 673, occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army: *Provided,* That the siding herein authorized shall not extend westwardly beyond a point 569 feet and 9 inches east of the present site of Sibley Hospital or any of its buildings, and shall be limited to the use of the Medical Department of the United States Army; and within six months following the declaration of peace the Surgeon General shall cause said side track to be entirely removed from the limits of said street and shall cause the aforesaid street to be restored to its condition prior to the construction of the siding without cost to the District of Columbia.

The Surgeon General of the Army shall provide for the construction, maintenance, and removal of this siding as herein authorized and prescribed, and the costs thereof shall be defrayed from the appropriations for the Medical and Hospital Department of the United States Army: *Provided further,* That said track shall be used only between the hours of 6 o'clock a. m. and 9 o'clock p. m. except in cases of extreme emergency, and trains shall be operated with the least possible noise.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, this is the Senate bill that has been asked for, as stated before by me, by the Surgeon General, for the purpose of extending a spur track to the medical supply depot. Hearings were had in the Senate, and the bill was reported and passed unanimously.

The objection made to it was made by some officers of a very worthy institution known as a hospital, because they feared it would be a permanent fixture there; and so the House committee, in order to remove any question as to permanency, recommended the amendment, as shown in the report, that it should be used simply during the war and 30 days thereafter.

Now, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILLIARD] was recommended in the House committee and should be offered as a committee amendment, as I understand it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I just came in. It may be that the necessity of the bill was explained before, but I did not hear it.

Mr. MASON. Yes. It is an urgent necessity. It really ought to have been passed at once. The Government of the United States has a supply depot for all of the medical and surgical supplies that are received here for distribution throughout the country. The estimated loss is several hundred dollars a day to the Government. They are paying \$300 for drayage a day, and that could be saved if this track were extended over the street. In addition to that, in addition to the saving of the money, there is a necessity of having quick distribution of the medical supplies that are sent here. Then they are divided up and distributed among the different hospitals and cantonments.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How close does it go to this hospital?

Mr. MASON. The committee were unanimous in the opinion that it did not injure the hospital at all. We had hearings upon that, and there was no evidence either before the Senate committee or before the House committee that it would in any way interfere with the hospital.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I will ask the gentleman if this is a proposition to lay a spur track so that they can run the supplies right to the supply depot without having to cart them at all?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. So that they can run them there in the railroad cars?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. This supply depot is sending carloads of supplies every week to European hospitals, is it not?

Mr. MASON. Yes; the Surgeon General himself came and urged the immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask the gentleman whether or not subsequent to these hearings the governors of this hospital withdrew their objection?

Mr. MASON. I do not understand that they have formally withdrawn their objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the committee are satisfied that it will be of no real injury to the hospital?

Mr. MASON. Yes; it is clearly of no possible damage to the hospital; but for fear it might be we provided that it should continue only during the war.

Mr. FESS. As I understand there has been an investigation made, very largely in the interest of the hospital, to ascertain

whether it would interfere with the hospital, and that a report has been made that it will not seriously interfere.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. FESS. However, I understand that the governors of the hospital have not withdrawn their objection.

Mr. MASON. I do not understand that they have withdrawn their objection. I did understand that their main objection was for fear that it might be a permanent improvement there.

Mr. FESS. I will say that I have had an unusual number of protests, coming, as is usually the case, from persons who have been written to, and who have been asked to protest against this particular movement, and I was interested to ascertain the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBBINS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to say to him that from my own investigation I am satisfied in my own mind that we ought to offer this measure of relief, and I shall therefore vote for the bill, although I would have hesitated to do so if you had not put this limitation in the bill, because I am greatly interested in seeing that property retain its value.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have received a great many protests against this proposed siding in by this hospital, stating that the hospital has been an institution there for 30 years, and that there is no necessity of the Government establishing a warehouse right up near to it and then running a railroad siding in by the hospital to the warehouse.

Mr. MASON. It does not run by it. If the gentleman had visited the location, or had seen a photograph as we have, he would not pay one moment's attention to that. It can not possibly interfere with the hospital, and we want to distribute the medicines promptly to the soldiers here and elsewhere.

Mr. ROBBINS. Was it necessary to establish the warehouse in that particular place?

Mr. MASON. The warehouse depot was rented, and it was stated before the committee that it is the only available place which the Surgeon General could secure for it at that time.

Mr. ROBBINS. These protests have come to me, and I am seeking information. The protests came to me in this form, that this Lucy Webb Hayes Hospital, established as a memorial to Mrs. Hayes, wife of a former President, some 30 years ago, was in a suitable neighborhood, properly located, properly cared for, and the United States came in and without any very great reason established a supply depot right alongside of it.

Mr. MASON. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. ROBBINS. And now seeks to run this railroad right in by it.

Mr. MASON. I wish I had the photograph. If the gentleman would take the time to read the report which I have made—

Mr. ROBBINS. I have read the report on this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? I think I may be able—

Mr. ROBBINS. I merely want to be sure about this. Many of my constituents have protested earnestly against this proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to say that I have also had a number of protests, among them one from a prominent Methodist minister of my district, and to him I made a full statement of the conditions, of the bill in its present form, and of the existing circumstances. He submitted that statement to a board of his church, and thereupon he wrote to me stating that in view of present conditions they did not press further opposition. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate his letter in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

FIRST METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
EAST DETROIT DISTRICT,
Romeo, Mich., April 3, 1918.

Representative L. C. CRAMTON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your communications regarding the matter of extension of the railroad approaching the Sibley Hospital.

I submitted the correspondence to the conference board of the Woman's Home Missionary Society, who are especially interested in the case. They went carefully over the whole matter and are satis-

fied that the best that can be done has been done, and they direct me to convey to you their sincere and hearty appreciation and thanks for your interest in the matter.

To this permit me to add my personal thanks.

Cordially,

W. M. WARD.

Mr. LITTLE. May I have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the gentleman indicate what change has been made in this bill that would make a change in the opinion of the gentleman to whom he refers? A very distinguished Methodist bishop has written me in accordance with the objections which have been expressed here. Now, if there has been some change made in the bill, I would like to know what it is.

Mr. MASON. The Senate bill provided that the track could be used only during the period of the war and for six months after, and that then the track should be taken up. In order to satisfy the wish of the reverend gentlemen who appeared before us the committee reduced that time by putting in an amendment saying that it could only be used for 30 days after the war. We supposed that was satisfactory; that they were patriotic and wanted to help us get the medicine to the soldiers; and we have heard nothing further from it. All of this propaganda of protest was made before the Senate passed the bill. As soon as it came to us we had the facts investigated. We had before the committee the health officers and prominent physicians and the heads of medical institutions of the city of Washington, and they said that it could not in any possible way injure this hospital.

Mr. LITTLE. Do I understand that some of the preachers interested in this have been satisfied by the committee that the present bill contains nothing for them to criticize?

Mr. MASON. I do not make such a statement, because I do not know. One stated that if they could be assured that it would not be a permanent thing, but simply a war measure to help the Government to distribute medical supplies, they would not object. Ever since the amendment known as the Hilliard amendment has been agreed to I have heard nothing further.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understood the gentleman to say that this is only a war measure.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the track will be taken up in 30 days after peace is declared.

Mr. MASON. No one can use it after peace is declared, and the tracks will be taken up in 30 days.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the putting in of these tracks constitute a nuisance to the patients in the hospital?

Mr. MASON. No; if it would, I would ask that the Government move its warehouses. There has not been a single member of the committee who has visited the place or a single health officer from the city of Washington but what says that it would not interfere with the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBBINS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit? There are important reasons why this bill should be laid aside at this time, and I will ask the gentleman to withhold that request for the time being.

Mr. MASON. I would like to have this amendment adopted, and then the committee can order a favorable report upon the bill and we will be through.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. On page 2, line 3, after the word "Army," insert the words "and for the period preceding the declaration of peace and 30 days thereafter." This is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Army," insert the following: "and for the period preceding the declaration of peace and 30 days thereafter."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the committee should now rise and the House should proceed with other business, requiring probably 30 or 40 minutes, and the House should again resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District matters, would this be the first business taken up?

The CHAIRMAN. When the District of Columbia business is again resumed this would be the unfinished business and the first in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this will take two minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the word "and" in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should be stricken from his amendment.

Mr. MASON. That is correct, and I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the first word, "and." The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Army," insert the following: "for the period preceding the declaration of peace and 30 days thereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill as amended be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bills under consideration to which amendments have been adopted, and those without amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration sundry bills, and had directed him to report back bill H. R. 10894, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill; that bills H. R. 9784 and 10891 be passed without amendment; that the bill H. R. 11231 be passed with an amendment, and the bill S. 3476 be passed with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bills and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on the bill (H. R. 10894) permitting certain persons to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy, striking out the enacting clause.

The question was taken, and the enacting clause was stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill (H. R. 9784) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

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

On motion of Mr. WHEELER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The next question is on the amendment to the bill (H. R. 11231) to regulate the hours of duty of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The next question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill (H. R. 10891) to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My Speaker, I move that the several votes by which the bills were passed be reconsidered and that that motion lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

SILVER COINAGE (H. REPT. NO. 505).

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 317.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole of Senate bill 4292 as the same passed the Senate. The

Clerk shall read the said bill as the same passed the Senate, and at the conclusion of such reading the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the same to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 4292) to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized from time to time to melt or break up and to sell as bullion not in excess of 350,000,000 standard silver dollars now or hereafter held in the Treasury of the United States. Any silver certificates which may be outstanding against such standard silver dollars so melted or broken up shall be retired at the rate of \$1 face amount of such certificates for each standard silver dollar so melted or broken up. Sales of such bullion shall be made at such prices not less than \$1 per ounce of silver 1,000 fine and upon such terms as shall be established from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 2. That upon every such sale of bullion from time to time the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately direct the Director of the Mint to purchase in the United States, of the product of mines situated in the United States, and of reduction works so located, an amount of silver equal to 371.25 grains of pure silver in respect of every standard silver dollar so melted or broken up and sold as bullion. Such purchases shall be made in accordance with the then existing regulations of the mint and at the fixed price of \$1 per ounce of silver 1,000 fine, delivered at the option of the Director of the Mint at New York, Philadelphia, Denver, or San Francisco. Such silver so purchased may be resold for any of the purposes hereinafter specified in section 3 of this act, under rules and regulations to be established by the Secretary of the Treasury, and any excess of such silver so purchased over and above the requirements for such purposes shall be coined into standard silver dollars or held for the purpose of such coinage, and silver certificates shall be issued to the amount of such coinage. The net amount of silver so purchased, after making allowance for all resales, shall not exceed at any one time the amount needed to coin an aggregate number of standard silver dollars equal to the aggregate number of standard silver dollars theretofore melted or broken up and sold as bullion under the provisions of this act, but such purchases of silver shall continue until the net amount of silver so purchased, after making allowance for all resales, shall be sufficient to coin therefrom an aggregate number of standard silver dollars equal to the aggregate number of standard silver dollars theretofore so melted or broken up and sold as bullion.

Sec. 3. That sales of silver bullion under authority of this act may be made for the purpose of conserving the existing stock of gold in the United States, of facilitating the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States, of providing silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use, and of assisting foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States. The allocation of any silver to the Director of the Mint for subsidiary coinage shall, for the purposes of this act, be regarded as a sale or resale.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse the Treasurer of the United States for the difference between the nominal or face value of all standard silver dollars so melted or broken up and the value of the silver bullion, at \$1 per ounce of silver 1,000 fine, resulting from the melting or breaking up of such standard silver dollars.

Sec. 5. That in order to prevent contraction of the currency, the Federal reserve banks may be either permitted or required by the Federal Reserve Board, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue Federal reserve bank notes, in any denominations (including denominations of \$1 and \$2) authorized by the Federal Reserve Board, in an aggregate amount not exceeding the amount of standard silver dollars melted or broken up and sold as bullion under authority of this act, upon deposit as provided by law by the Treasurer of the United States as security therefor, of United States certificates of indebtedness, or of United States one-year gold notes. The Secretary of the Treasury may, at his option, extend the time of payment of any maturing United States certificates of indebtedness deposited as security for such Federal reserve bank notes for any period not exceeding one year at any one extension and may, at his option, pay such certificates of indebtedness prior to maturity, whether or not so extended. The deposit of United States certificates of indebtedness by Federal reserve banks as security for Federal reserve bank notes under authority of this act shall be deemed to constitute an agreement on the part of the Federal reserve bank making such deposit that the Secretary of the Treasury may so extend the time of payment of such certificates of indebtedness beyond the original maturity date or beyond any maturity date to which such certificates of indebtedness may have been extended, and that the Secretary of the Treasury may pay such certificates in advance of maturity, whether or not so extended.

Sec. 6. That as and when standard silver dollars shall be coined out of bullion purchased under authority of this act, the Federal reserve banks shall be required by the Federal Reserve Board to retire Federal reserve bank notes issued under authority of section 5 of this act, if then outstanding, in an amount equal to the amount of standard silver dollars so coined, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay off and cancel any United States certificates of indebtedness deposited as security for Federal reserve bank notes so retired.

Sec. 7. That the tax on any Federal reserve bank notes issued under authority of this act, secured by the deposit of United States certificates of indebtedness or United States one-year gold notes, shall be so adjusted that the net return on such certificates of indebtedness, or such one-year gold notes, calculated on the face value thereof, shall be equal to the net return on United States 2 per cent bonds, used to secure Federal reserve bank notes, after deducting the amount of the tax upon such Federal reserve bank notes so secured.

Sec. 8. That except as herein provided, Federal reserve bank notes issued under authority of this act shall be subject to all existing provisions of law relating to Federal reserve bank notes.

SEC. 9. That the provisions of Title VII of an act approved June 15, 1917, entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the powers conferred upon the President by subsection (b) of section 5 of an act approved October 6, 1917, known as the "trading-with-the-enemy act," shall, in so far as applicable to the exportation from or shipment from or taking out of the United States of silver coin or silver bullion, continue until the net amount of silver required by section 2 of this act shall have been purchased as therein provided.

At the conclusion of the reading of the first section of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] whether it is intended—

The SPEAKER. The rule provides that the bill shall be read.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] have 10 minutes and that some gentleman upon the other side have 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] have 15 minutes and that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] have 15 minutes.

Mr. POU. I accept the modification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] have 15 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] have 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the motion that I made to strike out the last word, in view of the provisions of the rule, would not now be in order?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. MADDEN. I was simply going to ask the gentleman from Virginia to explain certain things in the bill.

Mr. GLASS. That is what I shall try to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the bill ought to be read through under the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, after the bill is read through is it subject to amendment in any section?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will conclude the reading of the bill.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state his opinion about this rule. It is all clear except the provision that we shall proceed in the House as in Committee of the Whole. That means, undoubtedly, it would have to be read under the five-minute rule. The House has already granted 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES]. That seems to be in the nature of general debate. The Chair thinks it is the duty under the rule, after these gentlemen have used 30 minutes, to have the bill read for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, that was altogether foreign to the purpose of the Committee on Rules and to the understanding that I had with the committee when I asked for the rule.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, may I direct the Chair's attention to the fact that upon the completion of the reading of the bill, under the rule, the previous question shall be considered as ordered? If that be the effect of the rule, certainly amendments would not be in order after the previous question is ordered under the five-minute rule, because the rule further goes on to say that there shall be only one motion in order, and that a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was called from the Chamber temporarily for a moment, but do I understand the Speaker to hold that under the rule the bill would have to be read for amendment under the five-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. That is the rule that applies to proceedings in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of the House be waived in this instance.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I may be in error about it, but I think that rule applies in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union but not when we are considering a bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a suggestion that will clear it all up, and that is that consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule be waived. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair is mistaken as to unanimous consent having been granted to the

gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from California to speak. I do not think the Record will show that the matter was actually submitted and allowed.

The SPEAKER. If there be an oversight in that respect the Chair will put the request again.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it was the intention of the Committee on Rules when this rule was agreed to that the Chairman would move the previous question. That would leave 20 minutes on a side, to be divided among those who desired to discuss the bill, and upon the conclusion of that discussion the bill should be read and passed, the previous question being considered as ordered, thus avoiding the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule as suggested by the Speaker. After the rule was agreed to, and the bill taken up by direction of the Speaker and ordered read, it occurred to me that the debate agreed upon should be had, and it was for that reason that I suggested to the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that a request be preferred for unanimous consent for 30 minutes of debate, as indicated.

The SPEAKER. The way the matter stands, then, is that the gentleman from Illinois suggested, and the House adopted his suggestion, that debate under the five-minute rule be waived. Now, the Chair is reasonably certain that he put this 15-minute request, but in order to be certain he will put it again. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I find that there is no report accompanying this bill. I do not know how gentlemen in the House are informed about the bill—

Mr. GLASS. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois there is a report, the original of which is at the desk, and a copy of which has been furnished the Public Printer, and he promised to have the printed report here by 3 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON. I am just taking for granted this bill is all right, having been passed by the Senate and being reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and I have great confidence in the chairman and in that committee; but frankly I expect I have been busy about something else, and I declare I have not even read the bill.

Mr. GLASS. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. CANNON. I would like for a full explanation to be made, and if the 15 minutes is not enough let the gentleman proceed until he has fully explained the bill.

Mr. GLASS. I think perhaps I shall be able to explain it in less than 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To ask if the gentleman objects to having the report read. He says it is at the Speaker's desk. It is a short report.

The SPEAKER. The printer has it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understood the report was here. If it is available, why not have it read. It may save a great deal of concern about the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I understand it has gone to the printer.

The SPEAKER. The report is in the hands of the printer and will be here in 10 minutes—the printed copy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is such an unusual proceeding and such an unusual bill—

Mr. GLASS. I think I can explain the bill in less time than it would require to read the report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] that they come in front of the Speaker's stand and explain what they have got to explain, so that Members can hear them, and if in the meantime the report arrives and it is desired to have it read it can be read.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman suggests the absence of a quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of no quorum, and the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, when this measure was originally drawn some months ago it was designed to meet and overcome the difficulty that had arisen in our foreign-trade relations, involving a rather serious discrimination against this country in the matter of foreign exchange. Importers of many necessary articles were subject to great loss by reason of the depreciation of the American dollar in neutral countries in Europe and Asia, particularly in Spain and the Scandinavian nations as to Europe, and in the Orient, India and China. In that view it was not an emergency measure. It was confidently expected that the

committee would have ample time to examine the questions involved, should it be thought desirable to consider the bill at all, and discuss them thoroughly. But within the last 10 days circumstances, of which I am not at liberty to speak in detail, have arisen which make action by Congress imperative. For that reason the bill, by unanimous action of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the other body, was presented to the Senate and, without division, passed. It was taken up for consideration on Friday and Saturday of last week by the House Committee on Banking and Currency and, at an exceptionally largely attended meeting, unanimously ordered to be reported to the House.

In our trade relations with the Orient, and particularly with India, we are put to the necessity of paying our balances in metal, and, on account of the large importations of jute, burlap, and other materials used in the handling and distribution of our crops, we are obliged to meet a large exchange balance, to our very great disadvantage. It shall be necessary for this country to ship to India, for the next ensuing 16 months at least, about \$100,000,000 of gold to meet our importations, or otherwise to do what this bill proposes to do, borrow from the Treasury the only available stock of silver in the world at this time and ship it to India to meet trade balances. It is not necessary to say to the House that, gold being our primary money, every dollar of it that we shall export circumscribes our ability to meet the extraordinary commercial requirements of our own country at this time.

In short, if we do not pass this bill immediately we may be put to the necessity of shipping gold rather than silver to India. I transgress no propriety and reveal nothing that should not be disclosed to the House when I say that the governor of the Federal Reserve Board stated to the committee that the board had already felt obliged to give the large importers of jute, burlap, and other materials, which we are obliged to have, the assurance that if something of this sort should not be done immediately by Congress the Federal reserve banks would assure them the gold necessary to meet trade balances. The bill provides that there shall be a retirement, gradual or immediate, as circumstances may require, of \$350,000,000 of outstanding silver certificates; and as those silver certificates are retired a like amount of the silver coin in the Treasury held as a cover for the silver certificates will be broken up and melted into silver bullion and sold by the Secretary of the Treasury to meet foreign exchange exigencies and to avert serious trouble in India. The Congress knows that India uses not exclusively, but almost exclusively, silver as its metallic currency. Any deficiency, if any, in the circulating medium that may be occasioned by the gradual or speedy retirement of \$350,000,000 of silver certificates is to be met by the issuance, under authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, of what is known as Federal reserve bank notes, based on short-time gold certificates and notes of the United States.

When the emergency shall have passed or the war ended, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase an equivalent amount of silver to that which may be utilized in this transaction to replace the silver thus loaned to the British Government and used for foreign exchange purposes by the recoinage of a like amount of silver dollars, upon which may be issued a like amount of silver certificates.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman have any objection to my asking a question right there?

Mr. GLASS. Not at all.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the interest rate charged on the rediscouts based on these certificates be sufficiently high to compensate the Government for the cost of recoinage?

Mr. GLASS. We think so. It is upon that theory that the bill is drawn.

Mr. MADDEN. And it is a higher rate than is usually charged on what we rediscout.

Mr. GLASS. That is true. There will be no trouble about the retirement of these Federal reserve bank notes when the emergency shall have passed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The gentleman stated that there would be a trade balance of \$100,000,000 in the next 16 months between this country and India. That accounts for \$100,000,000. Why the other \$250,000,000?

Mr. GLASS. The other \$250,000,000 is to meet foreign exchange accounts with other countries and especially is to be used to counter an exigency that vitally affects our allies in the conduct of this war. Just in the degree that it vitally affects them it vitally affects us. I will read to the House a telegram that was sent to me from Deming, N. Mex., while I was absent from the city attending the funeral of my late colleague, Mr. JONES, by Secretary McAdoo, in which he says:

"A war emergency of the utmost urgency makes the prompt passage of the Pittman bill imperative. I commend this subject earnestly to the consideration of yourself and your associates on your committee. Will you please permit Assistant Secretary Leffingwell to lay before you my views about this matter?"

"WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
"Secretary of the Treasury."

Upon my return I—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is just as well to be frank with the House. We are considering the bill under a rule, as it comes from another body. During the discussion over there this was said:

I know that the situation in India is critical and that this bill is to relieve that situation. England must have more silver to meet her obligations to India, and India wants silver. There is only one great reserve of silver in the world to-day, and it is found in the Treasury of the United States, and that reservoir of silver must be opened and hastened to India in order to relieve the existing conditions.

Is that statement correct?

Mr. GLASS. That states the case in a nutshell. That statement, or a statement similar to that, was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, who spoke briefly to the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a situation affecting our allies at least equally with the United States?

Mr. GLASS. It is a situation we are obliged to meet. It is rather distressing to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to feel compelled to bring to the House a measure all of the details of which he is not at liberty to discuss fully and to ask the House upon its faith in him and his associates of the committee, acting as a unit, to accept the bill, but that is precisely the situation.

Upon my return to Washington on Saturday I found that the Committee on Banking and Currency had had a meeting and such hearings as were possible. In addition I personally made inquiry in every responsible quarter and satisfied myself that there was nothing else to do but to pass the Senate bill if we would avert trouble. To reassure the House even more fully, if I can, I present this letter, sent to me by the President under date of April 21:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 21, 1918.

HON. CARTER GLASS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GLASS: I am taking the liberty of writing you to ask if the early report and passage of the silver bill will be possible. Circumstances have arisen which make the passage of this bill a genuine war emergency; otherwise I would not suggest so immediate action upon it. The circumstances, however, are pressing, and, I beg you to believe, justify me in making this request. I believe that you have been informed from the Treasury Department just what the exigency is.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman may have such further time as he and the House may desire in order to complete his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may have such time as he may desire in order to complete his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GLASS. I will say to the House that I have no desire to proceed further. If I have not made the matter clear, I will be glad to answer any question that I can answer. But I do not desire to proceed any further with any general statement.

Mr. FOCHT. Before the gentleman retires, I would like to ask this question: It occurred to me when he was addressing the House and when he stated that this was for the relief of an ally, whether, rather than to deplete the Treasury of the silver reserve, it would not be possible for England to commandeer the jute in India, just as we commandeer any commodity in this country?

Mr. GLASS. My inquiry into the subject in all its aspects leads me to believe that this proposal is the only immediate remedy that may be applied to the situation.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances I should be opposing this bill very strenuously on several grounds. If the country were not in this war and the present emergency were not upon us, I should regard this bill as a piece of economic and financial folly.

There are several things in it that, if it were in my power, I would change. I would amend it radically, but from the information that has been conveyed to the members of the com-

mittee by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Federal Reserve Board, some of which information has been stated already by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], I conclude that this is not only an emergency measure but a matter of the greatest urgency. I therefore feel it to be my bounden duty to support it as it is, since under the rule just adopted it can not be amended.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. I will.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It comes to us rather suddenly here. I want to inquire if there is any evidence before your committee as to whether or not England knew of this exigency for some time and considered it before this was sprung on the United States?

Mr. HAYES. England has known for some time that she had out obligations, of course, but she was not familiar, and the world has not been made familiar, and is not now familiar, and it is not desirable that it should become familiar, with the dangers that lurk in the immediate future.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Did England take any steps to relieve this situation?

Mr. HAYES. Certainly; all the steps that were possible. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has stated, the United States has the only great supply of silver that is in the world.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I saw a statement in the paper this morning, and I think it would be fair that the gentleman should know of it, to the effect that in this transaction there is a speculation of over \$70,000,000 by bankers of England. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. HAYES. I know nothing about that. I want to say that under ordinary circumstances I should insist upon acting upon my own judgment and experience, after many years of study of financial questions; but under the present circumstances, when the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States comes to me and says, "The passage of this bill is a most vital war necessity," I sink my own judgment and my own feeling in the matter and yield to his urgent request as if it were a command. [Applause.] Although the circumstances surrounding this emergency have been quite fully explained to the members of the committee, many other things are doubtless known to the President that he is not at liberty to explain to the members of the committee; necessarily information must be open to him that he could not disclose to us.

I do not know that I care to discuss at any length the provisions of the bill. The gentleman from Virginia has explained them perhaps sufficiently. It is not intended by this measure to contract the currency at all. As fast as the silver is disposed of and the silver certificates withdrawn from circulation, other forms of currency will take their place. As fast as the Secretary of the Treasury can purchase the silver, he is not only authorized, but he is directed, to purchase and recoin and replace the silver which for the time being is taken out of the Treasury and sent abroad, so that this bill will not affect the volume of the currency nor the silver element in our currency permanently at all.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. HAYES. I yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says it will not affect the currency, the amount of money in circulation. What is to be placed back of the Federal reserve notes that are to be issued in place of the silver certificates when the silver is gone?

Mr. HAYES. United States certificates of indebtedness with a 5 per cent gold redemption fund, like the national bank currency.

Mr. GLASS. I may say to my colleague just at this point that we regard it as very much better to place United States gold certificates behind these Federal reserve banks than to place United States bonds behind them, because we wanted to avoid going back to the old system of a bond-secured currency.

Mr. HAYES. Of course, it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. GLASS. It does.

Mr. HAYES. But it is only a temporary expedient.

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

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman state that the certificates may become due in one year?

Mr. HAYES. Yes; they are due in one year, but they may be extended under the terms of the bill.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is all this amount to be placed to the credit of the United States?

Mr. HAYES. Is this amount to be placed to the credit of the United States? I do not know that I understand what the gentleman means.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The bill is advancing a credit of \$350,000,000?

Mr. HAYES. Yes. The Government will own the silver, of course, as soon as the silver certificates are retired. The silver in the Treasury now is in the nature of a trust fund, owned by the owners of the certificates.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. When we ship this silver out how shall we get it back again?

Mr. HAYES. We shall not get it back.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We must get a credit. Are we getting an equal amount of credit for the silver?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. We sell the silver bullion?

Mr. HAYES. Yes. We sell the silver and use it largely to pay our debts. We are in the same condition as a man who owes Tom, Dick, and Harry, and has his chest full of silver and gold. He takes his choice as to whether he will pay in silver or gold. In this case we may pay either in silver or gold, and we prefer to pay in the former coin. Because it will enable us to hold on to our gold is one reason why I am willing to support this bill. If we do not use the silver we have in this emergency, we must part with some of our gold.

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

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I notice that the purchases of silver are to be made according to existing regulations at the Mint and at the fixed price of \$1 per ounce of silver. How is that price of \$1 per ounce arrived at?

Mr. HAYES. Silver was worth in New York City on Saturday 96 cents and a fraction, and for some time it has fluctuated between 85 cents and \$1 an ounce. We are selling it at the market price or a trifle above. Of course, the United States having put an embargo on the exportation of silver, the price will be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury so long as the embargo lasts, as he is the only large purchaser of silver in this country.

Mr. HUSTED. Your price remains absolutely fixed. But assume that the market value changes; you sell it at \$1 an ounce, in spite of the market price?

Mr. HAYES. But the market price can not change in view of the situation created by the bill.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. PHELAN. I will remind my colleague that we sell it at least for a dollar, and that we buy it at a dollar, and so we lose nothing. And there is a provision in the export law so that no silver can be exported unless the President says so, so that we absolutely control the output of the mines of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to ask a question about this bill. It is a very important matter. Silver is scarce. I see we are limited to the purchase of silver produced only in the United States. Why should we not purchase in South America, where we have large trade balances, and in Central America, and in Mexico, and British Columbia?

Mr. HAYES. Our silver mines produced 77,000,000 ounces last year. That is about one-half of the product of the world. We do not need to go outside this country, even if we dispose of all this \$350,000,000. You can see readily that in a few years it can be all back again in the Treasury from the product of our own mines, and we want it to come from our own people.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAYES. I ought not to take any more time.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. In buying silver the merchantable price is 96?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Has the committee made any investigation of the amount of silver bullion in the individual ownership of citizens—speculators in silver bullion?

Mr. HAYES. We are advised that there is no considerable amount of that.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. None in private ownership?

Mr. HAYES. None to amount to anything. The demand has been great and the price unusually high for some time, and all these holdings are unloaded.

Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, this is a very extraordinary as well as a very grave and serious situation. We all of us in the House have become accustomed on both sides of the House to vote for the passage of bills which we totally disapproved of, because we were assured that they were necessary for the war.

But in nearly all cases until now we have at least had put before us some of the reasons of their necessity, and we have often surrendered our own judgment to the judgment of the Executive. But now a measure has come before us for which we are asked to vote because it is essential as a war measure, and yet the reasons are entirely withheld from us, so that this is a larger draft upon our confidence than has heretofore been made. But I feel for myself that despite that, inasmuch as this is an international question, we can not insist upon knowing the reasons, which we are told it is wise to withhold. Therefore, for one, I am content to ask no further questions and to accept the statement that there are reasons which can not be divulged to us which make it exigent and compulsory that this legislation pass, and so I am willing to vote for it. But I wish to say that one of the motives that constrains me to vote for a measure which seems to me fundamentally unsound, and which probably hardly anyone in this House approves of or wishes to vote for, is that I have great confidence in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suppose the chairman of that committee [Mr. GLASS] has been consulted by the President and facts have been imparted to him which it is not thought prudent to confide to the rest of us, and I believe that when the momentary exigency is past, and when it is possible to remedy the serious danger into which this legislation might plunge our whole banking system, the Banking and Currency Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], will, as far as possible, make amends for this extraordinary step and bring us back into the path of safe banking. Therefore, for one, with much reluctance, but feeling that here as in previous cases we must yield to the wishes of the Executive and accepting the statement that it is unsafe to make public the information on which this legislation is based, regretting the necessity, I shall yet vote for the passage of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?
The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. HAYES. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I should be glad at any time to support sections 1, 3, and 4 of this bill, which I think are absolutely sound and could as well be passed in time of peace as in time of war. This silver that is piled up in the Treasury back of the silver certificates is not real basic money. It is about 20 per cent water, or fiat money, or paper money, or whatever you have in mind to call it. The silver certificates circulate on a gold basis by fiat of law, and so do the silver dollars themselves whenever anyone will take them. It is a good thing to be able to get rid of the silver, and get rid of it at a good price. We are selling it at a price which is larger than the price that silver has reached for a good while except in the case of fluctuations of the past year, and we are making it take the place of gold in foreign trade. We are selling it at a price that involves no loss to the country.

Now, the proposition that we have got to buy it back again and pile it up all over again is vicious and wrong, as is also the proposition to issue Federal reserve bank notes to take the place of the silver certificates as they are retired. The ostensible purpose of this is to prevent contraction; but there is no harm in a little contraction. I think it is pretty well understood, and I am going to say it plainly, that we are agreeing to these sections of the bill because it is necessary to act speedily and we have every reason to believe that we could not get the bill through the Senate, past the objections of the silverites in that body, without having them talk a couple of months, if we should cut out these objectionable sections. [Applause.]

I am willing to agree to speedy action on the assurance of the President that speedy action is necessary, but I want it made plain just why it is that such assurance needs to be given. This is a Senate bill and we are told to pass it just as it came from the Senate, because to amend it so as to make it sound would cause a dangerous delay. It is a plain case of holdup by the silverites, and I expect to do what I can, when the present emergency has passed, to see that the objectionable features shall be repealed.

Mr. HAYES. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in two minutes I can not go very far in a discussion of this measure. I do feel, however, that as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee some explanation should be made by me as well as by the other members of that committee. The facts have been pretty well stated in connection with this bill. I do not believe there is a member of this committee here who, under ordinary circumstances, would support this bill or who would support it now except for

the fact of the extreme necessity for this special legislation, as pointed out by the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Mint, and the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, all pleading for the immediate passage of this bill. In connection with this argument there is one point that has not been covered. I should like to mention that, and it is this, that this \$350,000,000 of silver, which is now held by the Treasury of the United States, is a trust fund; that silver certificates are outstanding against that fund, and they must be redeemed before this coin can be released. There are now about \$39,000,000 of these silver certificates held by the Treasury Department at this time, which, when this authority is given, will permit the cancellation of and the melting up of these silver dollars held as security for this amount. I hope the Treasury Department, in the administration of this law when it is passed, will be careful to see that none of the trust obligations are violated in the handling of this transaction. This sacred trust must not be violated under any circumstances.

In connection with the issuance of Federal reserve bank notes, a whole lot might be said that can not now be said in connection with this debate. When we passed the Federal reserve act we practically repudiated the bond-secured note-circulation proposition. In this instance we are going back to that in practically the same form by providing for the issue of Federal reserve notes by the 12 Federal reserve banks, secured by one-year temporary Treasury certificates, which are nothing more or less, in this instance, than a double promise to pay on the part of the United States. Why not issue United States notes direct and be honest with the people and not deceive them? In supporting this measure I am relying entirely upon the representations made by the administration officials that this is of the most pressing necessity to aid our allies to win the war. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time has expired. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. GLASS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent Mr. RAKER was given leave to revise and extend his remarks on House bill 10894.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I would not occupy the time of the House now except for the fact that the matter to which I wish to call attention is, to my mind, a matter of very great importance to the people of the country. That is the question of the Federal farm-loan bank and the manner in which the people's money, collected under the guise of war taxes, is being loaned throughout the country. I believe it is a matter of greater importance than the average citizen has any good conception of.

I have given this question considerable thought, and I am not a crank on this subject. At this time, when the people of the country are being called upon to contribute to the Federal Government in aid of carrying on this great war, I believe that it is a great mistake to squander money so collected from the people in loaning money in a manner entirely, in my opinion, different from that expected when the Congress of the United States passed that law. I am in receipt of a letter from a member of the Farm Loan Commission, Mr. George W. Norris. I made a statement on the floor of the House not long ago and said that I knew of a piece of land that had been sold less than five years ago at \$3 an acre. To make it clear to you, I sold the land myself. I own the adjoining 80 acres, that I now offer for sale at \$5 an acre, and get no purchaser. Not long ago the man to whom I had contracted that land wrote me and wanted a deed for the land, and stated that he was getting a loan from the Federal Government at \$15 an acre, no improvements on the land, and he wanted me to recommend the loan. I declined to do so.

Commissioner Norris wrote and asked me to give him the particulars. I answered Mr. Norris, saying I sold the land in question, but that I had rather not give the information requested, and asked the gentleman's pardon for declining to give the information. It is not my place to look after the Federal farm loans. I am not a member of any board that has control of those loans. I do not know whether the man succeeded in getting the loan or not, but he wrote me saying he was getting it and wanted me to recommend it. If the loan was made the land has been sold to the Federal Government, for nobody will pay that price—\$15 per acre—for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will be brief, for my time is limited and I have much to say.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the amount of the loan that the gentleman says the Farm Loan Board made on the land?

Mr. FORDNEY. The man wrote me that he was obtaining a loan of \$15 an acre.

Mr. MADDEN. How much did he pay?

Mr. FORDNEY. Three dollars per acre.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the idea of the gentleman as to what this land is worth?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am offering the adjoining 80 acres at \$5 an acre, with no purchaser.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does not the gentleman offer it to the Farm Loan Board for \$15 an acre?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have nothing to offer the Farm Loan Board but criticism. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman knows that the application of \$15 an acre was not approved by the farm-loan bank.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not; the owner said he was getting the money, and asked me to give him a recommendation.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman know that the farm-loan bank does not undertake to pass on an application until the perfected title papers come in, and, as the gentleman says, he refused to make the recommendation, no perfect-title papers have been presented to the bank.

Mr. FORDNEY. When I gave the man a deed to the land he had a perfect title. Let me call the gentleman's attention to something that I have in the way of proof of what I am going to say. Here is a statement of the loans made in the State of Kansas from the bank at Wichita, Kans., up to January 1, 1918, reported by the register of deeds or bonded abstractor. I have a list of each party's name to whom loans have been made. The description of the land, the section, town, and range, and the amount of money loaned with the assessed valuation of the land given. I made inquiry of some Members of the House from the State of Kansas, and I am told by them that the assessors in making their returns must make oath that the land has been assessed at its actual value.

The loans made in the State of Kansas up to January 1, 1918, amount to \$3,801,900. The total valuation is \$5,162,958; the loans amount to 73½ per cent of the valuation, when the law provides that the Government can only loan 50 per cent of the value of the land and not in excess of 20 per cent of the permanent insured value of the buildings thereon.

In the assessment of real estate the buildings are included with the land, so that in these valuations the land and buildings are included, and on both, which the law provides that the Federal farm-loan banks can not loan more than 50 per cent, the record shows they have loaned 73½ per cent of the total valuations.

I have not time to go into all the details of the loans, but they have loaned in one instance \$10,000 on property valued at \$7,000.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not want the House to believe that the law limits loans to the assessed value, but it is the actual appraised value.

Mr. FORDNEY. What is the difference between the actual value and your candid opinion as to its real value when you make oath that you have assessed it at the real value?

Mr. WINGO. In my State it would be 50 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, you can not make oath that you assessed it at its actual value when you know you fixed the assessment at but 50 per cent of its actual value; that would not be honest, would it?

Mr. WINGO. In regard to the law—

Mr. FORDNEY. The law provides that it shall be assessed at the actual value.

Mr. WINGO. I am talking about the Federal law, which will not permit them to loan upon the assessed value, but to put it on the actual value.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to hear what the gentleman has to say, because I have a high regard for him and his opinion, but I have information here that leads me to believe that the managers of those banks are disposing of that money in a loose manner. I have here a letter from one gentleman that writes me that loans were made on a piece of property in the State of Kansas, and that immediately upon receiving the loan the man left the property and said that it was the best sale he ever hoped to make of his property. He also points out a piece of property on which the Government loaned \$1,000, which has been for sale at \$600 for some time. Here is a statement from another man, who says that his neighbor, one of the loan

board, borrowed \$2,000 on his farm, and the adjoining farm, just as valuable, is offered to him to-day for \$1,700.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but I will ask the gentleman to be brief.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman the description of the land, so that it could be located?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and I am going to put into the RECORD, if the House will permit me to do so—I shall put in the RECORD each and every loan made in the State of Kansas up to the 1st of January last, and the description of the land, together with the owner's name, to whom the loan has been made, the amount of the loan, and the assessed valuation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I asked the question because the gentleman is charging gross maladministration, and he ought to be specific.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to mislead anybody.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman ought to ask permission to have that all put in.

Mr. FORDNEY. I shall do so. A gentleman named Smith—Capt. William S. A. Smith—who made a speech at St. Paul a few days ago, said "There will be only two of those banks that will show red ink." That is to say, they have all made a profit except two—the New England institution at Springfield, Mass., and the bank at Columbia, S. C. I have here a statement coming from a gentleman—Mr. R. Ingalls, of 307 East Seventeenth Street, New York—who made an investigation of this matter and writes me and says that he has taken these figures from the report of the Comptroller of the Currency. He states that according to the Comptroller of the Currency, on October 31, 1917, the 12 Federal land banks had no reserve or surplus and that their liabilities for funds received were \$34,984,029.89; their assets, after deducting salaries and expenses, \$34,273,843.84.

This apparent deficit of \$709,186.05 and an indebtedness not itemized of \$3,650,306.37 do not make a satisfactory showing. He says that the deficits apparent at each of the land banks at that date were as follows:

At Springfield, \$49,058.11; Baltimore, \$44,219.77; Columbus, \$57,362.64; Louisville, \$42,105.33; New Orleans, \$71,387.09; St. Louis, \$61,084.99; St. Paul, \$86,655.70; Omaha, \$46,273.95; Wichita, \$79,784.74; Houston, \$51,771.18; Berkeley, \$66,935.24; Spokane, \$52,537.20.

In other words, in the entire 12 banks the smallest deficit is \$42,000, according to the records, whereas Mr. Smith says that they are all on the right side of the ledger except two. I made inquiry of some gentleman from the State of Kansas as to the loans made in the western part of Kansas, and was told that the banks in that State will make practically no loans at all in some counties because of the condition and the value of the land, it being poor. Yet the Federal Government has made loans there far above the assessed valuation as shown by the records as given me by Mr. Ingalls.

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

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman proceed for 10 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that there is another very important District measure relative to the disposal of garbage that I desire to have disposed of. I shall not object to the gentleman having his 10 minutes, but I shall have to object to any more than that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows whether the farmers of Kansas who a few years ago borrowed \$50,000,000 from the railroads have ever paid them back?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not know that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What is that?

Mr. MEEKER. Whether or not the loan of \$50,000,000 by the farmers three or four years ago in Kansas has been paid back to the railroads?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The farmers of Kansas do not owe a cent to the railroads.

Mr. MEEKER. When was it paid back?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It never was borrowed.

Mr. MEEKER. Begging the gentleman's pardon, the railroads hauled their wheat free, thus advancing them \$50,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman has been reading fiction.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman let his statement stand as to that?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman speaks of a deficit shown by those banks in their reports. The gentleman intends to be entirely fair, I suppose; but does not the gentleman know that their books are not kept as they are in other banks, who charge up the discount when they make the loan, but they wait until the end of the year to collect the interest? Therefore the first year they had to run on their capital, charge up as if it were a deficit all expenses, and it will come out of the earnings at the end of the year.

Is not that the reason for the deficit? Does not the gentleman know that is the reason for the large deficit?

Mr. FORDNEY. If I did know I would have said it.

Mr. STEVENSON. I will say that is the way their books are kept and therefore they have charged them with a deficit without giving them credit for the earnings of the loans they have made. They get no credit in bookkeeping until the end of the year. In other words, you loan a man a thousand dollars and he has to pay interest on it and then credit up yourself with the interest for one year, and you wait until the end of the year—

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, the gentleman is making a speech. I do not know whether he is right or wrong, but I do not think he is right.

Mr. STEVENSON. I know I am right.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to see some other proof than the gentleman's mere statement. Here is a gentleman's statement whose figures I take as being correct. He says the banks have lost money. I would like to have the gentleman present his figures, because I want to be corrected if I am in error.

Mr. STEVENSON. I will take time to present them when I have an opportunity.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to be right on this matter if I am wrong, but my candid opinion is that the Congress of the United States, gentlemen, where we authorized \$200,000,000 of the people's money, collected for war purposes, placed at the disposal of these banks, there ought to be an investigation by Congress so that we may know whether or not these statements are correct or incorrect, for if the people's money has been thrown away, as indicated by these loans, we should know it. I have been and am loyal to this administration.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am loyal to this administration, and I am going to continue to be loyal in reference to carrying on this war; but I tell you, gentlemen, when you come in here with pretended war measures that prove to be political, then my loyalty to your party ceases. I am going to watch this enterprise as closely as I can and be loyal to the good people that I have the honor to represent here, sir, but I will draw the line when men here use these war measures for political purposes; and if this money is being loaned in an extravagant manner, as my information gives me reason to believe it has been, I am going to enter my most earnest protest. I say it is time that the Congress of the United States appointed a committee of Members of this House to investigate these loans and to see whether or not the loans as published, a list of which I will put in the Record, with the permission of the House, are correct or incorrect. I am not opposed to this system, but I am opposed to the squandering of the people's money on bad loans, poor property—

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not hear the first of the gentleman's statement. Is it charged that the banks were loaning money to farmers who are Democrats whether they have got ample security or not?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I did not say that, but I do say this—

Mr. CARAWAY. Well—

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute; let me answer my good friend. I do say this: That I am informed by some Members of Congress from the State of Kansas that the majority portion of those loans mentioned in this list are from counties in Democratic districts.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the gentleman, maybe it is like it is down home, that nobody but Democrats own land.

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. CARAWAY. I said maybe nobody but Democrats ever owned land out there.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well, I do not believe the gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. STEENERSON. On that theory how do you account for the fact that North Dakota and Minnesota are two of the

largest States where the largest sums have been loaned? And as to those two States I did not know that they were Democratic.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to charge positively that this money is being loaned to Democrats in discrimination against Republicans, but the gentleman in his question prompted me to say that—

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. I believe the gentleman has there a statement of the different banks. Does not it show that the smallest number of loans and the smallest volume of loans, with the exception probably of the Massachusetts district, is in Columbia, S. C., a district in which there is no Republican congressional district in the whole layout? Is not that so?

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether it is so or not, this man, Mr. Smith—

Mr. STEVENSON. Does it not say that the Columbia district is the smallest?

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether it is true or not, this man Smith—

Mr. STEVENSON. Who is a Republican, by the way.

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute, let me answer you.

I want to say to the gentleman that the one bank mentioned as having a deficit is in Columbia, S. C., and I do not think you could find a Republican in that district with a fine-tooth comb.

Mr. STEVENSON. And you will see that there has only been about \$2,000 of loans, I believe it is, made there. It is the smallest loan there. Therefore we are not loaning it to the Democrats, at least.

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether that is true or whether it is not, Mr. Smith states that there is a deficit at that bank. Therefore if at Columbia, S. C., they are only small borrowers, they undoubtedly are small landowners.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the gentleman is going to put in the statistical data to which he has referred.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir. The printed lists of loans in the State of Kansas.

Mr. WINGO. How much will that take up in the Record?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know. This is the amount, sir [indicating]. A list of the loans made by the Federal bank at Wichita, Kans.

Mr. WINGO. And you will specify the name of the borrower and the descriptions of the land, so that they can be located easily?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. The owner's name, the amount of rural credit, the assessed valuation of lands and buildings, the number of acres; for instance, John Henning obtained a loan of \$1,500 on the assessed valuation of his land and buildings—\$2,400, 160 acres, on the northwest quarter of section 26, township 26, range 24.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving further the right to object, I do not believe the gentleman would make a charge unless he believes it; but he has charged criminal maladministration. Has the gentleman introduced a resolution?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I have not. And I want to say to you I do not accuse anybody of being dishonest; but I do claim that there has been less caution used than should have been in making these loans.

Mr. WINGO. I have no brief for the board. If they have done all that the gentleman has charged, he ought to file an appropriate resolution here. If they have done what the gentleman has charged, I will join with him in investigating; but I do dislike to see a gentleman of his standing make an attack on this system at a time when its enemies are trying to break it down.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not an enemy of this system. I only criticize the parties in charge of the loans—if my information is correct bad loans have been made.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman has evidence that will justify that charge, they are guilty of maladministration and in justice to the House he ought to file a proper resolution to see whether it is true or not.

Mr. FORDNEY. In justice to Mr. R. Ingalls, who gave me much of the information I have in this matter, I wish to insert in the Record some of the correspondence I received from him.

But first, for example, suppose a party asks a loan on his farm, valued as follows: Land valued at \$2,000 and the permanent, insured value of buildings, \$2,000; total value, \$4,000. The Farm Loan Board by law is authorized to loan 50 per cent of the land value, or \$1,000; and 20 per cent of the permanent insured value of buildings, or \$400; or a total of \$1,400; or 35 per cent of the assessed valuation, provided the same is its actual value. An examination of list of loans given below will reveal the fact that the loans described are far in excess of the percentage authorized by law.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
BOURBON COUNTY.				
John Henning.....	\$1,500	\$2,400	163	NW. 1/4 sec. 23, T. 23, R. 24.
Wm. I. Killion.....	1,000	4,530	158	NE. 1/4 (fractional) sec. 4, T. 25, R. 24.
Katherine R. Owen.....	1,500	2,400	80	W. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 22, T. 27, R. 22.
Andrew Nelson.....	1,500	2,620	157	S. 1/4 SE. 1/4, SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 16 and NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 (les. 3 a.) of sec. 21, all in T. 24, R. 23.
Edgar T. Shull.....	3,200	4,400	148.51	NW. 1/4 (fractional) sec. 6, T. 26, R. 23.
Ella H. Todd.....	7,000	9,750	250	SE. 1/4 and pt. NE. 1/4 of 34 and S. 85 a. in NW. 1/4 of 35, all in 24-25.
John Henning.....	4,200	4,160	240	NW. 1/4 18-26-24 and E. 1/4 NE. 1/4, 13-26-23.
N. J. Judah et al.....	7,000	7,800	280	E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of 21-27-23.
D. E. Walrod.....	3,000	4,300	117	12 1/2 a. NW. 1/4, SE. 1/4 and 10 1/2 a. NE. 1/4, 19-23-24.
Berton E. Marsh.....	1,500	7,800	160	NW. 1/4, 15-25-25.
Hert E. Beth.....	4,500	3,330	123	S. 1/4 S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of 23 and pt. NW. 1/4 of 26, all in 23-24.
P. M. Orr.....	2,000	4,670	99	Pt. SW. 1/4, 29-24-25.
Charley L. Beck.....	2,400	3,990	115	W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and W. 1/4 NE. 1/4, NE. 1/4 of 8 and 15 a. in SE. 1/4 of 5, all in 25-24.
Benjamin H. Elder.....	500	1,000	40	SW. 1/4, SW. 1/4, 11-26-23.
Herbert Bly.....	2,100	5,540	240	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of 26 and SE. 1/4 of 27, all in 26-24.
Albert R. Peterman.....	500	2,500	99	Pt. SW. 1/4, 8-25-25.
Jordan F. Johnson.....	2,500	2,990	75	55 a. in E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 of 29 and 20 a. in E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of 20-23-31.
Milton E. Richard.....	1,200	5,120	160	NE. 1/4, 6-25-23.
Smith B. Crane.....	2,400	2,900	75	Pt. E. 1/4, NE. 1/4, 31-23-25.
Total.....	49,500	81,600		
BUTLER COUNTY.				
Anderson Holladay.....	7,000	12,155	207.75	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4, and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4, 24-27-4 and SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4, 19-27-5, and other land.
James Belford.....	800	1,355	40	E. 1/4 E. 1/4, NW. 1/4, 35-29-35.
Total.....	7,800	13,510		
BARBER COUNTY.				
Arch Rankin.....	3,000	5,500	163	W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 12, T. 31, R. 10.
W. E. Keener.....	2,700	4,300	163	SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 7, N. 1/4 NW. 1/4, SW. 1/4, NW. 1/4, 8-33-10, and 3 acres in NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 21-32-10.
C. E. Appel.....	3,000	7,500	159	SE. 1/4 (less 1 acre for school) sec. 6, T. 32, R. 12.
Jacob S. Warnstaff.....	4,000	3,600	160	NE. 1/4 sec. 15, T. 30, R. 14.
John T. White.....	1,000	1,700	280	N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 23, N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 33, T. 32, R. 12.
Scott Circle.....	6,000	9,700	320	N. 1/4 sec. 4, T. 34, R. 10.
Elmer N. Angell.....	1,500	1,800	240.75	Lot 3, SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 B. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 2, T. 33, R. 13.
Mathew P. De Witt.....	10,000	15,660	640	Lots 3, 4, 5, SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 6, T. 33, R. 10; lots 1, 2 and S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 1, T. 33, R. 11; lots 3, 4, E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 31, T. 32, R. 10; SE. 1/4 sec. 30, T. 32, R. 11.
Walter Jackson.....	3,500	2,700	240	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 24, T. 30, R. 12; lots 3, 4 sec. 2, T. 31, S. 1/4 SE. 1/4 35, T. 30, R. 12.
R. S. Cavin.....	3,000	3,600	120	SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 11, NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 12, T. 32, 10.
Isaac N. Copley.....	2,500	3,100	160	SE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 6, N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 7-33-10.
J. M. Hall.....	10,000	12,250	2,021.45	SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 33-30-13; lot 2, SW. NE. 1/4 W. 1/4, SE. 1/4, and W. 1/4 sec. 4-31-13, NW. 1/4 W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 9-31-13, SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 15-31-13, NE. 1/4 16, E. 1/4 sec. 5, E. 1/4 sec. 8-31-13.
Fred Betz.....	1,100	1,600	80	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 28, T. 31-13.
Wm. C. Aubley.....	4,800	5,000	156.45	SW. 1/4 7-32-12.
Horace E. Stout.....	5,500	4,000	368	N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 23, SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and E. 10 acres of NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 30, S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 32, T. 31, R. 12.
C. E. Adams.....	4,600	3,500	203	NW. 1/4 14, and part NE. 1/4 15, east of public road, T. 32, R. 12.
Albert G. Dekat.....	3,000	4,800	163	W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 23-32-19.
D. H. Axtell.....	1,000	1,000	123	SW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 27, W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 34, T. 33-12.
Charles Palmer.....	800	3,000	160	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 4, S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 3, T. 33, R. 10.
H. J. Parker.....	10,000	9,220	1,280	S. 1/4 SW. 1/4, S. 1/4 SE. 1/4 13, all of sec. 24, N. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 25, T. 32-13.
J. E. Thomas.....	5,000	4,880	142	SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4, SE. 1/4 S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 (except 18 acres of cemetery and except lots 21-22-23-24, Bk. 3, Cook's Add. of Med. Lodge), all in sec. 2, T. 32, R. 12.
Thomas F. Gallagher.....	3,000	1,700	160	NW. 1/4 sec. 1, T. 31, R. 12.
Alice Hamilton.....	4,600	3,700	160	S. 1/4 NW. 1/4, N. 1/4 SW. 1/4, 33, T. 31, R. 11.
H. W. Stevens.....	2,000	2,000	80	S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 32, T. 31, R. 11.
J. H. Landwehr.....	4,000	6,400	160	NW. 1/4 sec. 16-32-10.
Peter J. Dohn.....	1,600	2,200	90	Lot 1, sec. 18, T. 32, R. 10, NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 13-32-11.
C. A. Marikham.....	4,000	5,020	680	Lots 2-3-4, SW. NE. 1/4, S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and S. 1/4 sec. 5, SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 6, T. 34, R. 13.
Total.....	105,200	129,430		
COWLEY COUNTY.				
Charles T. Wahlenmaier and wife.....	3,000		160	E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 24-34-4.
Sarah I. Mayhill and husband.....	4,400		160	SW. 1/4 sec. 24-34-5.
Alonzo C. Messner and wife.....	8,000		560	SE. 1/4 sec. 14, SW. 1/4 sec. 13, E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, sec. 23, W. 1/4 NW. 1/4, W. 1/4 SW. 1/4, sec. 24-34-4.
Fred Gillock and wife.....	1,000		40	NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 24-34-3.
Elbert D. Fondray and wife.....	2,000		158	NE. 1/4 sec. 24-34-4.
Orville C. Jones and wife.....	2,000		40	40 rds. W. SW. 1/4 sec. 15-34-4.
Skiney W. Keely and wife.....	2,000		80	W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 31-30-4.
Louis A. Dickinson and wife.....	5,800		160 1/2	SE. 1/4 portion SW. 1/4 sec. 32-31-4.
George E. Birdzell and wife.....	1,600		80	S. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 16-34-4.
Total.....	29,300			
CHEROKEE COUNTY.				
Maud Landin Stiles.....	3,000	10,820	320	N. 1/4 2-34-23.
William E. Smith.....	3,200	3,960	120	N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 13-32-21.
E. O. Stevens.....	4,000	4,755	160	NE. 1/4 31-31-23.
Dowthard Scott.....	2,000	2,960	80	N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 13-32-24.
Laura A. Cammack.....	2,600	3,555	110.60	N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 6 and fr. SW. 5-32-22.
Alex Brown.....	1,300	2,430	80	E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 28-31-23.
Total.....	16,100	28,480		
CLAY COUNTY.				
George Sparrowhawk and Alice G. Sparrowhawk, his wife.....	1,900	3,270	80	N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 6-10-4.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
COMANCHE COUNTY.				
Nick Pepperd.....	\$3,000	\$2,300	240	SE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 sec. 34, W. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and S. 1/2 SW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 sec. 35-32-18.
Laura May Simkins.....	3,500	2,925	147	SW. 1/4 sec. 35, T. 32, R. 20 less 100 ft. of R. of W. of A. T. and S. F. H. R.
Oscar M. Maris.....	2,500	3,450	163	SW. 1/4 6-31-18.
John F. Windus.....	7,000	5,680	240	W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 31-33-20.
John M. Jones.....	2,000	3,830	163	NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 23 and E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 21-32-21.
Willis Banks.....	3,700	5,291	240	NE. 1/4 and N. 1/2 SE. 1/4 sec. 31-32-19.
Oliver S. Riney.....	2,100	2,720	163	SE. 1/4 sec. 30-33-20.
Oliver Jones.....	5,000	5,825	483	S. 1/2 sec. 2, SE. 1/4 sec. 3, 32-20.
William G. Deubler.....	5,000	6,780	800	S. 1/2 SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 9, all sec. 16-34-15.
Jesse H. Williams.....	3,800	2,815	163	NW. 1/4 sec. 8-32-20.
William E. Baldridge.....	3,800	4,000	163	NE. 1/4 sec. 8-33-20.
Benjamin H. Bird.....	3,500	3,420	240	Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 sec. 3-33-19.
James L. Alley.....	2,500	2,720	163	W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 17, E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 sec. 18-33-16.
Marvin T. Downing.....	8,500	6,525	523	W. 1/2 sec. 6-33-17, NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 1-33-18, S. 1/2 NW. 1/4 sec. 5-33-17 and W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 30-32-17.
Oral O. Darnell.....	1,500	2,410	163	NE. 1/4 sec. 24-34-18.
James L. Williams.....	2,000	1,230	163	NE. 1/4 sec. 24-32-18.
Total.....	59,400	61,870		
DICKINSON COUNTY.				
J. N. Taylor.....	8,000	8,770	160	NW. 1/4 sec. 8, T. 14, R. 4 E., 6 p. m.
Byron J. Taylor.....	8,000	13,700	160	SW. 1/4 sec. 34, T. 13, R. 4 E., 6 p. m.
Leon W. Taylor.....	8,000	9,330	163	NW. 1/4 sec. 23, T. 13, R. 4 E., 6 p. m.
Ira S. Taylor.....	2,900	4,000	80	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 sec. 31, T. 13, R. 4 E., 6 p. m.
Clarence Taylor.....	10,000	18,070	320	S. 1/2 sec. 32, T. 13, R. 4 E., 6 p. m.
John Fiedler.....	2,800		80	W. 1/2 of E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4, E. 1/2 and W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 2, T. 14, R. 3 E., 6 p. m.
Total.....	39,700	53,870		
DOUGLAS COUNTY.				
Jos. C. McCaules and wife.....	7,500	9,690	163	N. W. 1/4 of sec. 9-13-19, 160 acres.
Eugene T. McFarland and wife.....	2,500	4,180	83	W. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 of sec. 9-13-19, 80 acres.
Joseph C. Walter and wife.....	1,500	2,650	80	E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 8-12-18, 80 acres.
Wm. Sulzen and wife.....	5,000	6,455	163	SE. 1/4 of sec. 8-12-18, 160 acres.
Al. Delbert Armstrong and wife.....	1,500	2,810	80	S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 1-12-17, 80 acres.
Carle E. Cox, et al.....	6,000	14,525	293.39	E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 8-13-19, also SW. 1/4 of sec. 8-13-19, also E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 17-13-19 less 21.91 acres; in all 233.39 acres.
I. T. Herd and wife.....	7,400	8,910	85	N. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 of sec. 18-12-20, also 5 acres in SE. corner of sec. 18-12-20, 85 acres.
Total.....	31,400	49,220		
ELLSWORTH COUNTY.				
W. Lorenzo Reed.....	4,000		160	SE. 1/4 16-16-7.
Thomas F. Mullen.....	1,500		160	SE. 1/4 15-15-6.
John F. Hubka.....	3,000		160	W. 1/2 NW. 1/4 25 and S. 1/2 SE. 1/4 26-14-10.
Patrick E. Mullen.....	600		160	NE. 1/4 22-15-5.
Total.....	9,100			
ELLIE COUNTY.				
James B. Shutts.....	3,000	5,390	320	SW. 1/4 and S. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and SE. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 2-13-18.
Bertrne Berry.....	1,000	2,785	160	NW. 1/4 1-12-19.
James Ross.....	5,500	7,490	320	E. 1/2 27-12-19.
Walter M. Stanton.....	1,700	2,770	160	NE. 1/4 14-12-19.
George Bellman.....	6,000	16,045	323	N. 1/2 29-13-18.
Edward Kraus.....	3,200	5,050	323	W. 1/2 20-14-19.
William J. Bellman.....	6,000	11,280	323	W. 1/2 7-13-18 and SE. 1/4 6-13-18.
Frank B. Pfeifer.....	2,000	2,560	160	E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 and W. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 34-13-19.
J. E. Haddock.....	2,500	4,250	163	W. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 2-33-18.
John Brumit.....	1,800	3,910	163	NE. 1/4 11-13-19.
John R. Chittenden.....	6,500	32,605	640	Sec. 27-13-18.
William H. Shutts.....	8,000	12,460	963	All sec. 5-12-17, E. 1/2 32-11-17.
Joseph Bahl.....	6,000	16,840	483	E. 1/2 and SW. 1/4 29-13-18.
Peter J. Walter.....	1,300	3,870	153	NW. 1/4 18-12-17.
John O'Loughlin.....	8,100	13,690	621	Sec. 12-13-19 except a 20 a. tract.
Edward Blender.....	8,000	17,590	323	NW. 1/4 28-13-18 SE. 1/4 20-13-18.
Jacob F. Schoendaller.....	3,500	7,590	323	N. 1/2 26-12-19.
Total.....	74,100	166,145		
GEARY COUNTY.				
Alfred H. Christenson.....	3,000	3,380	144 1/2	NW. 1/4 sec. 16-12-7, ex. 15 1/2 out of N. side.
Edward C. Liston.....	3,500	4,590	70	That part lt. 11, spl. sec. 13-11-5 lying south of county road.
Louis Ascher.....	10,000	11,000	200	S. 1/2 NE. 1/4, N. 1/2 SE. 1/4 sec. 35 and NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 36-11-6.
John H. Johnston.....	2,600	4,480	194.53	NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4, S. 1/2 SW. 1/4, NE. 1/4, SW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 6-12-7.
John C. Ramsour.....	1,000	1,500	40	NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 16-12-5.
Dan G. Younklin.....	10,000	17,750	560	SE. 1/2 and E. 1/2 of W. 1/2 and SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4, sec. 2, W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 SE. 1/4, SE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and .05 in sec. 11-10-4.
Louis J. Settgast.....	6,000	6,300	153	SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4, NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 of sec. 34 and N. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 35 (ex. 10 a.) T. 11, R. 6.
Fred J. Settgast.....	2,000	6,500	155	NW. 1/4 sec. 35-11-6, ex. 5.6 a.
Richard Settgast.....	3,500	9,650	250.40	S. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 35, T. 11, R. 6 and lots 3 and 4, SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 3-12-6, SW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and lot 4 sec. 34-11-3.
Edward Baresel.....	8,000	7,000	160	SW. 1/4 sec. 27-12-6.
Reuben Nickelson.....	8,000	12,885	233	W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 sec. 28; NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 33-11-5, ex. 4 a. in NW. 1/4 33.
John D. Cameron.....	10,000	8,830	203	SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 1-12-7.
Total.....	67,600	98,865		
HARPER COUNTY.				
C. E. Warren.....	4,500	5,100	160	NW. 1/4 of sec. 32-31-8.
E. H. Burgess.....	3,200	4,500	240	E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 and W. 1/2 of the SE. 1/4 of sec. 21, and the E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of sec. 20-31-8.
C. M. Wyrick.....	8,400	15,600	640	S. 1/2 of sec. 35-31-9, and N. 1/2 of sec. 2-32-9.
D. H. Hoyt.....	5,200	9,900	280	E. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 of sec. 21, and NW. 1/4 of sec. 22-32-9.
Mary E. Campbell.....	10,000	20,600	560	E. 1/2 of sec. 36-31-9, lots 3 and 4, and E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of sec. 31-31-8.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
HARPER COUNTY—contd.				
Harry H. Burgess.....	\$3,200	\$2,850	160	E. 1/2 of the E. 1/2 of sec. 21-31-8.
Mott, H. White.....	1,400	1,600	80	W. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 of sec. 7-32-9.
Asa E. Burgess.....	3,200	3,300	160	W. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of sec. 20-31-8.
J. H. Hadsall.....	10,000	13,100	400	N. 1/2 of sec. 8 and W. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 9-32-8.
Phebe J. Warren.....	4,000	4,800	160	NE. 1/4 of sec. 35-31-9.
Jessie Campbell.....	10,000	21,000	720	All of sec. 23, SE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of sec. 26-31-9, NW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 of sec. 30-31-8
Total.....	63,100	102,350		
HARVEY COUNTY.				
Edward Evans.....	2,500	14,036	201	E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and part of NE. 1/4 10-23-1 E.
David K. Wilson.....	4,600	10,675	240	S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 28-22-2 E.
Willis J. Refner.....	6,700	11,290	240	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 9-21-2 E.
A. B. Gilchrist.....	7,400	15,760	320	SW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 21-22-2 E.
W. S. Gilchrist.....	4,500	8,150	160	SE. 1/4 21-22-2 E.
Dari I G. Miller.....	1,600	6,045	80	E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 5-24-1 E.
W. J. Moulds.....	7,000	8,920	160	NW. 1/4 23-23-1 W.
Alpha Gates et al.....	2,400	3,355	80	W. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 10-24-2 E.
R. J. Chellans.....	3,700	5,283	80	W. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 10-23-1 W.
N. K. Broc'way.....	3,500	4,595	80	E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 15-24-2 E.
C. C. Heidebrecht.....	3,000	3,985	80	E. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 30-22-3 W.
Jacob Vogt.....	5,000	8,195	160	NE. 1/4 21-22-3 W.
Henry F. Friesen.....	3,000	5,995	160	SE. 1/4 21-22-3 W.
J. R. & J. C. Smith.....	7,000	9,220	160	NW. 1/4 25-22-1 W.
J. G. Ewert.....	7,000	7,980	160	NW. 1/4 2-23-2 E.
Nannie J. McBride.....	4,000	5,765	80	N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 32-23-1 E.
Eli M. Hoover.....	6,300	8,165	160	NE. 1/4 17-24-2 W.
A. W. Rogers.....	6,300	15,980	320	E. 1/2 21-24-1 E.
L. E. Rose.....	1,600	4,865	80	N. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 32-23-2 E.
Harrison M. Lowman.....	2,800	5,315	75	Part of E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 12-24-1 W.
William R. Peacock.....	3,000	7,220	80	N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 34-24-1 W.
Clark J. Duff.....	6,000	9,430	154	NW. 1/4 36-23-1 E.
A. D. Brush.....	4,200	4,455	87	Part of SE. 1/4 19-22-2 E.
R. A. Moore et al.....	4,300	8,605	160	SW. 1/4 23-22-1 E.
Ida H. Soth.....	3,200	3,770	80	W. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 28-24-1 E.
H. C. Utz.....	3,000	5,935	80	W. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 26-24-1 W.
F. A. McBurney.....	5,000	9,550	100	S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 and part of SE. 1/4 2-23-2 W.
N. K. Brookway.....	4,000	4,595	80	E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 15-24-2 E.
William E. Jones.....	4,000	7,845	140	Part of SW. 1/4 26-22-1 E.
C. C. Lindamood.....	3,200	3,730	80	N. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 24-22-1 E.
H. M. Lowman.....	3,600	5,315	75	E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 12-24-1 W.
Gred B. Ellerts.....	5,500	7,925	154	Part of SW. 1/4 35-24-2 E.
Mose P. Prather.....	4,000	5,950	100	W. 100 acres of SW. 1/4 2-24-1 W.
William Patton.....	4,000	6,975	160	W. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 18-24-2 E. and S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 13-24-1 E.
F. A. McBurney.....	3,000	4,325	67	Part of SE. 1/4 2-23-2 W.
Henry H. Re'ier.....	3,000	4,305	80	S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 14-22-3 W.
Daniel G. Miller.....	2,500	6,045	80	E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 5-24-1 E.
Cornelius F. Friesen.....	2,900	2,047	49	NE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 31-22-2 W.
Ed A. Kramer.....	7,000	9,760	160	SE. 1/4 4-23-1 W.
Arthur A. Schanbacher.....	4,200	5,575	93	Part of SE. 1/4 21-23-2 W.
Edward J. Stucky.....	6,500	9,405	160	NE. 1/4 5-22-2 W.
W. C. Cummins.....	8,000	10,760	160	SW. 1/4 11-22-1 W.
H. P. Harms.....	5,300	9,295	160	SW. 1/4 25-23-2 E.
Frank M. Wetschensky.....	3,600	5,870	128	S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 4 and part of SW. 1/4 3-23-2 E.
H. A. Heatwold.....	3,500		68	Part of S. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 25-22-1 W.
Total.....	195,500	322,251		
JEWELL COUNTY.				
A. L. Clark.....	3,000	4,375	80	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 36-2-6.
C. G. Shellhase.....	3,500	5,765	80	S. 1/2 NW. 1/4 24-1-6.
J. C. Shellhase.....	3,500	5,365	80	N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 24-1-6.
Total.....	10,000	15,505		
JOHNSON COUNTY.				
Geo. W. Bacon and Mary E. Bacon (wife).....	1,000	1,300	10	10 acres of SE. 1/4 17-13-21.
Alexander E. Frame, Nellie Frame (wife).....	3,000	6,160	80	E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of 7-14-23.
Frank Efinger, Dottie M. Efinger (wife).....	3,000	6,740	81.15	W. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 of 6-14-23.
Joseph Goode, Mary Goode, (wife).....	3,500	11,300	80	S. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, S. 10 acres of SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, N. 10 acres of NW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4, and NE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4, all in 6-13-25.
Julius M. Moll and P. K. Moll (wife).....	4,000		80	(Not divided in records, SE. 1/4 of, 150 acres, \$12,800 assessed) N. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 of 23-13-23 ex. right of way.
Edward Shaw and Emma Shaw (wife).....	4,600	5,200	80	N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 25-13-22.
Henry J. Barthol, Josephine Barthol (wife).....	5,000	5,800	160	SE. 1/4 of 14-13-22.
Earl L. Timms (single).....	2,000	3,650	25	Lot 3 of N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 of 34-13-23.
Morton Y. Greeley, Lillian Greeley (wife).....	3,000	4,880	80	E. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 of 9-15-23.
Mabel S. Myers, Harry E. Myers (husband).....	4,000	5,900	80	E. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of 20-14-22.
Chas. G. Bowling, Eva M. Bowling (wife).....	2,300	3,800	78	Part of SE. 1/4 of 35-12-21.
Carl Albin Holmquist and Rebecca G. (wife).....	500	3,008	10	Part of NW. 1/4 of 17-12-23.
Edward Moody and Eliza Moody (wife).....	10,000	14,600	200	S. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 35, W. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 of 35-12-24.
Joseph W. Davidson, Minnie (wife).....	2,500	3,090	40	NE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 9-12-23.
Turner Park, Minnie P. (wife).....	3,700	3,770	80	NE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 of 17 and SW. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 of 9, all in T. 12, R. 23.
Chas. Delahunt (single).....	2,000	9,600	160	SE. 1/4 of 13-13-22.
Total.....	51,100	88,798		

List of entries made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
KINGMAN COUNTY.				
R. E. Smith.....	\$7,530	\$9,513	231	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 23-27-7.
I. F. Dodson.....	4,000	8,063	243	SE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of NE. 33-29-7.
A. E. Woolridge.....	4,000	5,954	160	NW. 1/4 27-27-8.
H. O. Riley.....	1,500	2,790	80	E. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 31-27-6.
M. Heatherman.....	8,000	6,240	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 12-28-9.
Do.....	3,888	E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 1-23-9.
Do.....	1,702	S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 6-23-8.
Do.....	2,050	403	N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 7-23-3.
M. M. Yeoman.....	10,000	4,305	403	NW. 1/4 2-23-7.
Do.....	10,640	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 3-29-7.
W. J. Sheahan.....	7,000	5,830	243	SW. and NW. and N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 12-23-9.
Do.....	5,870	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 11-28-9.
Noah Cheatum.....	5,000	6,204	213	NE. 23-27-8.
Do.....	2,952	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 24-27-8.
F. W. Millard.....	4,000	4,700	163	SE. 1/4 19-29-6.
W. S. Van Dosten.....	2,000	4,033	123	S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 4-30-7.
Mike Sheahan.....	4,000	5,740	193	NW. 1/4 16-28-9.
H. E. Bett.....	3,000	2,403	80	N. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 22-29-7.
Do.....	2,533	80	S. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 27-29-7.
P. W. Gillin.....	8,000	9,962	323	E. 1/4 8-29-9.
R. R. Matlock.....	4,000	4,712	193	SE. 1/4 23-29-7.
Nick Gillen.....	8,000	4,139	193	NW. 1/4 6-23-9.
Nick Gillen.....	6,888	163	NE. 1/4 1-29-10.
J. Heatherman.....	5,000	6,340	163	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 13-23-9.
B. A. DeWeise.....	4,800	2,920	203	N. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 33-29-7.
Do.....	1,537	W. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 25-29-7.
A. A. Gerber.....	10,000	6,888	363	E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 28-27-7.
Do.....	15,915	S. 1/4 27-27-7.
Isabelle Lyford.....	2,500	3,280	163	E. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 30-23-6.
J. A. McMahan.....	5,500	7,675	163	NE. 1/4 4-23-7.
G. M. Cheatum.....	5,000	7,067	243	NW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 7-27-7.
E. B. Baber.....	3,500	3,808	163	SW. 1/4 24-27-10.
Frank Pro.....	8,000	6,665	373	W. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 3-29-7.
Do.....	4,949	W. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 27-29-8 less 27 ac.
W. L. Brown.....	3,500	6,986	200	S. 1/4 of NW. 1/4, N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 11-28-8.
Do.....	SE. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 11-28-8.
P. J. Egan.....	2,500	2,671	80	E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 7-27-7.
A. Weniger.....	7,000	11,297	240	SE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of NE. 9-23-7.
Claud Brand.....	3,000	3,722	80	N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 9-27-7.
G. C. Fredick.....	10,000	11,793	403	In Sections 4 and 5-23-7.
R. R. Griem.....	4,000	2,658	163	N. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 12-30-9 and SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 12-30-9.
Chas. A. Kuszmaul.....	3,000	5,320	160	SE. 1/4 16-23-3.
E. W. Vim Lundingham.....	4,500	6,020	163	NW. 1/4 23-23-8.
Anna L. Roehr.....	4,500	4,600	163	NW. 1/4 33-23-6.
Hugh Martin.....	6,000	5,125	280	N. 1/4 of S 1/4 of Sec. 32-29-6 and SW. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 32-29-6.
Do.....	3,060	E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 31-23-6.
Gussie Viney.....	2,000	6,077	163	NE. 1/4 21-28-5.
Oliver E. Cox.....	2,000	5,494	163	NW. 1/4 29-27-8.
G. E. Bruch.....	2,700	5,840	163	NE. 1/4 13-27-8.
W. R. Blakey.....	10,000	8,388	360	SE. 1/4 1-27-5 and W. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 6 and E. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 7-27-4.
Alva Dutton.....	4,000	6,204	160	NW. 1/4 10-27-8.
Willard Faneler.....	1,500	6,768	160	NE. 1/4 28-27-5.
Chas. Sponenberg.....	4,500	6,163	200	S. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 5-30-5.
Wm. Leslie.....	2,100	1,980	120	E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 33-30-9.
E. M. Fly.....	1,500	1,745	Part of NE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 1-29-8.
L. C. Lecklider.....	1,600	2,480	80	W. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 28-23-7.
Katie Scoville.....	1,800	3,050	80	E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 3-23-6.
Noah Cheatum.....	4,100	6,122	160	SE. 1/4 23-27-8.
J. F. Birkenbaugh.....	4,200	3,050	160	W. 1/4 of W. 1/4 21-23-7.
F. W. Millard.....	2,500	75	SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and 35 acres off west side of NW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 25-29-7.
W. S. De Weise.....	4,200	7,022	271	Lot 5 and SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 4-30-10, also SW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 3-30-10.
J. W. Ehlnke.....	2,400	3,200	40	SW. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 23-27-7.
L. L. Selley.....	7,800	5,528	520	SE. 1/4 10-30-8.
Do.....	5,535	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 15-30-8.
Do.....	2,050	E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 22-39-8.
Total.....	231,200	333,765
LINN COUNTY.				
S. J. Campbell.....	2,000	3,030	80	W. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 10-23-23.
Orville W. Simpson.....	1,300	6,775	160	E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 9-22-24.
George Wyatt.....	2,100	2,655	100	NE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4, SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, and S. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 25-22-23.
Total.....	5,400	12,500
LABETTE COUNTY.				
William T. Swope.....	3,000	3,130	140	N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 1, and N. 1/4 N. 1/4 sec. 2, ex. fraction lying west of railway, T. 31, R. 17.
C. E. Smalley.....	1,500	2,460	80	N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 11-31-17.
Total.....	4,500	5,590
LEAVENWORTH COUNTY.				
Archibald Wright Jaggard, Min G. Jaggard, Carl Brueckmann and Martha Brueckmann.....	10,000	14,790	240	SW. 1/4 sec. 25, E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 of sec. 25, T. 11, R. 22.
.....	2,400	2,000	40	NE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 sec. 12, T. 12, R. 22.
Total.....	12,400	17,390
M'PHERSON COUNTY.				
J. T. Brown.....	4,000	3,500	163	NE. 1/4 23-19-5.
Melvin A. Frisbie.....	3,000	163	SW. 1/4 6-18-1.
Svante Lundun.....	4,500	10,800	160	SW. 1/4 16-19-3.
Charles H. Shaw.....	4,000	4,800	74.8	N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 22-19-3.
G. A. Reess.....	4,400	4,220	160	W. 1/4 NW. 1/4 19-17-1 and N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 24-17-2.
Total.....	19,900	23,320

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
MONTGOMERY COUNTY.				
Estell E. and H. C. Ditterich	\$2,700	\$2,800	83	Lots 3 and 4 in 3-31 S. 17 E. 6th principal meridian.
MORRIS COUNTY.				
Ralph B. Felton	6,000	10,100	203	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ 15-14-7.
Ray B. Felton	6,100	6,470	240	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 27 and NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 23-14-7.
Harry J. Wood	1,500	2,670	80	Lots 15 and 12 6-14-8.
Robert E. Simmons	3,000	2,390	80	Lots 3 and 10 NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 6-14-8.
J. H. Burton	2,000	4,070	202.70	Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, S.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 31-14-8.
George Dason	2,500	4,890	121	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ N. $\frac{1}{2}$ 4, pt. N. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$, lots 1 and 13 18 14-8
Daniel L. Morris	9,000	7,050	278.13	N.W. $\frac{1}{2}$, N. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$, N. $\frac{1}{2}$, S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 31-14-7.
J. O. Rochat	2,500	4,290	160	S.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 25-15-7.
A. G. Leitch	6,400	7,690	320	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ 6, E. $\frac{1}{2}$ E. $\frac{1}{2}$ 7-15-7.
C. C. Iams	2,400	2,350	80	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 21-14-7.
Ira E. Hosi	5,400	5,000	160	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ 30-14-7.
Jane Barb	1,800	2,050	40	NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 8-15-7.
Lydia F. Reeves	7,500	9,890	400	NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 19, E. $\frac{1}{2}$ S.W. $\frac{1}{2}$, NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 20-15-7.
M. D. Peters	2,000	3,900	160	N.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 26-14-7.
Alfred Waid	3,000	3,000	200	Lots 1-2-3-4-5, sec. 6-15-8.
Walter E. Back	2,800	3,120	115	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$, pt. NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 10-15-7.
Olof H. Nelson	4,500	4,890	160	N.W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 7-14-7.
Total	69,000	81,720		
NEMAHA COUNTY.				
Ray Wickliff	7,000	8,380	145	NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 6-3-12, except $\frac{1}{2}$ acres deeded for road purposes.
Frank H. Dri	10,000	11,740	160	SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 1-2-11.
Fred J. Melcher	10,000	14,638	160	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 16-2-12.
Total	27,000	34,758		
NEOSHO COUNTY.				
Wesley A. Spener	1,500	3,000	80	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 20-30-18.
J. K. Mullen and wife	2,000	2,500	80	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 30-30-18.
Samuel N. Fisher	4,000	5,200	160	SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 29-30-18, NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 32-30-18. The \$4,000 mortgage covers 160 acres.
Total	7,500	11,700		
PAWNEE COUNTY.				
H. C. and Melissa J. McPrath	3,000	5,925	77.53	An irregular tract in NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 5-22-15.
J. W. Collins	5,000	7,490	160	SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 2-23-16.
J. W. Gaston	6,000	7,520	160	NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 32-21-18.
William R. Hain	1,000	7,770	151.54	Lots 3 and 4 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 4-20-18.
Ellis P. Miller	2,000	15,820	320	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ 27-21-15.
Hugh Roberts	2,100	4,820	281	Lots D-1 sec. 23-23-18 and lots E.-3 and 4 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ and SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 32-23-18.
E. E. French	5,000	7,300	150	Lots 1 and 2 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 2-23-18.
Blaine Roberts	3,000	6,575	312	Lots D-C-5 and 6 and SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 33-23-18.
David E. Johnson	4,500	7,130	150	NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 13-23-15.
J. C. Smith	5,000	9,880	320	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ 8-21-19.
C. H. Dyeman	8,000	11,870	320	SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 22 and SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 23, all 21-18.
O. F. Wilcox	1,000	3,180	77	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 16-23-16.
A. L. Stacwell	10,000	15,435	280	Lot 4 and part 3 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ and part of NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ and part SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 6-22-15.
J. S. Compton	8,000	11,830	320	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ 30-21-18.
Theodore B. Price	5,000	5,840	150	SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 28-22-18.
D. Bridge	8,000	15,180	320	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 7-23-18.
Ella A. Brownee	2,000	5,670	160	SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 21-21-20.
Oriando H. Hill	1,300	2,700	50	North 50 acres of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ 31-21-15.
Total	79,900	151,905		
PHILLIPS COUNTY.				
Guy C. Goddard and wife	4,000	5,980	320	NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ and SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 2-2-18.
Dee F. Hain and wife	2,300	4,665	150	NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 22-3-18.
John F. Naye and wife	1,800	3,070	100	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 21-4-18 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 16-4-18.
W. W. Warner and wife	3,000	4,150	160	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 18-3-17.
Dick Hodge and wife	1,500	1,885	80	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 25-2-18.
Allen B. Dixon and wife	3,000	6,380	240	SE. 13-3-17 and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 18-3-15 except 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres.
M. L. Herbace	8,000	17,015	640	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 10 and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 11-3-17.
W. J. Stewart and wife	3,000	4,835	160	SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 14-3-18.
Ellis T. Christensen and wife	3,000	4,050	150	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ and N. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 20-4-18.
J. O. McKown and wife	2,000	3,040	160	NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 2-2-18.
Luther M. Solt and wife	2,500	4,300	70	Commencing at NE. corner of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 34-4-20, thence W. to $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. line, thence S. 80 rods, thence E. 80 rods, thence N. 80 rods to sec. line, thence N. to place of beginning, less 100 ft. R. R. right of way cut diagonally through said land, and except 4 acres S.E. corner, containing 70 acres, more or less.
Total	34,100	59,370		
POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY.				
E. B. Homewood and Margaret Homewood (husband and wife)	3,000	5,080	80	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 24-9-10 less 10 acres S. and W. of Rock Creek and all W. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 25-9-10, lying E. and N. Rock Creek.
George R. Farrell and Alice Farrell (husband and wife)	6,000	7,725	89.7	NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ and lot 1 and part lot 2 lying S. of right of way U. P. R. R. in sec. 6-10-11.
Gottlieb Yalge (widower)	2,000	2,405	90	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ and W. 10 acres S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 10-10-9.
Joseph Farrell and Grace Farrell (husband and wife)	2,400	3,470	70	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ NE. $\frac{1}{2}$ less 10 acres of 2-10-12.
Marins Pedersen, Margrethe Pedersen (husband and wife)	1,500	1,855	40	NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ NW. $\frac{1}{2}$ 28-9-10.
Total	14,900	20,535		

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
PRATT COUNTY.				
Allen McCue.....	\$5,000	\$6,800	240	NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 13-28-11.
Ashford B. Snyder.....	1,800	6,600	160	SW. 1/4 21-28-14.
Eda D'vorak.....	3,400	2,880	160	NW. 1/4 20-28-11.
William F. Brown.....	7,500	12,632	278 1/2	SW. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 9-26-14.
Joseph W. Heaton.....	10,000	14,000	320	S. 1/2 of 2-29-14.
Martin Curran.....	2,000	5,850	320	E. 1/2 of W. 1/2 of sec. 33 and SW. 1/4 sec. 28-27-15.
F. H. Sellon.....	10,000	13,500	480	W. 1/2 of sec. 3 and NW. 1/4 sec. 4-28-11.
William H. Sellon.....	10,000	12,200	520	SW. 1/4 sec. 22 and NE. 1/4 and NW. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 and S. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 sec. 27, and N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 34-27-11.
Total.....	49,700	74,462		
RENO COUNTY.				
Geo. M. Ege.....	4,000	5,644	190	SW. 1/4 11-26-10.
F. R. Frank.....	7,000	7,980	221	Lot 1 SE. of NE. sec. 3, and lot 4, sec. 2, twp. 26, R. 10.
Jacob Schweitzer.....	6,500	8,240	320	S. 1/2 5-26-9.
Frank D. Webb.....	4,700	7,288	190	NW. 1/4 7-22-9.
Geo. Schweitzer.....	4,500	5,696	188	SE. 1/4 3-26-10.
John C. Epp.....	3,800	8,060	205	SW. sec. 27 and part of SE. 1/4 27-22-4.
Abraham R. Schmidt.....	3,000	3,733	100	SW. sec. 19-22-4.
H. D. Bailey.....	4,000	4,974	440	SE. sec. 1 and SW. 1/4 and E. 1/2 and SW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 sec. 12-22-10.
Dedrick W. Ruffel.....	1,100	1,745	60	NW. of NE. and W. 1/2 of NE. of NE. 29-22-4.
Jacob L. Heidebrecht.....	3,000	4,596	115	Part of SE. of 27-22-4.
John R. Garman.....	7,000	10,188	320	E. 1/2 of 15-26-10.
Ians P. Pederson.....	1,200	2,722	80	N. 1/2 of SE. of 17-26-10.
Adolph A. Erker.....	3,000	2,565	142	Lot 3 and E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 18-26-4.
Cornelius B. Copeland.....	7,000	8,317	152	Lot 3 and S. 1/2 of NW. of 4-26-4.
Albert L. Ostrander.....	4,900	5,017	142	Lot 1-2 and E. 1/2 of NW. of 18-26-4.
Robert C. Bargill.....	3,000	6,468	160	NW. 1/4 30-25-10.
Annie Hook.....	1,700	2,972	160	SW. 28-25-10.
William H. Fulks.....	5,000	6,468	158	SW. 32-25-10.
Peter Reese.....	3,200	5,438	160	NW. 24-26-10.
Lloyd L. Boles.....	3,200	4,944	160	SW. 13-26-10.
Charles E. Litchfield.....	4,000	7,168	320	S. 1/2 5-22-10.
Gus H. Faney.....	2,000	3,084	160	NW. 28-25-10.
A. T. Regier.....	2,000	3,120	80	N. 1/2 of SE. 30-22-4.
Henry T. Ediger.....	3,200	6,917	80	S. 1/2 of SE. 17-22-4.
Jonas H. Holmes.....	4,000	6,468	160	SE. of 13-25-10.
Omar F. Elliott.....	4,000	5,144	160	NW. of 14-26-10.
William T. Pieper.....	2,500	6,238	160	SE. of 14-26-10.
Cornelius H. Friesen.....	2,800	6,493	160	NE. of 35-22-4.
Mathias Beltz.....	7,500	12,726	160	SE. 27-25-4.
Charles E. Durand.....	10,000	17,304	320	S. 1/2 3-23-5.
George M. Davis.....	2,200	2,901	80	E. 1/2 of NW. of 12-25-6.
William P. Frank.....	5,000	7,092	160	SW. of 35-25-10.
W. J. Elliott.....	9,000	15,956	640	All of sec. 9-22-10.
Joel Raines.....	8,000	9,064	320	E. 1/2 of 7-26-9.
Mary Raines.....	6,000	7,268	160	SE. 6-26-9.
Total.....	152,100	229,678		
RICE COUNTY.				
Lewis M. Harpand wife.....	2,100	4,320	225	SW. 1/4 of 19-21-9, lot 1 and NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 30-21-9.
William H. Haltomand wife.....	6,000	9,420	320	NW. 1/4 32-21-9 and SW. 1/4 29-21-9.
Henry W. Rose and wife.....	10,000	13,165	320	SE. 1/4 31-19-6 and NE. 1/4 0-20-6.
John D. Hemly and wife.....	8,000	8,000	160	NW. 1/4 29-19-6.
Millard Robert and wife.....	5,000	7,620	160	NW. 1/4 11-19-9.
Marion Bradger and wife.....	2,000	6,000	160	NW. 1/4 8-20-6.
Total.....	33,100	47,525		
REPUBLIC COUNTY.				
Erick Erickson and wife.....	1,000		35	SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 31-1-5.
ROOKS COUNTY.				
Alexander G. Lowry.....	1,800	3,800	160	SE. 1/4 34-7-19.
Edward D. Hausen.....	3,000	5,540	167	NW. 1/4 14-8-19, tract in SW. 1/4 14-8-19.
John A. Hance.....	3,500	4,000	160	NE. 1/4 31-7-19.
Frank Shutts.....	6,000	10,200	320	E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 and S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 16-7-16.
Ray O. Grover.....	2,500	4,600	160	NE. 1/4 18-7-19.
C. R. Gillilan.....	4,000	3,800	150	E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 S, N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 17-7-16.
Jesse V. Stewart.....	2,600	5,700	157	W. 1/2 E. 1/4 18-7-16.
John D. Wolf.....	800	1,100	80	W. 1/2 NW. 1/4 34-7-16.
J. F. Whitford.....	4,500	9,000	320	W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 7-7-16, W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 12-7-16.
William J. Houston.....	900	2,100	120	SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 17, SE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 18, NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 19-7-16.
James Webster et al.....	10,000	11,160	320	SE. 1/4 33, N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 31, N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 32-7-18.
Roy Brown.....	3,000	4,500	155.06	NW. 1/4 18-7-19.
William L. Edwards.....	3,200	4,500	160	W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 19-7-19.
T. E. Dugan.....	6,000	8,900	393	NW. 1/4 2-7, SW. 1/4 35-6, S. 1/2 SE. 1/4 34-6-20.
Total.....	51,800	78,900		
STAFFORD COUNTY.				
Eldon R. Nelson.....	10,000	10,910	320	SE. 1/4 19-25-11 and SW. 1/4 20-25-11.
Cass O. Morgan.....	7,500	11,005	240	SE. 1/4 23-25-11 and E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 33-25-11.
C. C. Gallagher.....	4,000	5,935	160	SW. 1/4 21-25-12.
James E. Sallee.....	3,200	4,320	240	SE. 1/4 and S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 34-21-11.
William H. Smith.....	4,500	5,735	160	NE. 1/4 33-21-11.
Total.....	29,200	37,905		
SALINE COUNTY.				
John Dinkler and wife.....	1,100	3,000	80	W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 10-15-5.
SEDGWICK COUNTY.				
Nelie F. Gibbons.....	2,000	2,110	40	SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 24-23-1 W.
Wesley Greeson.....	7,000	17,400	128.86	Lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 6-27-1 E.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
SEDGWICK COUNTY—contd.				
T. A. Boll.....	\$3,200	\$4,020	151.30	Lots 4, 5, 9, and 10, sec. 13-25-3 W.
Dave Seibert.....	3,000	6,240	80	S. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 22-23-1 W.
Mary J. F. Carlisle.....	5,000	8,880	320	N. 1/2 sec. 5-25-3 W.
N. A. Carlisle et ux.....	5,000	2,940	123	SW. 1/4 5-25-3 W.
Geoffry F. T. Carlisle.....	6,000	4,350	164.70	SE. 1/4 sec. 5 and lot 1 sec. 8-25-3 W.
W. R. Blakey et ux.....	10,000	6,750	360	SE. 1/4 sec. 1-27-5 W. Kingman County and W. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 6 and E. 1/2 and NW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 7-27-4 W. Sedg. Co.
Wm. Arthur McCormick.....	8,000	9,930	160	SE. 1/4 8-25-3 W.
C. E. Haskell.....	1,300	3,820	30	Commencing 20 rods N. of SE. cor. of SE. 1/4 31-27-1 E, W. 80 rods N. 60 rods E. 80 rods S. 60 rods to beginning.
O. W. Benner et ux.....	3,000	4,840	42	N. 1/2 of N. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 33-23-1 E.
Chas. C. Benner.....	2,000	5,040	38	S. 1/2 of N. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 33-23-1 E.
W. H. White et ux.....	2,500	4,730	80	N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 23-25-3 W.
Harvey C. McCormick.....	3,500	4,540	116	Lots 2 and 3 and S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 8-25-3 W.
Wesley Gresson.....	10,000	17,400	120.88	Lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 6-27-1 E.
S. H. Wemple et ux.....	1,000	1,350	20	N. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 25-28-1 W.
Fred Wilbur et ux.....	7,000	11,540	142	Lots 3 and 4 and S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 23-23-1 W.
Total.....	79,500	115,880		
SUMNER COUNTY.				
J. M. Manahan.....	4,000	6,740	160	SW. 1/4 20-31-1 W.
W. E. Dole.....	2,000	4,950	160	NW. 1/4 27-33-2 E.
T. Max Reitz.....	4,000	11,030	80	E. 1/2 NE. 1/4 20-31-2 E. The valuation has not been divided on the NE. 1/4 20-31-2 E.
Ed Cook.....	4,500	4,950	160	SE. 1/4 6-33-2 W.
John C. Frankum.....	7,000	14,560	320	N. 1/2 32-31-1 W.
A. C. Whealy.....	4,500	6,160	160	NW. 1/4 22-33-1 E.
Thomas Padgett.....	3,500	5,880	160	SW. 1/4 23-34-2 E.
Thomas A. Hubbard.....	10,000	{ 6,260 7,080 }	320	SW. 1/4 23, NW. 1/4 26-33-1 W.
Total.....	39,500	57,610		
WASHINGTON COUNTY.				
Mary Hogan.....	2,600	{ 2,150 5,820 }	160	S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and N. 1/2 SE. 1/4 32-5-4.
Edmond L. McNamara.....	2,500	3,700	80	W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 8-5-4.
Albert J. Schroll.....	4,500	7,570	160	NE. 1/4 13-5-4.
Louis Hoover.....	2,500	3,570	70	W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 21-5-4 (except 10 acres off of south side).
Joseph D. Hoazan.....	4,200	5,640	160	SW. 1/4 12-5-4.
John A. Hoover.....	3,900	5,720	160	NW. 1/4 35-5-4.
Joseph McNamara.....	2,800	4,190	80	E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 8-5-4.
John P. Hogan.....	4,500	{ 3,570 6,360 }	160	E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 and W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 21-5-4
Thomas J. Hoazan.....	2,600	2,960	80	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 32-5-4.
Frank Zrust.....	2,000	3,370	80	W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 33-4-4.
Thomas J. Hoazan.....	1,900	2,960	80	W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 29-5-4.
Maurice F. Crimmins.....	2,300	3,780	80	N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 10-5-4.
Jacob Werner.....	2,500	6,020	120	E. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 23-5-4.
Patrick O'Heary.....	5,200	6,850	160	W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 33-5-4.
Total.....	44,000	74,230		
WILSON COUNTY.				
Jacob N. Elliott.....	1,800	2,000	80	S. 1/2 SW. 1/4 33-30-17.
Leslie D. Connell.....	1,000	2,800	80	E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 32-28-18.
Total.....	2,800	4,800		
WYANDOTTE COUNTY.				
George C. Johnson and wife, Sarah H.....	5,000	6,000	40	NE. 25-11-24.
Henry La Fountain and wife, Montana.....	2,000	1,550	18.75	NW. 3-11-24.
S. D. Gratigny and wife, Lucy C.....	1,500	3,050	20	SW. and NW. 25-10-24.
James O. Mooney and wife, Catherine S.....	2,000	2,400	28	NE. 17-11-24.
Joseph Ricker and wife, Martha.....	2,000	4,400	20	NE. and SE. 26-10-24.
J. M. Rose and wife, Mary Anna.....	1,500	1,200	10 1/2	NW. 25-10-24.
H. G. Randall and wife, Jessie I.....	2,000	4,000	40	NE. 14-10-23.
Frank O. Taylor and wife, Katie.....	1,000	1,650	10	SE. 25-10-24.
David R. Emmons and wife, Lena.....	2,500	4,200	29.75	NE. 25-10-24.
Ora K. Williamson and wife, Florence.....	4,000	5,000	58	NE. 35-11-23; SE. 26-11-23.
R. C. Williamson and wife, Minnie.....	10,000	11,970	163	NE. and SE. 26-11-23; NE. 35-11-23.
Elizabeth Dora Tref and husband, Henry.....	1,400	1,400	28	NE. 20-11-23.
Total.....	34,900	46,880		
CLARK COUNTY.				
G. C. Ely.....	5,600	9,300	800	All of sec. 36 and W. 1/2 SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 21 and NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 23, T. 31, R. 21.
Herman Dahms.....	2,000	5,200	160	SE. 1/4 sec. 1-30-25.
C. C. Fawzer.....	3,000	3,200	160	NE. 1/4 sec. 22-30-25.
Smith S. Spainhour.....	5,000	6,800	320	NE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 sec. 32-30-24.
W. H. Hatcher.....	2,700	2,400	240	NW. 1/4 and W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 sec. 21-31-21.
Paul E. Clark.....	5,000	8,960	480	W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 sec. 18 and E. 1/2 of W. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 sec. 7-34-21.
J. B. Schoonover.....	1,500	1,600	80	S. 1/2 NW. 1/4 3-30-24.
Joseph Amy.....	1,500	3,520	128.33	Lots 1-3 and S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 1-30-25.
Rufus N. Estes.....	2,000	3,600	160	NW. 1/4 sec. 29-30-25.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
CLARK COUNTY—continued.				
William F. Miller.....	\$2,500	\$3,200	163	SE. 1/4 sec. 10-31-25.
Ira F. Pitman.....	2,500	4,400	169	SE. 1/4 sec. 6-30-24.
Jacob Klein.....	2,800	2,560	323	NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 sec. 16-31-25.
John E. Beard.....	3,030	2,860	323	SE. 1/4 and the W. 1/4 sec. 16-31-25.
Alexander T. Floyd.....	3,500	4,200	323	SE. 1/4 sec. 25 and NE. 1/4 sec. 36-33-25.
Elza W. McConnell.....	2,600	3,200	163	SW. 1/4 sec. 1-31-25.
W. W. Beard.....	2,000	1,585	95	W. 1/4 NW. 1/4 sec. 15 and 15 acres off E. side NE. 1/4 sec. 16-31-25.
Geo. P. Harvey.....	7,000	7,720	399	NE. 1/4 sec. 17, NW. 1/4 sec. 16, and S. 1/4 SW. 1/4 sec. 9-34-23.
William Bradford Grimes.....	7,000	10,600	640	E. 1/4 sec. 17 and N. 1/4 sec. 16-31-21.
James I. Pitman.....	9,000	12,950	690	N. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 sec. 21, E. 1/4 NE. 1/4 sec. 20, and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 sec. 20-30-24.
Annis M. McConnell.....	1,500	3,680	163	NE. 1/4 sec. 2-31-25.
George A. Duval.....	10,000	8,840	1,121.62	In T. 32, R. 21.
William J. Workman.....	7,200	10,940	480	E. 1/4 sec. 36, SW. 1/4 sec. 36-33-21.
Total.....	68,200	121,315		
CHEYENNE COUNTY.				
Homer D. Hayward.....	2,100	2,490	483	NE. 1/4 33 and N. 1/4, 31-5-42.
Roy D. Baldwin.....	500	530	163	SW. 1/4 34-5-42.
R. C. Owens.....	1,200	1,490	323	W. 1/4 16-4-42.
James W. Collins.....	1,000	1,320	363	NW. 1/4 10, SE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 3-5-42.
A. F. Forsythe.....	2,200	2,490	483	E. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 22-4-42.
William J. Powell.....	1,500	1,570	323	S. 1/4 23-4-42.
William H. Rogers.....	1,300	2,530	163	NW. 1/4 1-1-37.
Albert Weaver.....	1,600	2,000	163	SE. 1/4 22-3-33.
Phillip F. Fishbeck.....	1,300	2,500	323	SW. 1/4 8 and NW. 1/4 17-5-37.
William H. White.....	600	480	163	SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4, SW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 34-1-38 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 3-2-38.
Alfred Dorsch.....	1,700	2,920	163	SW. 1/4 5-3-37.
Bernard H. Hickert.....	1,000	1,700	163	SW. 1/4 4-3-38.
Lewis Scheller.....	1,600	1,820	323	SE. 1/4 21 and NE. 1/4 28-4-42.
John T. O'Brien.....	2,000	1,800	163	SW. 1/4 1-1-38.
Daniel L. Ough.....	3,500	4,720	603	S. 1/4 SE. 1/4, SW. 1/4 4, SE. 1/4 5, NW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 9-1-38.
George W. Morris.....	800	900	163	Lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 2-1-39.
Gertrude M. Chipperfield.....	1,800	2,280	563	NW. 1/4 4, NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 5-2-38 and SW. 1/4 32-1-33.
Eugene E. Collins.....	4,000	3,300	403	W. 1/4 34 and E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 33-4-42.
William T. Case.....	400	400	80	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 23-1-33.
Total.....	30,100	37,430		
DECATUR COUNTY.				
O. G. Bell.....	4,500	3,980	440	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4, NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4, NW. 1/4 SE. 1/4, SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 6 and N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 7 and SW. 1/4 5-2-28.
Chas. L. Marquart.....	1,600	2,200	240	NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 20-3-30.
E. A. Pauley.....	1,200	2,990	323	N. 1/4 35-3-23.
Herbert L. Hanchett.....	4,000	4,460	317	N. 1/4 16-3-23.
Oliver C. Milleson.....	1,000	960	163	E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 25-3-30.
Addison C. Carheart.....	4,000	6,600	403	W. 1/4 and N. 1/4 NE. 1/4 32-3-23.
Charles Lemman.....	1,600	1,570	163	SW. 1/4 20-3-30.
S. T. Marcuson.....	2,700	3,300	323	SW. 1/4 and S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 34-4-23.
H. C. La Tourette.....	1,800	2,820	173	NE. 1/4 24-3-30.
Do.....	500	660	163	NE. 1/4 25-3-30.
Henry H. Miller.....	1,500	1,600	163	SW. 1/4 14-2-26.
C. L. Buswell.....	1,300	1,720	313	SE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 30 and NE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 31-3-23.
James Petrasok.....	6,500	7,040	640	All sections 15-4-23.
Katherine Handwerk.....	2,500	7,480	720	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 1, E. 1/4 12 and NE. 1/4 13-4-30.
Augustus D. Litton.....	1,000	2,170	232	SE. 1/4 and part SW. 1/4 9-3-28.
Addison J. Coulter.....	2,500	2,520	163	NW. 1/4 8-2-27.
Angela Handwerk.....	1,500	1,640	160	NW. 1/4 35-3-31.
Total.....	33,900	54,680		
FORD COUNTY.				
H. L. Hartshorn.....	4,000	3,600	163	SW. 1/4 3-28-23.
Abraham Pyles.....	2,000	2,600	163	SW. 1/4 28-25-25.
Martin V. Hess.....	2,000	2,010	163	NW. 1/4 19-23-28.
Clarence O. Haywood.....	6,400	5,780	323	E. 1/4 22-29-25.
George J. Stauth.....	4,000	4,660	323	W. 1/4 17-27-25.
E. Madison.....	4,000	4,050	163	NW. 1/4 3-28-22.
Jonathan O. Riegel.....	10,000	11,288	483	N. 1/4 and N. 1/4 S. 1/4 2-28-22.
E. F. Wright.....	2,500	1,933	151.61	SW. 1/4 7-28-22.
H. L. Hartshorn.....	3,500	3,200	163	SE. 1/4 4-28-23.
Christian H. Wagler.....	3,000	3,528	163	NW. 1/4 8-23-21.
J. L. Riezel.....	10,000	6,870	273	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 SE. 1/4 1-28-22, lots 7 and 8 in 36-27-22.
Charles H. Redfield.....	7,700	5,645	261 1/2	NW. 1/4 and 101 1/2 by 160 rods SW. 1/4 24-28-22.
Norton E. Askew.....	2,300	2,280	163	NW. 1/4 16-28-25.
Luna A. Lamb.....	5,000	7,284	323	NW. 1/4 9 and SW. 1/4 4-28-22.
Walter A. Cobb.....	7,000	6,560	403	W. 1/4 25 and N. 1/4 NW. 1/4 33-28-23.
Robert D. Askew.....	4,000	6,684	323	N. 1/4 14-28-24.
Norton E. Askew.....	2,300	2,312	163	NE. 1/4 17-28-23.
Albert Miller.....	7,000	6,992	480	W. 1/4 16 and NW. 1/4 9-26-25.
Forrest H. McCauley.....	10,000	11,490	543.92	W. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 and W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 31-29-23.
Minnie B. Vance.....	4,200	4,320	324.80	N. 1/4 2-25-23.
A. L. Deniston.....	6,500	7,885	317.47	S. 1/4 30-29-24.
A. B. Duncan.....	6,000	5,485	200	SW. 1/4 14 and NE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 15-28-22.
J. E. McQuillin.....	2,500	3,344	163	S. 1/4 S. 1/4 21-27-24.
Perry W. Jenkins.....	4,000	3,700	160	SE. 1/4 11-28-22.
Erwin Streiff.....	4,500	5,273	318.72	W. 1/4 2-27-21.
G. A. Roggenesses.....	2,500	3,035	155 1/2	NE. 1/4 20-27-21 ex. 4 1/2 acres.
W. T. Middleton.....	8,000	7,910	323	E. 1/4 35-28-22.
Hugh O. Taylor.....	5,000	5,453	240	NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 18-29-24.
John E. Wiese.....	3,000	3,049	163	NW. 1/4 14-25-22.
Erasmus Madison.....	4,000	3,360	163	NE. 1/4 3-28-22.
Russell B. Hageman.....	4,000	7,900	323	S. 1/4 2-28-23.
B. W. Gross.....	5,500	5,190	280	NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 30-28-22.
C. W. Hartshorn.....	5,000	4,488 1/2	323	SE. 1/4 4 and NE. 1/4 9-28-25.
Lawrence E. Geoffroy.....	3,000	3,657	323	E. 1/4 6-25-24.
James M. Kimbrel.....	2,500	2,495	149.96	SW. 1/4 19-28-25.
John C. Umbach.....	3,600	4,138	323	NW. 1/4 25 and NE. 1/4 26-28-25.
William T. Elland.....	5,800	5,783	243	SE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 23-29-22.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
FORD COUNTY—continued.				
Allen W. Jones.....	\$8,400	\$8,981	207.94	Part W. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 31-23-24.
I. D. Ainsworth.....	3,701	4,627	100	Part NE. 1/4 25-23-23.
Dora Faulkner.....	5,500	5,052	320	N. 1/4 35-23-25.
Total.....	184,800	203,923		
FINNEY COUNTY.				
Ed. Gosman.....	1,000	710	97.27	Lot 2 in 4-23-32.
John H. Towles et ux.....	4,000	903	160	E. 1/2 E. 1/4 16-24-34.
Gertrude S. Towles et vir.....	6,000	4,900	201	W. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 and N. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 16-24-34.
L. M. Bland et ux.....	3,000	10,000	80	S. 1/4 SE. 1/4 11-24-31.
C. J. Stople et ux.....	2,700	5,103	39	W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 12-24-33.
D. C. Berlinecart.....	5,500	4,800	640	All 21-24-31.
Noah S. Horst.....	1,500	1,310	178.90	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and lot 1 4-23-32.
M. R. Wilks.....	3,500	2,450	320	S. 1/4 15-23-32.
Paul Randall Crow.....	2,600	2,230	240	S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 2-23-32.
Chas. F. Judy.....	2,000	2,250	319	NE. 1/4 34 and SE. 1/4 27-23-30.
Albert Drussel.....	3,000	1,865	400	SE. 1/4 35-23-33 and lot 1 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 4-23-33.
John F. Maura.....	1,500	2,400	476	S. 1/4 25 and NE. 1/4 33 T. 25-31.
Charles Cowgill.....	1,500	1,600	318.88	SW. 1/4 20 and NW. 1/4 30 T. 25 R. 32.
John Landgraf.....	3,600	4,200	640	W. 1/4 27 and SE. 1/4 28 and NE. 1/4 34 T. 21 R. 32.
S. R. Guthrie.....	5,000	4,745	553.95	SE. 1/4 8-25-31 and all that part of 9-25-31 lying south of the Arkansas River.
Hans Thomesen.....	2,000	5,400	160	NE. 1/4 30-22-34.
O. G. Stevenson.....	2,400	6,400	160	SW. 1/4 32-23-33.
William H. Wilks.....	3,000	2,050	320	E. 1/4 34-25-32.
Teddy L. Stotts.....	700	1,000	160	SE. 1/4 36-23-30.
Estella W. Hazle.....	3,000	3,700	160	NE. 1/4 18-24-34.
Frederich Ulrich.....	1,800	2,050	160	SW. 1/4 16-22-32.
Henry Meyer.....	3,000	2,450	320	S. 1/4 17-26-32.
William E. Trull.....	800	1,030	160	NE. 1/4 26-23-30.
Melvin D. Kemp.....	4,000	5,140	120	NW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 33-23-33.
R. E. Stotts et al.....	3,500	4,000	120	W. 1/4 NW. 1/4 15 and SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 13 T. 21 R. 32.
Charlie O. Winget.....	3,000	8,600	160	SE. 1/4 26-23-33.
W. H. Guthrie.....	6,500	9,460	920	All 15 south of Arkansas River; all N. 1/4 23 south of Arkansas River T. 25 R. 31.
Amel Landgraf.....	4,500	3,150	720	E. 1/4 25, NE. 1/4 and W. 1/4 SE. 1/4 35 T. 21 R. 32.
C. F. Blank.....	800	800	160	SW. 1/4 2-21-32.
Richard J. Churchill.....	2,500	2,600	483	S. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 22, N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and S. 1/4 NW. 1/4 23, all in 22-30.
Alice E. Williams.....	3,000	2,510	323	E. 1/4 10-22-34.
Basil P. Shull.....	8,000	9,000	800	All 11, E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 15 T. 24 R. 32.
George H. Reeve.....	7,000	8,750	160	E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 NE. 1/4 1-21-33.
Walker B. Bidstrup.....	5,000	6,520	367.60	SE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 and lots 2 and 3, 10-24-34.
E. B. Sears.....	2,000	3,500	320	NW. 1/4 32 and SE. 1/4 23-22-32.
Henry Gieseking.....	1,600	2,100	49	SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 36-23-33.
Clarence P. Hamilton.....	800	1,050	160	NE. 1/4 26-25-33, except right of way for R. R.
Eli M. Bender.....	1,500	1,650	48.45	Part 8-24-33.
John T. Claassen.....	800	1,120	160	SW. 1/4 10-26-31.
A. S. Guthrie.....	6,000	5,680	861.86	All 5-26-31.
Alonzo F. Rhea.....	1,200	1,100	160	NE. 1/4 32-26-31.
F. W. Kolbus.....	1,000	1,200	160	SE. 1/4 21-23-30.
Total.....	123,800	151,440		
GREELEY COUNTY.				
W. E. Thero and wife.....	1,100	950	160	NW. 1/4 29-17-39.
Malcolm McDonald and wife.....	800	900	160	SW. 1/4 28-16-40.
Adam Nagel and wife.....	800	730	160	NE. 1/4 18-16-40.
Harold C. Smith and wife.....	500	775	160	SW. 1/4 24-16-40.
Frank C. Woods and wife.....	1,000	1,600	323	NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 34-16-40.
Irving A. Harper and wife.....	700	900	160	NE. 1/4 18-16-40.
Ward Lobdell, single.....	1,000	1,200	160	SE. 1/4 3-20-39.
John M. Smith and wife.....	800	1,600	320	E. 1/4 36-16-40.
Lewis A. Doty and wife.....	700	900	160	NW. 1/4 13-17-40.
Joe Kuttler and wife.....	8,000	9,410	2,040	SW. 1/4 23-29-39, NE. 1/4 19-23-39, SE. 1/4 35-20-40, W. 1/4 6-20-39, S. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 16-19-39, NE. 1/4 7-19-39, SE. 1/4 21-19-39, SE. 1/4 20-19-39, SE. 1/4 24-17-42, E. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 32-19-39.
David P. Jones, widower.....	1,500	1,750	323	NE. 1/4 15 and NE. 1/4 16 in 19-42.
Oscar C. Mayne and wife.....	1,100	1,000	160	SE. 1/4 34-18-41.
Erick Beigefast and wife.....	1,200	1,650	323	N. 1/4 8-16-42.
C. F. Woods and wife.....	600	750	160	SE. 1/4 4-17-40.
Clint Stevens, single.....	1,900	1,900	230	NE. 1/4 23, except 10 acres, and E. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 23 in 18-40.
Katie Davison and husband.....	1,000	1,000	160	SE. 1/4 21-18-39.
Total.....	22,700	26,985		
GRANT COUNTY.				
Guy McGilivray.....	800	1,050	160	SE. 1/4 17-23-37.
Geo. Basler, Jr.....	700	900	160	SE. 1/4 23-17-38.
George Bales.....	700	900	160	NE. 1/4 22-27-38.
Edward A. Kopley.....	1,600	1,950	520	W. 1/4 of sec. 35-23-33.
Calvin L. Algers.....	700	900	160	NE. 1/4 35-23-38.
Alvin Edlin.....	700	895	160	NW. 1/4 1-30-37.
Ed. Swagerty.....	700	780	160	SW. 1/4 20-28-36.
Clarence L. Kopley.....	800	1,050	160	NW. 1/4 11-30-38.
Franklin W. Kopley.....	800	1,030	160	SE. 1/4 10-30-38.
Dave Stort.....	600	890	160	NE. 1/4 8-22-36.
John A. Walker.....	700	1,125	160	NW. 1/4 34-27-37.
James J. Fletcher.....	800	1,080	160	SE. 1/4 19-27-35.
William L. Bales.....	1,500	2,120	323	SE. 1/4 21 and SW. 1/4 22-27-36.
Aaron C. Moore.....	1,300	1,900	320	E. 1/4 of sec. 11-27-37.
Phillip A. Walker.....	1,500	2,095	332.80	NW. 1/4 13-27-37 and SW. 1/4 7-27-33.
Isaac Peterson.....	1,600	2,200	320	SW. 1/4 12 and NW. 1/4 13-30-35.
Cornelius H. Pritchard.....	1,000	1,500	240	NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 14-30-35.
C. J. Priest.....	500	890	160	SE. 1/4 4-30-35.
William A. Moore.....	2,000	2,795	480	S. 1/4 of sec. 2-27-37 and NE. 1/4 7-27-35.
Benjamin F. Orton.....	1,600	1,850	320	NE. 1/4 23 and SW. 1/4 24-23-31.
Frank F. Lewis.....	800	1,250	160	SW. 1/4 3-27-37.
Russell R. Bechtelshimer.....	800	960	160	SW. 1/4 31-28-37.
George H. Braver.....	900	1,380	240	E. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 or SE. 1/4 21 and NE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 25-30-35.
Charles O. Lewis.....	700	1,000	160	SW. 1/4 15-27-35.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
GRANT COUNTY—continued.				
Edwin O. Stuart.....	\$3,600	\$5,900	960	E. 1/2 and SW. 1/2 27 and NW. 1/2 and E. 1/2 of SW. 1/2 and W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 34, and E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 23 and E. 1/2 NE. 1/4, all in 33-29-35.
William F. Coder.....	1,000	1,380	240	NW. 1/4 of sec. 5 and S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 2-30-33.
Edward F. Towler.....	5,000	7,000	1,129	W. 1/2 of sec. 29, all of sec. 21, and NW. 1/4 22-30-37.
Frank L. Bruce.....	700	985	160	SE. 1/4 13-23-33.
S. E. Hylton.....	1,400	1,800	320	SE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 22-23-33.
Joseph C. Findley.....	2,400	2,260	480	SE. 1/4 33 and NW. 1/4 34-27-33 and NE. 1/4 4-23-31.
James F. Parsons.....	10,000	1,920	1,523.24	N. 1/2 SE. 1/4 33, SW. 1/4 and E. 1/2 SE. 1/4 W. 1/2 SE. 1/4 34-30-37, balance located in Stevens County.
Total.....	47,900	71,155		
GOVE COUNTY.				
Fred L. Bentley.....	1,200	1,300	320	NE. 1/4 35-15-29, NE. 1/4 17-15-23.
Christian E. Hockersmith.....	1,800	1,700	320	E. 1/2 35-13-28 (except 1/4 acres).
Reed H. Holmes.....	1,000	1,680	320	Lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 5-15-27.
Wynne P. Harrington.....	3,000	3,045	480	W. 1/2 13 and NE. 1/4 14, all in 14-28.
John H. Hinchliff.....	600	940	160	SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and S. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 12-15-23.
Marion E. Miller.....	600	800	160	NE. 1/4 29-15-29.
Arthur R. Bentley.....	2,000	1,880	480	NW. 1/4 11 and NE. 1/4 10 and E. 1/2 NE. 1/4 11 and S. 1/2 SW. 1/4 21-15-23.
Benjamin F. Campbell.....	600	720	160	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 21-15-23.
George W. Bowman.....	1,700	2,735	160	NE. 1/4 9-12-23.
Robert J. Abell and Mary H. Abell, husband and wife.	8,000	9,220	1,820	All 25-12-31; NE. 1/4 30-12-30 and N. 1/2 and SW. 1/4 35-12-31.
Marvin G. Davidson.....	3,000	2,440	480	S. 1/2 31 and SE. 1/4 33-15-28.
Oley V. Davidson.....	3,000	2,680	480	SE. 1/4 27 and N. 1/2 34-15-28.
Alden Nickerson.....	1,500	1,660	320	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 and N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 23-13-27.
John C. Bowman.....	2,000	2,480	160	NW. 1/4 33-11-23.
Harvey P. Ikenberry.....	2,400	3,560	160	SE. 1/4 31-11-26.
James W. Williams.....	2,400	3,120	320	N. 1/2 32-12-31.
Samuel S. Long.....	8,000	9,360	640	N. 1/2 36 and SE. 1/4 25 and NE. 1/4 35, all in 11-23.
A. W. Hendrickson.....	1,000	1,600	160	NE. 1/4 22-12-27.
Frank A. Rice.....	2,000	2,460	160	NW. 1/4 26-11-27.
Edward C. Prather.....	1,200	1,920	160	SW. 1/4 26-11-31.
William H. Fink.....	3,700	2,050	320	NE. 1/4 2-12-27 and NW. 1/4 32-12-25, this last being in Trego County and assessed value not given.
Total.....	50,700	57,410		
GRAY COUNTY.				
Paskel L. Spivey.....	5,000	4,850	320	SW. 1/4 22 and NW. 1/4 27-29-27.
John C. Latham.....	2,000	2,690	320	W. 1/2 sec. 35-24-30.
William E. McCauley.....	2,000	2,350	160	SW. 1/4 36-29-27.
Riley I. Montgomery.....	6,000	4,715	480	E. 1/2 2-29-29 NW. 1/4 2-29-29.
Samuel Imhoff.....	3,000	3,010	320	Lots 1-2 and S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 and lots 3-4 and S. 1/2 NW. 1/4 1-29-30.
T. F. Potts.....	1,600	1,965	160	SE. 1/4 35-28-29.
John Sweeney.....	3,000	3,900	320	NE. 1/4 7-23-29, W. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4, SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, sec. 22-27-29.
E. E. McHugh et al.....	8,500	8,405	610	All of 32-29-28.
John B. Ferguson.....	1,300	1,510	160	Lots 3-4 and E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 30-27-30.
Hugh Elliott.....	2,800	2,365	320	E. 1/2 26-29-29.
John H. Miller.....	3,500	3,905	320	N. 1/4 11-23-29.
Edward Cleghorn.....	1,300	1,610	159.68	NW. 1/4 30-27-30.
A. J. Elliott.....	5,000	5,446	633.12	E. 1/2 35-29-29 and NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 31-29-23.
Henry T. Unruh.....	1,600	1,510	160	NW. 1/4 23-23-33.
Christopher C. S. Sikes.....	1,500	1,660	160	NE. 1/4 31-23-29.
W. E. Bendley.....	3,600	4,015	320	E. 1/2 24-27-29.
Samuel Dirks.....	3,200	4,350	320	W. 1/2 30-28-29.
Peter S. Lubbers.....	2,000	2,465	160	SE. 1/4 18-28-27.
J. G. Byer.....	2,000	2,020	320	S. 1/2 5-26-30.
J. E. Kendall.....	3,000	4,990	480	E. 1/2 and NW. 1/4 22-25-29.
J. B. Frazier.....	3,500	3,020	320	N. 1/2 36-27-30.
J. J. Govertzen.....	3,000	2,995	320	S. 1/2 6-25-28.
Alva E. Frazier.....	5,000	7,310	800	E. 1/2 15 and SW. 1/4 11 and NW. 1/4 14, and SE. 1/4 10-27-30.
J. M. Henderson.....	1,500	1,255	160	SW. 1/4 34-29-29.
Milton H. Clothier.....	3,500	1,815	783	All of 13 and lots 9, 10, 11, 12 in 1-25-23.
J. F. Reinst.....	8,000	7,690	800	All of 29 and NE. 1/4 30-25-28.
J. D. Patterson.....	5,000	4,870	470	SE. 1/4 34 and S. 1/2 35-23-30.
Fred P. Schmidt.....	4,500	4,820	320	E. 1/2 19-28-28.
R. E. Israel.....	5,600	5,900	640	All of 9-27-29.
James W. McReynolds.....	10,000	12,057	1,120	W. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 15 and E. 1/2 21 and W. 1/2 22-23-23.
F. A. Williams.....	2,500	2,215	160	NE. 1/4 21-28-29.
Anna Jossorand.....	1,200	1,610	160	SW. 1/4 17-23-30.
Walter W. McDonald.....	1,600	1,830	160	SE. 1/4 25-29-30.
Godfrey N. Gifford.....	900	1,190	157	Lots 1 and 2, and NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4, and N. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 18-27-23.
Thomas W. Brumby.....	2,000	3,020	320	E. 1/2 22-27-28.
Total.....	119,700	129,358		
HAMILTON COUNTY.				
Solomon Yonally, single.....	1,100	1,530	320	NW. 1/4 12-23-40, NW. 1/4 2-23-40.
N. M. Herbig and wife.....	4,000	5,365	1,276	Lots 1 and 2 and SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 5-23-42, NE. 1/4 7-23-42, SE. 1/4 4-20-42, NW. 1/4 20-25-42, E. 1/2 32-25-42, SW. 1/4 33-25-42, NW. 1/4 11-23-43.
William F. Kaesler et ux.....	1,400	1,150	160	SW. 1/4 12-29-42.
Guenther Westerman, widower.....	500	810	160	SW. 1/4 9-23-42.
Carl Kaesler, widower.....	1,000	1,610	320	S. 1/2 11-23-42.
Alono Geiger and wife.....	2,000	3,305	80	S. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 3-24-41.
Roy J. Morrow and wife.....	5,400	5,230	300.70	Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and N. 1/2 of N. 1/2 10-24-41.
John W. Michaels and wife.....	1,200	1,485	320	NE. 1/4 25-23-40, NE. 1/4 30-29-39.
Charles A. Calkins and wife.....	10,000	14,080	3,679.96	All section 33-24-42, all section 5-25-42, all section 11-25-42, all section 1-25-43, N. 1/2 and N. 1/2 of S. 1/2 11-25-43, lots 3 and 4 and S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 4-25-42, SE. 1/4 34-24-42, SE. 1/4 32-24-42.
L. W. McMasters, single, and G. W. McMasters, single.....	2,000	2,450	640.72	SW. 1/2 21-21-39, SE. 1/2 21-21-39, lots 3 and 4 and S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 1-22-40, lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 1-22-40.
John F. Van Dyke and wife.....	1,000	1,300	320	SE. 1/4 10-23-41, SW. 1/4 16-23-41.
Byron A. Boughton and wife.....	1,100	1,230	320	SW. 1/4 22-22-41, NE. 1/4 22-22-41.
Albert L. Martin and wife.....	600	510	160	W. 1/2 of W. 1/2 10-23-41.
Total.....	31,300	40,125		

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
HASKELL COUNTY.				
N. T. Yount and wife.....	\$4,500	\$5,550	800	E. ½ and SW. ¼ S. 8 and W. ¼ 9-23-32.
Jasper Scott, et ux.....	2,500	2,016	320	SW. ¼ 29 and SE. ¼ 30-23-34.
Michael Waldron, et ux.....	1,500	1,805	160	SE. ¼ 23-23-31.
Willie Yunker, et ux.....	1,500	1,244	160	NW. ¼ 14-29-34.
Bernard Rogers, et ux.....	1,200	1,485	160	SE. ¼ 36-23-31.
John G. Rozge, et ux.....	1,200	1,247	160	E. ½ of W. ¼ 7-27-32.
Rufus E. Oliver, et ux.....	1,000	972	160	NE. ¼ 22-27-34.
J. L. Hickman, et ux.....	1,600	1,716	320	W. ¼ 33-23-34.
Total.....	15,000	16,035	
HODGEMAN COUNTY.				
John S. Whiteside and wife..	8,000	8,525	640	All of sec. 2-24-23.
Carl Carlson and wife.....	7,500	5,145	480	NE. ¼ 13-24-23 and S. ¼ 7-24-22.
J. F. Harris and wife.....	7,500	8,300	400	S. ¼ 21 and W. ¼ of SW. ¼ 22-24-22.
George Wesley Dixon and wife.	1,500	2,640	244	Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and S. ¼ of NE. ¼ 2-23-21.
A. L. Hull and wife.....	8,000	7,200	640	N. ¼ of 20-24 and E. ¼ 19-24-22.
Sarah E. Chisholm and husband.	3,500	3,000	320	SE. ¼ and SW. ¼ 9-22-25.
H. Gillogly and wife.....	4,500	4,255	480	W. ½ and N. ¼ of NE. ¼ of SE. ¼ 16-24-23.
John Love and wife.....	5,000	6,550	958	All sec. 3-23-26 and S. ¼ sec. 4-23-23.
Joseph Bishop (single).....	1,000	1,600	160	S. ¼ of NW. ¼ and N. ¼ of SW. ¼ 20-23-22.
Waller F. Pursley and wife..	1,400	2,615	160	NE. ¼ sec. 8-23-23.
John H. Mook and wife.....	4,000	4,140	480	NW. ¼ sec. 22 and NE. ¼ 22 SW. ¼ 15, all in 22-23.
Joe Boyce and wife.....	3,600	5,605	320	E. ¼ sec. 8-24-23.
W. G. Pitts and wife.....	3,500	3,635	234	E. ¼ of SE. ¼ sec. 31-22-23, also lots 3-4 S. ¼ of NW. ¼ sec. 5-23-23.
Charles Reese (single).....	1,500	2,240	160	NW. ¼ 23-22-24.
Albert Morris and wife.....	8,500	7,785	486	N. ¼ 12-24-23 and lots 1-2 E. ¼ of NE. ¼ 7-24-22.
Amaziah D. Moon and wife..	1,000	1,480	160	SW. ¼ 29-21-23.
George W. Sutton and wife..	2,000	2,100	160	NE. ¼ 19-22-25.
Joseph McKibben and wife..	2,500	5,050	320	S. ¼ sec. 15-22-24.
Samuel S. Love and wife.....	5,000	5,380	640	N. ¼ sec. 4, S. ¼ sec. 5-23-25.
N. L. Rucker and wife.....	2,200	3,555	157	SW. ¼ 33-21-21, except railroad right of way.
John A. Baldrey and wife.....	3,000	6,401	320	W. ½ sec. 3-23-22.
Orange L. Board.....	1,000	2,490	160	NE. ¼ sec. 7-22-23.
Joseph C. Gill and wife.....	1,500	2,240	160	NW. ¼ sec. 25-22-24.
Aaron E. Beck.....	2,000	2,300	160	SE. ¼ sec. 31-24-23.
Joseph F. Deyoe and wife..	5,300	4,240	480	N. ¼ sec. 28 and SE. ¼ 21-21-23.
R. Sherman Polson and wife.	900	1,440	160	NE. ¼ sec. 9-23-23.
Jorgen Peterson and wife..	4,000	4,090	320	S. ¼ 34-24-25.
J. Frank Crawford et al.....	6,000	6,340	800	SE. ¼ 8, all of 17-23-26.
Thomas A. O'Keefe and wife.	8,000	7,000	320	SE. ¼ of 6 and NE. ¼ of 7-21-22.
James A. Hull.....	1,000	1,600	80	N. ¼ of SE. ¼ of 20-24-22.
A. A. Stegman and wife.....	6,500	7,895	503	Lots 1-2 E. ¼ of NW. ¼ and SE. ¼, lots 3-4 and E. ¼ of SW. ¼ of 30-24-22.
T. J. Holdridge and wife.....	900	7,000	800	S. ¼ and NE. ¼ of 5 and N. ¼ of 8-21-24.
Robert L. Hull.....	1,000	1,600	80	S. ¼ of SE. ¼ 20-24-22.
Total.....	122,800	145,425	
KIOWA COUNTY.				
C. A. McAnarney.....	7,000	7,760	480	NE. ¼ 27, SW. ¼ 23 and SE. ¼ 22-27-16.
Earle B. Carpenter.....	4,000	4,080	160	SE. ¼ 23-27-16.
J. M. Treadwine.....	4,000	7,840	160	NE. ¼ 16-28-16.
Jeremiah Evans.....	10,000	16,400	480	E. ¼ of E. ¼ 27, W. ¼ 23-28-17.
Rolla V. Mapel.....	7,000	6,955	320	SE. ¼ 7-27-16, NE. ¼ 13-27-16.
Henry F. Bryant.....	6,500	5,990	320	W. ¼ 7-23-16.
H. B. Amerine.....	5,000	8,340	160	NW. ¼ 21-28-16.
Claude C. Baulden.....	2,500	5,200	160	SW. ¼ 35-27-17.
J. M. Treadwine.....	6,000	9,780	320	E. ¼ 1-28-16.
C. M. Miner.....	5,000	5,850	320	NE. ¼ 16 and NE. ¼ 22-27-16.
Total.....	57,000	78,245	
KEARNY COUNTY.				
Samuel Jones.....	2,500	2,390	560	N. ¼ and SW. ¼ and W. ¼ SE. ¼ 11-24-33.
Samuel F. Downs.....	500	590	160	NW. ¼ 34-24-38.
W. E. Linton.....	1,700	1,545	316	SE. ¼ 24-24-38 and NW. ¼ 19-21-37.
O. J. Toney.....	2,000	1,640	320	SE. ¼ 11 and NW. ¼ 12-23-33.
Clarence H. Dale.....	1,000	1,020	160	SW. ¼ 12-24-38.
P. H. Palmer.....	2,000	1,655	320	E. ¼ 8-23-38.
Joseph Kurz.....	2,000	2,365	480	N. ¼ 22 and SE. ¼ 22-31-38.
John M. Hauck.....	1,600	1,350	320	SW. ¼ NE. ¼ 10-23-38.
Luther F. Hefner.....	1,000	830	160	SE. ¼ 4-24-37.
Claude L. Hubbard.....	2,000	1,760	320	S. ¼ 20-24-37.
Medil M. Henderson.....	500	630	160	NE. ¼ 20-26-37.
Thomas H. Rosecrans.....	1,000	830	160	SE. ¼ 22-23-37.
John E. Dole.....	500	760	160	NW. ¼ 14-24-38.
Alfred White.....	5,000	5,200	160	SE. ¼ 35-23-35.
Don Ball.....	5,000	3,860	160	NW. ¼ 26-23-35.
W. H. Schoaf.....	4,200	4,120	158	SW. ¼ 27-21-35.
Jay S. Rishell.....	500	730	160	SE. ¼ 19-21-38.
Charles Bentrup.....	1,500	800	121.75	Lots 1-2-3-4, NW. ¼ of NW. ¼ 14-24-35.
Deroy P. Smith.....	800	870	160	SE. ¼ 20-23-36.
J. D. Gillack.....	1,000	5,100	40	SE. ¼ of NW. ¼ 35-23-35.
J. W. Gillock.....	5,000	4,560	160	SW. ¼ 26-23-35.
Dan G. A. Schaaf.....	1,800	2,455	160	NE. ¼ 2-23-35.
William A. Edson.....	800	950	160	SW. ¼ 23-21-38.
William H. Tebo.....	1,000	1,910	480	NE. ¼ and S. ¼ 32-24-37.
Clara A. Chesmore.....	800	675	160	NE. ¼ 33-22-36.
Ora A. Young.....	1,300	1,359	320	E. ¼ 18-22-38.
R. C. Oxelson.....	1,000	1,140	151.80	NW. ¼ 18-21-36.
Oscar Brown.....	700	675	160	SE. ¼ 8-22-38.
David D. Hamblen.....	4,000	3,470	800	All 17-21-36 and N. ¼ 20-21-36.
Lawrence Elliott.....	700	710	160	SW. ¼ 12-26-38.
George B. Martin.....	2,500	10,040	300	S. ¼ 13-24-36, less strip 35 feet wide off west side.
L. B. Shortridge.....	1,600	1,340	320	SE. ¼ and NE. ¼ 9-22-36.
Jacob F. Hefner.....	1,000	1,030	160	NW. ¼ 10-24-37.
Edward Feldman.....	800	870	160	SE. ¼ 10-26-38.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstracts—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
KEARNY COUNTY—contd.				
Frederick H. Meyer.....	\$2,500	\$3,795	150.25	Lot 1 and SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 22-24-35.
Daniel G. A. Schoaf.....	3,000	4,560	160	SE. 1/4 27-23-35.
Ernest L. Dora.....	1,000	1,470	160	NW. 1/4 12-24-36.
W. H. Tebo.....	1,000	730	160	NW. 1/4 32-21-37.
Richard Mathews.....	1,000	920	160	SW. 1/4 22-23-36.
Thomas H. Rosecrans.....	2,000	725	320	SW. 1/4 5 and NW. 1/4 5-23-37.
Thomas A. Berry.....	600	675	160	NW. 1/4 23-22-36.
William E. Fink.....	800	740	160	SE. 1/4 17-22-36.
Thomas W. Bruner.....	800	675	160	SE. 1/4 15-22-36.
James H. McCoy.....	800	775	160	SE. 1/4 11-21-37.
Eddie Wiatt.....	2,700	2,480	480	W. 1/4 of 23 1/2 NE. 1/4 23-21-33.
Lloyd H. Helkes.....	700	720	160	SW. 1/4 23-21-36.
Ruben Daniel.....	900	870	160	NE. 1/4 10-26-38.
W. M. McVey.....	800	830	160	SW. 1/4 24-23-37.
Thurston Wayne Foster.....	700	730	160	NE. 1/4 24-24-37.
T. C. Thorpe.....	8,500	9,895	2,405	N. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 34, all 36, T. 24, all of 2 and 3 and S. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 10-25-37.
Sarah E. Ferrell.....	2,800	5,685	299	Lots 2 and 3 and N. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and lot 1 of the NW. 1/4 sec. 12 and lots 1, 2, 3 of sec. 10-25-38.
Walter Decker.....	1,500	2,665	301.62	Lot 5 SE. 1/4 of N. W. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and lot 6 and E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 6-23-35.
Ezra Lyons.....	1,800	1,405	320	SE. 1/4 18-23-37 and NE. 1/4 24-26-37.
Total.....	97,900	109,533		
LOGAN COUNTY.				
W. R. Haslett.....	2,000	2,500	321	SE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 10-13-32.
Drew Lamoroux.....	900	1,555	160	SW. 1/4 9-12-32.
E. C. Fulton.....	1,300	2,039	160	SW. 1/4 1-11-33.
James F. Pool.....	1,100	1,990	160	NE. 1/4 30-12-32.
E. M. Cook.....	2,500	3,595	323	N. 1/4 14-11-33.
Elmer Baxter.....	1,800	2,515	323	W. 1/4 34-12-32.
Ida E. Brown.....	700	625	160	E. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 12-15-37.
Louie J. Wurst.....	700	1,069	160	NW. 1/4 10-14-35.
Patrik Slattery.....	2,000	2,420	640	All 23-14-35.
H. E. Hooper.....	700	905	160	NE. 1/4 20-14-35.
Joseph T. Hopper.....	800	1,089	160	NW. 1/4 8-14-35.
William O. Turner.....	800	950	160	NW. 1/4 14-14-35.
Walter B. Cassidy.....	1,800	2,385	240	NE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SE. 1/4 8-11-33.
Joseph Moore.....	600	660	160	SE. 1/4 14-14-35.
L. N. Sawyer.....	1,600	3,110	323	W. 1/4 23-12-34.
Samuel W. Minter.....	2,000	3,465	323	W. 1/4 31-11-34.
J. D. Veal.....	800	1,210	323	E. 1/4 17-14-35.
Frederick Ulrich.....	1,500	3,225	320	E. 1/4 1-12-33.
Louie Blau.....	1,100	1,490	323	W. 1/4 3-15-36.
James F. Barton.....	800	860	160	N. 1/4 SE. 1/4, E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 10-14-38.
Anna Deaver, nee Blau.....	1,100	1,680	320	N. 1/4 19-15-36.
H. K. Rogge.....	1,400	1,455	323	S. 1/4 5-14-35.
Alexander Anderson.....	1,000	1,830	323	SE. 1/4 34-13 and NW. 1/4 2-14-32.
Total.....	29,000	42,535		
LANE COUNTY.				
O. P. Jewett.....	4,500	4,853	640	Sec. 32-19-29.
Do.....	1,200	1,056	160	SE. 1/4 8-20-29.
O. J. Jewett.....	1,000	1,144	160	NW. 1/4 10-23-29.
W. A. Jewett.....	1,800	2,112	320	N. 1/4 9-20-29.
O. W. Jewett.....	2,200	2,948	320	N. 1/4 35-19-29.
R. H. Brown.....	2,600	3,014	320	W. 1/4 33-17-27.
Joe Shull.....	3,000	3,136	320	N. 1/4 23-18-30.
J. J. Woods.....	4,000	5,417	640	SW. 1/4 13, W. 1/4 24, NW. 1/4 25-16-28.
Fred Uppendahl.....	2,800	3,236	320	S. 1/4 23-18-30.
Fred Uppendahl, jr.....	800	1,408	160	NE. 1/4 3-19-30.
J. W. Beahm.....	1,000	1,584	160	NW. 1/4 21-19-27.
G. W. Hallbick.....	1,000	1,232	160	SW. 1/4 3-20-29.
F. A. Brown.....	5,500	6,035	977	Sec. 4, NW. 1/4, W. 1/4 NE. 1/4, and N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 3-16-29.
Virgil Miles.....	2,500	3,016	320	E. 1/4 27-16-29.
John Bohm.....	2,500	2,294	320	W. 1/4 16-19-27.
J. S. Dickinson.....	1,200	1,408	160	SW. 1/4 10-18-27.
Chester Shaffer.....	2,000	3,092	320	S. 1/4 35-19-28.
W. M. Burrell.....	2,000	2,464	320	SW. 1/4 23, and NW. 1/4 34-16-27.
C. W. Bretz.....	3,000	3,216	320	N. 1/4 17-17-28.
E. E. Eitel.....	4,000	5,585	623	Sec. 18-18-30.
W. L. Whiting.....	1,000	3,436	320	N. 1/4 33-18-30.
J. C. Tyner.....	5,200	6,511	480	NE. 1/4 1-18-29, and W. 1/4 6-18-27.
J. D. Setiles.....	1,000	2,363	160	SE. 1/4 23-17-30.
Chas. Fink.....	4,000	2,956	308	S. 1/4 24-16-27.
Sam. Reifschneider.....	3,500	3,616	320	SE. 1/4 22, and SW. 1/4 23-19-27.
W. H. Walker.....	1,500	2,840	200	NW. 1/4 17, and NW. 1/4, NE. 1/4 18-18-28.
E. W. Funk.....	3,100	3,544	240	NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 SW. 1/4 3-18-28.
W. V. Young.....	1,000	1,408	160	NE. 1/4 17-18-29.
Grant Moyer.....	5,000	5,844	960	E. 1/2, N. 1/2 NW. 1/4, SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4, NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 27, NE. 1/4 33, and S. 1/4 34-20-30.
Total.....	73,900	90,768		
MORTON COUNTY.				
Charles M. Gribble.....	700	880	160	NE. 1/4 31-34-43.
Clemen Butler.....	1,600	1,600	160	NE. 1/4 18-35-42.
John Sloan.....	2,500	4,310	430.5	N. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 sec. 18 and SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 18, lots 3 and 4, and E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 18-35-42, and lots 1 and 2, 19-35-42.
Leslie E. Stephenson.....	800	1,530	160	NW. 1/4 1-35-43.
John E. Moore.....	800	1,380	160	NW. 1/4 2-35-43.
Francis H. Butt.....	1,500	1,610	240	E. 1/4 of SE. 1/4, E. 1/4 of NE. 1/4, sec. 29, NE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 28-34-42.
Francis H. and John R. Butt.....	800	1,089	160	SE. 1/4 of NW. 1/4, SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 28-34-42.
George J. Leewe.....	1,500	2,400	320	NE. 1/4 sec. 34-34-43 and SE. 1/4 3-35-43.
Benjamin F. Roll.....	1,000	1,280	160	NW. 1/4 3-35-43.
Clarence A. Butts.....	800	1,280	160	SE. 1/4 22-33-43.
Roy A. Butts.....	800	880	160	SE. 1/4 29-33-43.
Burdett Johnson.....	600	980	160	SE. 1/4 12-33-43.
Frank E. Green.....	900	1,200	160	SW. 1/4 3-34-41.
Lee Roy Traer.....	600	1,050	160	SW. 1/4 8-34-41.
William T. Leake.....	1,200	1,480	160	SE. 1/4 18-34-41.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
MORTON COUNTY—contd.				
Mrs. Jennie Loudner.....	\$800	\$1,000	153.22	SW. 1/4 13-31-41.
Ernest F. Strong.....	1,000	160	NE. 1/4 1-35-42. (Was not proved up in time to be assessed, but about \$1,353.)
Fred C. Welch.....	800	1,280	160	SE. 1/4 13-31-42.
Lee B. Wilfour.....	1,570	3,000	480	SE. 1/4 11-31-42 and SW. 1/4 14, NE. 1/4 14-31-42.
Andrew R. Mos.....	570	930	154.19	SW. 1/4 11-31-41.
T. L. Menfell.....	1,000	1,295	149.73	SE. 1/4 3-35-42.
Charlie E. Brown.....	700	1,355	160	SE. 1/4 31-31-42.
James W. Gates.....	900	1,035	160	SE. 1/4 31-31-41.
Roy Mellott.....	700	1,280	160	NW. 1/4 15-31-41.
Albert J. Gerber.....	3,000	3,600	480	SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 5-35-41.
Robert S. Wazaman.....	570	1,000	160	NE. 1/4 8-31-41.
Sarah D. Wazaman.....	700	1,405	160	NW. 1/4 9-31-41.
Sherman Beery.....	600	1,000	150	NE. 1/4 24-31-41.
John Loudner.....	500	1,040	160	NW. 1/4 24-31-41.
F. May Burton.....	1,000	1,325	160	SE. 1/4 7-35-41.
Harry S. Shrauner.....	800	1,280	160	NE. 1/4 13-35-43.
Harry T. Smith.....	1,500	2,150	320	E. 1/2 of 25-31-43.
Jesse O. Tate.....	700	1,000	160	SE. 1/4 13-31-40.
Thomas J. Johnson.....	1,400	1,630	320	SW. 1/4 32 and SE. 1/4 31-32-39.
Oliver Shutt.....	900	1,480	160	NE. 1/4 19-31-41.
James Lewis.....	2,000	2,350	320	W. 1/2 sec. 9-33-39.
Roy A. Ranshaw.....	800	800	100	SE. 1/4 7-32-39.
Jesse M. Turner.....	800	1,380	157.40	Lots 3 and 4 and E. 1/2 of SW. 1/4 18-31-41.
Sadie Louise Cox.....	1,000	1,080	240	NW. 1/4 sec. 12, E. 1/2 of NE. 1/4 11-33-40.
William O. Frazier.....	1,600	1,360	160	SE. 1/4 34-33-40.
Edwin A. Riley.....	1,700	2,600	320	SE. 1/4 15, NE. 1/4 23-34-42.
Alvie J. Posy.....	800	1,080	160	SW. 1/4 24-33-43.
Emery L. Addington.....	600	880	160	NW. 1/4 10-33-43.
Total.....	44,700	62,555
MEADE COUNTY.				
Leo Burger.....	2,200	3,205	149.76	Lots 1 and 2 and E. 1/2 NW. 30-31-26.
Charles D. McAuley.....	2,000	3,710	160	SE. 1/4 5-30-26.
Francis N. Orr.....	5,500	5,945	514	E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 and N. 3/4 A. of SW. 1/4 14-31-26.
Myron Howard Gowdy.....	2,500	2,220	160	SE. 1/4 9-31-20.
F. L. Tice.....	4,000	3,455	320	S. 1/4 9-30-28.
George P. Gamble.....	2,000	1,715	160	NE. 1/4 19-34-28.
Alvie W. Fetters.....	500	855	160	SE. 1/4 and N. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 21-34-28.
Arthur R. Winter.....	4,000	3,465	320	N. 1/2 20-31-30.
Mable C. Sprott.....	500	800	160	SE. 1/4 4-35-28.
Jacob K. Froese.....	5,500	5,360	480	SW. 1/4 5, NW. 1/4 8, and NE. 1/4 7, all in 33-27.
Geo. H. Perkins.....	7,000	8,105	640	SW. 1/4 and N. 1/2 of 10, and NE. 1/4 9-31-28.
Joseph E. Lockhart.....	1,000	2,300	80	S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 24-31-28.
H. G. Halloway.....	8,500	9,045	320	SE. 1/4 of 18 and NE. 1/4 19-30-26.
Virgil O. Keltner.....	2,000	2,465	321.68	NE. 1/4 and lots 1 and 2 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 31-34-28.
Ja'ne Cordes.....	2,500	1,925	199 1/2	NE. 1/4 of 35, E. 1/2 of E. 1/2 of SE. 1/4 26-33-29.
Pearle Pa'len.....	1,000	1,045	160	NW. 34-34-28.
Walter S. Denslow.....	5,000	6,355	641.56	N. 1/2 and N. 1/2 of S. 1/2 of 2, T. 34 and SE. 1/4 35-32-28.
Silas Pontius.....	3,200	3,150	400	SE. 1/4 and W. 1/2 NE. 1/4 27 and SW. 1/4 26-34-28.
Johann P. Ediger.....	1,500	2,760	160	SE. 1/4 10-33-27.
W. L. Griffin.....	1,500	1,940	160	NE. 1/4 35-30-29.
Jacob Blue.....	1,200	705	160	SE. 1/4 10-34-30.
Geo. J. Enns.....	1,800	1,105	160	SW. 1/4 14-33-27.
C. E. Grover.....	1,000	1,035	160	W. 1/2 of E. 1/2 8-34-26.
W. L. Rossel.....	6,000	6,580	240	E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 23-31-23.
John W. Adams.....	900	705	160	SW. 1/4 4-34-30.
Marlon M. Way.....	8,500	11,915	610	All of 3-30-23.
James A. Reneau.....	2,500	2,110	320	SE. 1/4 W. 1/2 and NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 17-33-23.
Eli W. Kenworthy.....	3,500	4,265	100	NE. 1/4 7-31-23.
Verlan S. Couch.....	2,000	2,540	160	SW. 1/4 33-30-23.
J. I. Holdeman.....	1,600	1,630	160	SW. 1/4 13-32-23.
John C. Wynn.....	4,000	3,780	320	SE. 1/4 30 and NE. 1/4 31-31-23.
Reuben Parker.....	2,000	1,655	160	SW. 1/4 8-31-23.
Joseph E. Lockhart.....	1,500	2,325	80	E. 1/2 NE. 1/4 21-31-28.
Fred G. Feldman et al.....	4,000	2,710	480	S. 1/2 28 and NE. 1/4 29-33-29.
Edward G. Feldman.....	5,000	3,940	400	NE. 1/4 and N. 1/2, SE. 1/4 and E. 1/2, NW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 24 and SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 13-33-29.
Wilhelm C. Cordes.....	3,000	3,970	610	E. 1/2 35, SW. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 25 and SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 24-31-23.
John P. Ballard.....	5,000	3,370	496.65	W. 1/2 31-33-29 and NE. 1/4 33-33-30.
Elmer D. Jones.....	1,200	1,125	160	NE. 1/4 1-31-33.
James D. Dalgarn.....	3,000	3,615	320	S. 1/4 4-32-23.
Henry W. Bohling.....	1,200	2,125	150	W. 1/2 SE. 1/4, S. 1/2 SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4, S. 1/2 SW. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and S. 30 acres of SW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 22-31-23.
Henry H. Friesen.....	1,500	2,240	160	SW. 1/4 6-33-27.
Merton A. Horner.....	10,000	6,645	1,610	NE. 1/4 13, W. 1/2 E. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 SE. 1/4 24, SE. 1/4 25, 33-27; S. 1/2 18, NW. 1/4 and N. 1/2 SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 19, E. 1/2 and NW. 1/4 30-33-23.
A. M. Horner.....	9,500	7,565	1,760	W. 1/2 13, E. 1/2 14, all of 23, S. 1/2 NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 24, N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 25, NE. 1/4 26 in 33-27.
W. S. Armetrout.....	2,000	2,470	160	NW. 1/4 9-31-30.
C. M. Munzer.....	1,400	920	160	N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 31 and N. 1/2 NW. 35-33-30.
Josie M. Rhodes.....	5,000	6,840	150.27	Lots 1 and 2 and E. 1/2 NW. 7-31-27.
G. R. Kutz.....	3,300	2,130	200	SE. 1/4 4, NE. 1/4 NE. 1/4 9-31-26.
Henry M. Troutman.....	1,500	1,335	160	NW. 1/4 27-33-39.
Glen A. Wright.....	2,200	2,530	477.42	N. 1/2 18 and SE. 1/4 7-31-33.
Enos Amerin.....	4,500	4,135	320	W. 1/4 4-32-30.
P. P. Morrison.....	4,000	3,980	320	N. 1/2 13-31-30.
Albert Hawley.....	1,100	795	160	N. 1/2 NW. 1/4 SE. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 SW. 1/4 10-34-30.
Fred B. Buss.....	3,000	3,900	560	S. 1/2 of 15, N. 1/2 NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 of 21, N. 1/2 NW. and N. 1/2 of S. 1/2 of NW. 1/4 of 22, all in 34-23.
Frank Fox.....	600	1,020	160	SE. 1/4 17-34-33.
J. C. F. McAuley.....	10,000	7,915	560	S. 1/2 of 1, NE. 1/4 and E. 1/2 NW. 1/4 of 2-30-27.
William P. Homer.....	1,700	2,030	320	SW. 1/4 of 24, and SE. 1/4 23-31-23.
Elonzo White.....	700	695	157.33	Lots 3 and 4 and E. 1/2 SW. 1/4 7-34-33.
William H. Lee.....	900	800	160	NW. 1/4 14-31-33.
John L. Jones.....	3,000	2,750	320	SW. 1/4 5 and NW. 1/4 8-33-23.
J. S. Lawson.....	1,600	1,990	160	NE. 1/4 12-33-30.
Barthold John Helmsen.....	1,100	910	160	NE. 1/4 3-34-29.
Harvey L. Elledge.....	1,600	1,985	320	SE. 1/4 of 21, S. 1/2 SE. 1/4 23, SW. 1/4 SW. 1/4 24 and NW. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 of 25-34-23.
James C. Lowry.....	1,200	1,235	160	SE. 1/4 23-31-23.
John F. Tatkendorst.....	2,000	2,825	320	E. 1/2 and SW. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 of 3, SE. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 4 and NE. 1/4 of 9, all in 33-23.
Oscar C. Latshar.....	6,000	9,650	800	N. 1/2 and SE. 1/4 of 19, W. 1/2 of 33-33-27.
E. M. Angell.....	4,000	3,355	320	NE. 1/4 29 and SW. 1/4 32-32-29.
C. J. Angell.....	4,000	4,355	320	S. 1/2 30-32-23.
Elijah D. Allen.....	1,000	1,730	160	NW. 1/4 10-31-23.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
MEADE COUNTY—continued.				
David J. Brownlee.....	\$2,000	\$3,030	601	E. 1/4 NW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 NE. 1/4, SW. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 26, NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 of 33-31-24.
Henry J. Rexroad.....	7,000	5,290	649	S. 1/4 of 22 and W. 1/4 of 27, in 33-23.
Walter A. Burford.....	1,200	4,105	157	SW. 1/4 2-31-27.
George W. Spain.....	800	905	160	SW. 1/4 of N.W. 1/4 and W. 1/4 SW. 1/4 of 35, T. 33, lot 4 of 2-34-31.
G. M. Stockmeyer.....	1,000	795	109	NE. 1/4 19-31-31.
Total.....	221,209	233,610		
NORTON COUNTY.				
J. A. Rife.....	2,500	4,620	320	S. 1/4 1-4-23.
Charles W. Dowling.....	2,000	3,125	160	SW. 1/4 32-2-25.
Samuel Arnold.....	1,700	2,585	160	SW. 1/4 26-2-25.
Francis H. Roe.....	1,200	1,835	160.48	NW. 1/4 4-2-25.
Robert H. McCune.....	1,400	3,315	160	NE. 1/4 32-2-25.
William R. Dowling.....	2,500	3,540	158	SE. 1/4 31-2-25.
R. I. Fullerton.....	1,800	2,470	160	SW. 1/4 28-1-25.
Arba K. Mills.....	2,500	4,350	80	E. 1/4 SW. 1/4 2-2-21.
Arthur Saum.....	6,000	7,710	323	E. 1/4 29-2-23.
O. D. Hershiser.....	1,400	2,375	160	SW. 1/4 35-3-23.
Andrew P. Wilner.....	2,900	3,120	320	SW. 1/4 sec. 4 and NW. 1/4 9-2-25.
Ira L. Robbins.....	2,000	2,470	160	SW. 1/4 31-1-25.
Peter C. Garrett.....	2,500	3,730	232	SW. 1/4 35-2-25, E. 1/4 NE. 1/4 3-3-25.
William Railsback.....	1,000	2,030	160	NE. 1/4 15-1-25.
Total.....	31,200	47,325		
NESS COUNTY.				
Geo. S. Stullken.....	2,500	2,000	160	NE. 1/4 31-18-22.
Geo. Cranston, jr.....	1,500	1,925	160	NE. 1/4 31-18-22.
J. A. Bondurant.....	3,500	5,500	320	W. 1/4 24-20-22.
H. L. Mellies.....	3,000	5,124	480	N. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of S. 1/4 11-19-24.
W. R. Cranston.....	4,500	4,050	480	N. 1/4 SW. and 1/4 25-20-24.
H. F. Bruner.....	2,500	3,245	284	NW. 1/4 19-18-26 and SW. 1/4 23-18-26.
E. J. Ruffhead.....	3,500	3,213	320	W. 1/4 7-19-23.
Jeremiah Hopper.....	4,000	5,988	320	N. 1/4 33-18-23.
Wiley Clouston.....	5,000	8,214	640	S. 1/4 1-19-23 and W. 1/4 6-19-22.
C. D. Foster.....	500	1,944	160	SW. 1/4 9-13-23.
Guy L. Bondurant.....	1,600	1,710	160	NE. 1/4 19-23-21.
M. R. Irwin.....	4,000	5,155	480	N. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 6-20-22.
Emil E. Petersille.....	1,000	1,840	160	SE. 1/4 12-20-24.
Miner F. Murdahl.....	1,600	1,790	160	S. 1/4 of N. 1/4 24-18-23.
J. B. Cook.....	4,000	4,075	323	E. 1/4 23-18-24.
Wm. H. Ansbaugh.....	3,000	2,640	323	N. 1/4 23-17-23.
Fred C. Everhart.....	6,000	4,500	323	S. 1/4 20-17-23.
Ernest C. Misner.....	2,500	2,375	320	W. 1/4 20-17-24.
J. H. Elting.....	6,000	5,035	640	N. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 29 and NW. 1/4 28-17-23.
J. G. Harkness.....	2,600	2,970	323	W. 1/4 31-19-21.
James G. Harkness.....	1,800	2,040	160	NE. 1/4 32-18-23.
W. F. Baer.....	1,000	780	80	N. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 17-15-23.
Roy H. Baer.....	5,000	5,333	800	SE. 1/4 8 and E. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 5 and N. 1/4 of NW. 1/4 4-19-23.
Geo. L. Cook.....	3,000	3,323	323	S. 1/4 25-18-25.
Ira Whipple.....	1,200	2,090	160	NW. 1/4 12-19-21.
Benton E. Willour.....	1,200	1,400	160	SE. 1/4 31-19-23.
Noah Johnson.....	2,000	1,708	283	NW. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 9 and SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 4-20-23.
R. O. Elting.....	4,000	4,535	640	E. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 23 and NW. 1/4 33-17-23.
John Oostendorp.....	5,000	4,280	480	NW. 1/4 and NE. 1/4 10 and SE. 1/4 3-18-21, except 4 acres in SE. 1/4 2.
Clarence E. Myler.....	2,800	2,950	323	N. 1/4 13-17-25.
Guy Reeves.....	5,000	7,590	723	N. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 and N. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 32 and SW. 1/4 33-18-23.
Total.....	91,800	107,592		
SHERMAN COUNTY.				
Robert J. Hayden.....	700	1,040	160	NW. 1/4 13-9-41.
Jacob Tophigh.....	3,100	3,500	320	S. 1/4 9-9-40.
John De Witt.....	800	930	160	SE. 1/4 24-10-41.
Robert Barbee.....	1,100	1,580	160	NE. 1/4 33-7-39.
William K. Evans.....	1,800	1,120	160	NW. 1/4 10-7-39.
C. M. Feuno.....	3,200	3,160	480	NW. 1/4 12-6-39, SE. 1/4 of 18 and NW. 1/4 of 8 in 6-39.
C. C. Evans.....	4,500	3,590	640	NE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of 10-7-39.
Jasper Glenn Curry.....	800	1,040	160	NE. 1/4 32-6-40.
John Veselik.....	4,200	4,640	480	E. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of 15-9-41.
James B. Light.....	4,000	3,930	640	All of 27-6-41.
James A. Corkill.....	6,500	7,640	800	N.E. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 of 8-7-41, NW. 1/4 NE. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of 9-7-40, except strip of land 240 rods square.
George W. Gilbert.....	4,200	4,180	640	All of 1-7-39.
George T. Wilson.....	2,700	3,800	560	SE. 1/4 of 21, NW. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of 27, and S. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 of 32-6-40.
Wilfred C. Nichols.....	3,500	4,950	760	SE. 1/4 of 31-9, N. 1/4 and SW. 1/4, N. 1/4 and SW. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 6-10-39.
W. H. Been.....	800	1,110	160	SE. 1/4 of 33-7-41.
Bert A. Wells.....	3,000	4,170	640	W. 1/4 of 1 and E. 1/4 of 2 in 9-41.
Belle Amanda Forney.....	1,000	1,000	160	SW. 1/4 of 10-7-39.
Charles A. Rhoades.....	4,400	2,930	477	SE. 1/4 of 13-7-40 and E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 of 2 in 7-39, except strip of land 22 rods square.
Pedde H. Fixen.....	1,200	2,240	320	SW. 1/4 of 33-6-39.
J. O. Fralley.....	2,000	2,080	320	NW. 1/4 of 8-9-41 and SW. 1/4 of 5-9-41.
Henry C. Tagtmeyer.....	5,000	7,820	930	All of 16 and NW. 1/4 of 10 and SE. 1/4 of 9-7-40.
C. B. Albertson.....	2,200	2,320	320	NW. 1/4 of 12, NE. 1/4 of 2-7-41.
Clarence E. Morton.....	1,800	1,600	160	SW. 1/4 of 31-6-39.
A. T. Patterson.....	1,300	1,485	77	S. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 23-8-39, except strip of land 100 feet wide.
Charles Hartley.....	3,000	2,385	319	S. 1/4 of 6-6-37.
Guy Corkill.....	2,700	3,200	400	E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 of 4 and SW. 1/4 of 3 in 7-40.
Marion S. Taylor.....	1,000	950	160	NW. 1/4 of 15-10-41.
Edwin D. Briggs.....	1,100	1,280	160	NE. 1/4 of 23-9-38.
Thomas J. Taylor.....	1,600	2,340	320	S. 1/4 of 10-10-41.
Charles A. Rhoades.....	4,400	3,520	307	SE. 1/4 of 13-7-40 and E. 1/4 of SW. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and W. 1/4 of SE. 1/4 of 20-7-39, except strip of land 22 rods square.
T. J. Rhoades.....	2,500	1,340	163	E. 1/4 of E. 1/4 of 20-7-39 and a tract 22 rods square in the NE. corner.
Edith Taylor.....	2,000	1,840	320	S. 1/4 of 16-10-41.
E. H. Taylor.....	1,800	1,800	320	N. 1/4 of 16-10-41.
Jacob Schock.....	1,000	2,045	320.70	Lots 1 and 2 and S. 1/4 of NE. 1/4 and SE. 1/4 of 3, all in 7-42.
George Cramer.....	10,000	13,110	1,760	NE. 1/4 and S. 1/4 of 21 and all of 22 and W. 1/4 of 27 and SE. 1/4 and NW. 1/4 of 28, all in 8-42.
Walter Wason.....	1,100	1,120	160	NW. 1/4 of 15-7-32.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
SHERMAN COUNTY—contd.				
C. E. White.....	\$2,000	\$1,980	320	N. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 39-7-41.
Henry F. Gernhart.....	3,200	3,240	473	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 18-7-41 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 12 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 13, all in 7-42.
W. L. Kail.....	800	1,360	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 15-6-42.
J. Jensen.....	1,400	2,100	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 2-8-40.
Thomas J. Strange.....	500	630	159.7	Lots 3 and 4 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 30-10-37.
John E. Cotter.....	900	1,320	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 33-8-41.
Total.....	105,400	117,655		
STANTON COUNTY.				
John H. Mauk.....	500		160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 12-27-43.
Mark R. Worthington.....	700		160.25	Lots 1 and 2 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 1-29-42.
Robert L. Thompson.....	500		160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 6-27-42.
Jonas B. Winger.....	600		160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-27-40.
Robert R. Friend.....	1,000		320	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-30-40 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-30-40.
James Herrick.....	1,600		480	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 35 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 27 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 34-30-40.
Wade H. Smoot.....	500		160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 11-30-41.
Finley Yinger.....	1,000		320	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 21-27-40.
Total.....	6,400			
STEVENS COUNTY.				
Wm. Kinser.....	700	2,100	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 17-34-36.
Peter B. Wagner.....	1,800	1,780	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 17-33-38.
R. M. Young.....	1,500	1,360	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 23-34-37.
D. A. Everts.....	1,200	1,730	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-34-36.
Monroe Trauer.....	2,000	2,100	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 14-33-36.
Paul M. Trauer.....	1,500	2,000	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 15-33-36.
Joseph Ponder.....	1,000	950	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 10-32-33.
W. I. Cutter.....	1,500	720	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 11-34-37.
Edgar N. Stanley.....	1,500	2,000	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-34-36.
R. A. Paden.....	3,000	3,670	320	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 19-33-36.
Wm. Dillinger.....	3,000	3,200	320	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ 21-34-36.
R. E. Young.....	1,500	1,585	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 3-34-37.
Cassius M. Graham.....	1,500	2,230	240	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 22-31-35.
Ed. Plummerfelt.....	2,500	3,455	400	S. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 9 and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 10-34-33.
C. A. Maclasky.....	1,200	1,860	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 8-32-37.
S. G. Bond.....	9,500	9,620	1,123	Sec. 9 and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 28 and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 20-33-36.
Ira A. Stoner.....	1,000	4,000	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 9-33-37.
Chas. C. Haworth.....	1,000	1,645	160	Lots 3-4 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 19-34-35.
Lee S. Parker.....	2,000	3,440	320	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 19 and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 29-34-36.
T. O. Margan.....	1,500	2,450	480	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ 15 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 15-34-39.
Lee Reynolds.....	3,500	4,640	480	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 23 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 20-31-37.
C. E. Rittmoure.....	4,000	6,800	640	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 11 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 10-34-35.
Walter R. Chaffin.....	1,000	2,000	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 3-34-35.
C. F. Lages.....	1,500	2,420	240	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and N. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 12-33-36.
Wm. D. Scott.....	3,200	5,600	320	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ other quarter in Seward County 1-34-35.
Chas. W. Creamer.....	500	1,740	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 13-34-37.
Edna B. Hayward.....	5,000	6,024	461.92	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of sec. 18-33-37.
Geo. L. Bennett.....	800	1,925	320	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 25 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 24-34-39.
J. E. Flamer.....	2,500	3,700	320	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ 22-33-36.
O. J. Wayland.....	4,500	4,800	480	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 23-33-36.
Robert Earl Lynch.....	1,000	1,115	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 23-24-37.
John E. Trauer.....	1,600	1,740	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 10-33-36.
Monroe Trauer.....	1,500	1,600	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 14-33-36.
Jesse L. Brownell.....	1,500	1,880	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 31-31-35.
Orville J. Cunningham.....	1,500	1,840	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 14-34-37.
Samuel I. Hoffman.....	1,100	1,640	320	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 29-34-38.
Ray Stalcup.....	1,200	2,080	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-34-35.
Wm. J. Davis.....	8,000	9,120	1,123	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 14 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ 15 and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 13-33-38.
James F. Parsons.....	10,000	10,325	1,526.24	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 4 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ 5 NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 8, NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 9-31-37, N. $\frac{1}{2}$ SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 33 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 34 T. 30 R. 37.
James A. Ritter.....	1,300	1,560	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 31-34-35.
James W. Phillips.....	5,000	6,060	480	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 1-34-38.
Total.....	103,600	126,504		
SCOTT COUNTY.				
R. E. Close et ux.....	1,100	1,515	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 7-18-33.
Roy A. Helfrich et ux.....	1,800	1,705	320	Lots 3 and 4 and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 18-16-33 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 13-16-34.
John E. Crist et ux.....	3,200	3,865	480	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 27 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 34-20-33.
Luther J. Ciekler et ux.....	2,700	2,970	320	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 15-17-32.
Jesep Novak et ux.....	1,100	1,100	159.49	Lots 3 and 4 and 5 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 6-19-34.
Furman A. Cook et ux.....	3,000	2,530	320.16	Lots 1 and 2 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1-17-31.
Dana N. Meyers.....	900	1,030	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 22-16-32.
John L. Eyer et ux.....	2,500	2,640	480	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of sec. 20 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 19-16-34.
Clay E. McMillan et ux.....	3,000	1,835	280	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ all in 2-17-33.
John W. Ludlow et ux.....	2,700	3,903	480	E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of 11 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 10-17-31.
Elijah E. Eitel et ux.....	2,000	2,200	320	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 11 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 2-19-31.
H. L. Prondfoot et ux.....	6,000	3,510	710	N. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$, N. 20 rods of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and N. 20 rods of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ all in sec. 15, and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 10, S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 11 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 14, all in 17-33.
Celeste H. Wilcox et ux.....	800	700	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 25-20-32.
Susan R. Gunby.....	1,000	785	80	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 6-19-32.
Charles E. Wilcox et ux.....	1,200	1,475	320	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 25 and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 35-20-32.
William F. Beaton et ux.....	800	860	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 5-20-31.
George Finkenbinder et ux.....	5,000	5,995	799.24	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 19-20-32 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 24-20-33, and lots 1 and 2 and $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 30-20-32 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 28-20-33, SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 21-20-33.
John E. Cain et ux.....	2,000	2,485	480	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 4 and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 5 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 8-20-34.
Charles A. Brock et ux.....	1,300	1,760	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 21-17-32.
Leonard W. Sloan et ux.....	3,000	2,090	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 14-18-33.
John W. Newman et ux.....	1,600	1,940	320	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 28 and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 27-16-32.
Elmer B. Barnes et ux.....	3,000	3,750	320	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 28 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 35-18-31.
Lydia M. Whitam et ux.....	1,100	1,375	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 30-16-34.
F. A. Hines et ux.....	1,500	1,650	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 21-20-32.
Julia Hines et ux.....	1,500	2,255	320	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 22 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 21-20-32.
Edward Welch et ux.....	1,800	880	160	NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 29-16-34.
Charles E. Hawkness et ux.....	3,500	2,585	560	W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of sec. 15 and NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 21 and S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 16-20-31.
William F. Beaton et ux.....	600	815	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 4-20-31.

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
SCOTT COUNTY—continued.				
Lemons S. Robb.....	\$3,000	\$2,980	320	N. 1 of 34-18-32.
L. D. Binns et ux.....	1,100	1,430	160	SW. 1 of 10-18-31.
Frank W. Sperling et ux.....	1,500	1,540	160	SE. 1 of 35-18-31.
Joseph Hess.....	2,000	1,045	311	SW. 1 and lots 1 and 2 and E. 1 of NW. 1 of 18-18-81.
Total.....	66,300	67,260		
SEWARD COUNTY.				
E. F. Printz.....	5,000	5,900	480	NE. 1 of 2-35-31 and E. 1 of 35-31-31.
Charles O. Davis.....	4,500	5,800	480	NW. 1 and NE. 1 and SE. 1 of 32-33-31.
George E. Chittenden.....	1,500	1,700	160	SE. 1 of 13-31-32.
James H. Mammontree.....	1,000	1,500	160	SW. 32-31-31.
A. J. White.....	1,200	1,450	200	SW. of NE. and N. 1 of SE., SW. of SE. and SE. of SE. 22-31-31.
Wirt L. Flemming.....	3,000	2,820	315.5	Lots 1-2 and E. 1 of NW. 18, SE. 7, all in 33-31.
John L. Boles.....	8,000	17,200	1,250	W. 1 sec. 2; NE. and W. 1, 3; SE. 4; NE. 10; NW. 11, all in 31-31.
William Moody Wilson.....	4,000	4,600	320	SW. 13-31-31 and SE. 13-31-31.
Henry Berg.....	2,500	3,200	320	SW. sec. 32 and NE. 31, all in 32-31.
R. E. Hall.....	4,000	6,400	640	S. 1 of 33 and SW. 27-31-24; lot 4 and E. 1 of SW. and S. 1 of SE. 1 of 31-32-33.
Jessie Ponting.....	2,300	2,900	320	NE. 1 of 31 and NW. 1 of 32-31-31.
William C. Davis.....	4,500	3,300	720	E. 1 of NW. 1 of 22; SE. 1 of 10; N. 1 of SW. 10-31-31.
Ralph M. Heath.....	3,500	4,500	320	NE. 1 of 8; NW. 1 of 9; all in 34-31.
Charles L. Neff.....	1,600	1,600	160	NW. 2-31-31.
W. H. Hall.....	1,800	1,750	139	SW. 28-31-31.
Charles Thompson.....	600	1,200	160	SE. 18-31-31.
John E. Templeman.....	1,000	2,000	160	SW. 28-31-31.
V. M. Renner.....	1,000	1,600	160	NE. 21-31-31.
A. G. Morrell.....	1,500	1,850	160	NW. 15-31-31.
Mark D. Grossman.....	2,500	3,300	320	SW. 32-31-31 and NW. 1 of 5-35-32.
Calvin D. Day.....	1,300	2,150	323.81	Lots 1-2 and S. 1 of NE. and SE. 1 of 6-31-31.
Richard Day.....	800	1,000	169.82	Lots 3-4 and S. 1 of NW. 1 of 5-31-31.
Patrick Day.....	1,000	1,500	240	SE. 1 of 8 and E. 1 of NE. 1 of 17-31-31.
John Day.....	300	700	155.6	Lot 2 and SW. of NE. and N. 1 of SE. 5-31-31.
E. Hirn.....	6,000	16,875	2,100	Very long description.
Ruby Wightman.....	1,000	1,300	160	NE. 1-35-32.
William D. Scott.....	3,200	4,000	320	Lots 3-4-5; SE. of NW. 1 of 6-31-31; SE. 1-31-31.
E. D. Kelley.....	1,200	2,000	160	SE. 31-31-31.
Clyde Spry.....	2,000	2,700	160	NW. 1 of 15-31-31.
Fred W. Hasser.....	1,000	3,450	320	N. 1 of 6-32-32.
E. J. Fitzgerald.....	6,000	7,100	480	N. 1 and S. 1 of 8-31-31.
Orley M. Nic.....	6,000	5,800	480	N. 1 of 4-31-31 and SW. 1 of 33-31-31.
William Arbutnot.....	1,000	1,300	240	Lot 1 and NW. of NE. and S. 1 of NE. 4-33-33 and S. 1 of SE. 33-32-33.
Total.....	85,900	103,725		
TREGO COUNTY.				
Nile Cook.....	3,200	2,420	320	S. 1 of 27-15-21.
W. T. Cox.....	5,000	5,710	320	N. 1 of N. 1 and S. 1 of NW. 1 and N. 1 of SW. 1 of 10-13-21.
William H. Fink.....	3,700	1,920	320	NW. 1 of 32-12-25 Trego County and NE. 1 of 2-12-27 Gove County. Assessed value Gove County land not known.
Total.....	11,900	10,950		
THOMAS COUNTY.				
B. W. Baird and wife.....	2,000	3,810	480	N. 1 of 1-9-31 and NE. 1 of 2-6-31.
James A. Dav and wife.....	1,200	1,950	160	SE. 1 of 5-4-31.
A. O. Nickolson and wife.....	1,000	1,650	160	SE. 1 of 7-9-33.
Henry H. Goetsch and wife.....	5,000	7,400	955.63	S. 1 of 35-9-31 and W. 1 of 2-7-31 and N. 1 of SE. 1 of 3-7-31.
Lemley Fulwider and wife.....	1,600	3,330	320	N. 1 of 32 and SE. 1 of 35-8-35.
Thomas Johnston and wife.....	3,500	5,700	480	W. 1 and SE. 1 of 10-8-35.
Hans J. Hamm single.....	1,000	3,080	320	W. 1 of 19-10-31.
Clyde Leroy Jackson and wife.....	1,200	1,600	153.92	NW. 1 of 7-8-33.
Leonard C. Keck and wife.....	2,000	3,250	320	N. 1 of 18-31.
Total.....	18,500	31,800		
WICHITA COUNTY.				
F. A. Johnson.....	2,200	2,475	640	S. 1 and NW. 1 of sec. 13 and NE. 1 of sec. 14, T. 18, R. 37.
John H. Scott.....	4,400	4,355	640	All of sec. 2, T. 18, R. 37.
William R. Kessler.....	1,800	2,090	480	S. 1 of sec. 24 and SE. 1 of sec. 23, T. 18, R. 37.
L. G. Henry.....	4,000	5,075	1,120	S. 1 and NE. 1 of sec. 8, N. 1 of sec. 17, SW. 1 of sec. 5-20-33, NE. 1 of sec. 1, 20-37.
E. M. Greenawalt.....	2,700	2,640	480	N. 1 and SE. 1 of sec. 25, T. 17, R. 37.
R. E. Ford.....	1,500	1,720	480	S. 1 and NE. 1 of sec. 22, T. 18, R. 39.
John Schwandt.....	1,500	1,440	320	SE. 1 of sec. 14 and NW. 1 of sec. 23, T. 17, R. 36.
Thomas McDermott.....	2,400	2,880	480	SE. 1 of sec. 27, SE. 1 of sec. 28, NE. 1 of sec. 35, all 18, R. 35.
J. B. McClintic.....	3,000	4,375	768	NW. 1 of sec. 5, T. 18, R. 38, S. 1 of sec. 31, T. 18, R. 38, N. 1 of sec. 6, T. 13, R. 33.
Douvan Parish.....	1,000	1,700	80	S. 1 of NW. 1 of sec. 24, T. 18, R. 37.
A. D. Knapp.....	900	1,080	160	SW. 1 of sec. 4-19-33.
John Eder.....	1,200	2,270	400	NE. 1 of sec. 2, S. and of SE. 1 of sec. 1 and N. 1 of NE. 1 of S. 1 of NE. 1 of sec. 12, T. 19, R. 25.
George Smadies.....	1,000	1,185	320	NE. 1 of sec. 2, T. 17, R. 35.
John C. Banck.....	1,800	2,400	480	N. 1 of SW. 1 and NW. 1 and S. 1 of SW. 1 of sec. 22, SE. 1 of sec. 15, T. 17, R. 33.
A. W. Kleyrman.....	1,800	2,920	640	S. 1 and NE. 1 of sec. 9 and NE. 1 of sec. 15, T. 17, R. 33.
William Rickford.....	800	1,370	320	SW. 1 of sec. 32, T. 18, R. 35, NW. 1 of sec. 6, T. 17, R. 35.
Vet Coats.....	1,000	1,580	160	NE. 1 of sec. 25, T. 18, R. 37.
Ralph Johnson.....	3,000	3,230	800	W. 1 and SE. 1 of sec. 18, 1 of W. 1 of sec. 22, T. 18, R. 33.
Alva A. Kreitzer.....	500	1,150	160	NW. 1 of sec. 24, T. 18, R. 36.
Joe Neyer.....	3,000	2,875	640	NE. 1 of sec. 33 and SW. 1 of sec. 34, T. 18, and NE. 1 of sec. 4, T. 17, R. 37.
A. H. Stiles.....	600	880	160	SW. 1 of sec. 32, T. 18, R. 35.
Nicholaes Schwandt.....	2,000	1,840	320	NW. 1 and E. 1 of SW. 1 and W. 1 of SE. 1 of sec. 11, T. 17, R. 36.
Hugh Glenn.....	2,000	2,820	800	NE. 1 and N. 1 of NW. 1 of sec. 19 and lot 4 and SE. 1 of SW. 1 of sec. 18, T. 18, R. 33.
John F. Younger.....	2,400	2,640	480	E. 1 and SW. 1 of sec. 35, T. 17, R. 35.
Clarence W. Cline.....	1,500	1,870	320	NW. 1 of sec. 2 and NE. 1 of sec. 3, T. 18, R. 38.
Ted Lake.....	1,200	1,380	320	SW. 1 of sec. 11 and NW. 1 of sec. 14, T. 18, R. 33.
Lee M. Fletcher.....	1,100	1,520	320	NE. 1 of sec. 24 and SW. 1 of sec. 13, T. 18, R. 37.
John E. White.....	1,800	2,115	504	Lots 3 and 4 and S. 1 of NW. 1, and SW. 1 of SE. 1 of sec. 1, T. 18, R. 33.
Frank R. Byall.....	1,700	1,860	320	W. 1 of sec. 33, T. 17, R. 37.
Total.....	53,800	65,304		

List of farm loans made in Kansas by the Federal Land Bank at Wichita, Kans., up to Jan. 1, 1918, as reported by registers of deeds or bonded abstractors—Continued.

Owner's name.	Amount of rural credit loan.	Assessed value of land and buildings.	Number of acres.	Abbreviated legal description.
WALLACE COUNTY.				
Elmer Chaney.....	\$1,800	\$1,570	320	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 22, NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 36-14-41.
John Haas.....	600	950	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 12-15-41.
Wm. A. Gooch.....	700	660	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 20-12-42.
Arthur E. Bjorklund.....	700	820	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 22-14-41.
Jno. Peter Bygren.....	900	1,215	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 8-15-42.
Dake D. Morse.....	600	660	160	N. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 32-12-41.
William Bjorklund.....	800	790	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 15-14-41.
Chas. C. Halsey.....	4,300	4,215	1,120	Sec. 1, W. $\frac{1}{2}$ 11, SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 12-12-41.
M. R. Baker.....	2,500	2,620	480	E. $\frac{1}{4}$ and NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 23-15-41.
Gust Bjorklund.....	4,000	4,070	800	N. $\frac{1}{4}$ 22 S. $\frac{1}{4}$ 14, SW. 15-14-41.
George Morse.....	500	660	160	S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 32-12-41.
Roy G. Thompson.....	600	710	150	Lot 1 and N. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$, NE. of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 30-12-41.
Lemuel N. Woodburn.....	600	615	160	S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S. $\frac{1}{2}$ 34-12-41.
Wm. H. Lutz.....	900	910	157	Lots 1-2, E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 30-14-41.
Jno. E. Sexson.....	700	620	160	W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ and E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 26-13-42.
Pell Teed.....	2,400	2,825	480	S. $\frac{1}{4}$ 32-13-42, lots 2-1 and SE. of NE. 4-14-42.
Michael J. Gauss.....	800	650	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 32-14-41.
Charley D. Drum.....	500	790	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 30-13-42.
Frederic N. Cox.....	2,600	2,350	478	NE. and SW. sec. 33, SE. 20-14-41.
Jonathan J. Huitt.....	800	1,120	160	SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 20-14-41.
Clarence J. Cox.....	800	820	160	SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 30-14-41.
Frank M. Pell.....	800	805	160	Lots 2-3, NE. of SE. 24-13-43 and SE. of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$.
Josiah Gorsuch.....	1,800	2,715	312	N. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 30-12-33.
James A. Satterfield.....	800	855	160	SW. 8-14-42.
Thomas Porter.....	600	1,050	160	SW. 8-13-42.
Luther M. Shelley.....	2,100	1,950	480	E. $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 34 and SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 35-14-42.
Vernon L. Pierce.....	600	575	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 8-13-42.
Geo. C. Johnson.....	2,000	1,585	394	Sec. 25-14-43, NW. 30-14-42.
O. T. Kimmel.....	2,000	2,670	645	Sec. 3-18-42.
Thomas Dobson.....	800	1,940	160	SW. 12-13-41.
Don T. Whitney.....	700	870	160	NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ 24-15-40.
Chas. C. Halsey.....	4,000	4,330	1,120	S. $\frac{1}{4}$ 36-11-41, S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 2, NE. sec. 11, NE. 12-12-41.
Wm. Longberg.....	1,500	2,300	480	N. $\frac{1}{4}$ and SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ 25-12-41.
Harry B. Rockwell.....	1,400	1,485	320	S. $\frac{1}{4}$ of 28-11-40.
Floyd Edinborough.....	1,400	1,685	324	W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 18-15-33.
(35)	48,500	58,795

In justice to Mr. Flannagan and Mr. Ingalls, I here give some correspondence between these gentlemen:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD,
Washington, April 9, 1918.

Mr. R. INGALLS,
307 East Seventeenth Street, New York City.

DEAR MR. INGALLS: I see you quote me as saying the board had "no available figures showing the cost of business"—Letter of Secretary Flannagan, December, 1917. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 6, 1918, p. 4741.)

Will you kindly advise me date of letter from which this extract is taken and to whom it was written?

I wish to ascertain the connection and circumstances under which the statement was made.

Yours, very truly,

W. W. FLANNAGAN,
Secretary Farm Loan Board.

APRIL 12, 1918.

Mr. W. W. FLANNAGAN,
Secretary Federal Farm Loan Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I have to acknowledge your kind reply of April 11. I have never received a list of the States that have legalized the bonds of the Federal land banks as an investment for fiduciary and public funds. I should greatly appreciate the favor if you would send me the list, and also designate those States which have also legalized bonds of joint-stock land banks for such investments.

Mr. Hammond says he can not locate any of the correspondence he had with you and Mr. Lobdell about costs of business. With a view to helping you uncover it out of the bureau's files I will give the following extract from a letter of his dated January 31, 1918:

"In addition to the question of whether the board knows just what it is about I would mention the fact that I derived great discouragement from the board's reply to my request for information as to the cost of handling farm loans. * * * I wrote the Federal Farm Loan Board stating that I presumed the spread fixed by law was based upon established figures and that the board could show why a joint-stock land bank should earn attractive dividends for its stock on a one-point spread and that I should appreciate the supporting figures. The board replied that the data I asked for was not available. To loan several hundred millions of dollars as the obligation of banks engaged in a business upon which there is no available data as to cost would seem to me courageous to say the least."

Of course the correspondence is preserved somewhere. I saw and read the board's reply. My memory is that its date was December, and that it was signed by you and not by Mr. Lobdell. I hope this extract will serve your purpose. If the quotation should be ascribed to Mr. Lobdell instead of to you, and if some other date than December should be given, I would see that the correction is made before any reprints of the Record are made.

Are any figures as to the cost of handling farm loans yet available? I should like very much to have them, and I wish to thank you for the amortization tables just received.

Yours, very truly,

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FEDERAL FARM LOAN BUREAU,
Washington, April 16, 1918.

Mr. R. INGALLS,
No. 307 East Seventeenth Street, New York City.

DEAR MR. INGALLS: Your favor of the 12th duly received. The list of the States which have legalized Federal farm-loan bonds as an investment for fiduciary funds was mailed to you on the 11th and supposedly crossed your letter in the mails. If not received it will be duplicated upon request.

Concerning the matter of your quotation "from Secretary Flannagan's letter December, 1917," as follows: The board has "no available figures showing the cost of business," it appears I never wrote such a letter. The nearest approach to it is in a letter from Judge Lobdell (a member of the board) to Mr. L. P. Hammond under date of January 10, 1918, which reads as follows:

"Replying to your letter of recent date to our Mr. Flannagan, I regret to state that the board has not in hand specific data which would be of material value to you."

This letter was written in reply to a letter from Mr. Hammond, addressed to me under date of December 27, 1917, in which Mr. Hammond sought information in order to ascertain "whether investment in the stock of joint-stock land banks and operation in the distribution of bonds of the joint-stock land banks appeared to be profitable."

You will see, therefore, that Judge Lobdell's letter had reference to an entirely different subject from which your "quotation" seeks to apply. Judge Lobdell says in effect that there is no specific data available to determine the question whether or not an investment in the stock of joint-stock land banks would be profitable.

Your "quotation" makes the impression that the Farm Loan Board was derelict in not knowing the cost of business done by the Federal land banks, these banks being the exemplars of the system you are attacking.

I submit to you that this is unfair, and also that it is not in accordance with the facts of the case; the board has always known the cost of business done by each of the Federal land banks, and kept in close touch with it from the beginning.

Yours, truly,

W. W. FLANNAGAN,
Secretary Farm Loan Board.

P. S.—You should write Mr. FORDNEY that the quotation was in error, and also have it eliminated from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Will you do it?

W. W. F.

NEW YORK, April 17, 1918.

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

MY DEAR MR. FORDNEY: Inclosed is some correspondence from Mr. Flannagan, secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board. Since Secretary Flannagan turned Mr. Hammond's letter over to Member Lobdell, Mr. Flannagan is, of course, responsible for the reply. There is very little difference in sense between the words "no specific data in hand" and "no available figures." However, I will in the reprints note this change of the paragraph objected to by Mr. Flannagan:

"The act requires that both the Federal and the joint-stock land banks shall keep expenses and profits within a one-point spread. Replying to a query as to the effect of this provision on the latter, Member Lobdell wrote, on January 10, 1918: 'The board has not in hand specific data which would be of material value to you.'"

I feel that, if you think this matter of sufficient importance for comment, this paragraph would answer your purposes. Kindly return my inclosed correspondence with Mr. Flannagan as soon as you are through with it.

Also, I should like the return of those two newspaper clippings. I await with keen interest what you are going to say this week.

Very sincerely,

R. INGALLS.

The following figures or statement of appropriations for this system I obtained from the Committee on Appropriations:

Federal Farm Loan appropriations.

1917. For purchase of Federal land banks' stocks (Pub. 158, 64th Cong.) (\$9,069,000 limit) expended in 1917—	\$8,880,315
For salaries and expenses:	
1917. (Pub. 272, 64th Cong.) Deficiency—	100,000
1917. (Pub. 158, 64th Cong.) Act creating banks—	100,000
1918. (Pub. 381, 64th Cong.) L. E. J. Appropriation act—	260,000
1919. H. R. 10358, L. E. J. for 1919—	241,620
Purchase of farm loan banks' bonds. (Pub. 95, 65th Cong.)—	
Not exceeding in 1918—	100,000,000
Not exceeding in 1919—	100,000,000
Total —	209,581,935

In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make deposits, upon the request of the board, out of the Treasury a sum not exceeding \$6,000,000 at any one time. (Pub. 158, 64th Cong.)

6,000,000

Gentlemen, my object in calling the attention of the House to this matter is—if my information is correct—much incompetency has been displayed by men whose duty it is to pass upon loans already made, and that the Government is not getting proper security for the money loaned.

I thank the House for their attention.

GARBAGE COLLECTION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10613.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10613, to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10613, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10613) to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That in order that the service of the collection of garbage and miscellaneous refuse in the District of Columbia and the disposal of the same may be continued without further interruption, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, if in their judgment it is deemed to be the best interest of said District, are hereby authorized to purchase or lease all or any part of the plant, equipment, buildings, and grounds used by the Washington Fertilizer Co., the present contractor, for the collection, removal, reduction, or disposal of garbage, and for the purchase or lease of all or any part of the plant, equipment, buildings and grounds used by M. R. Ready, the present contractor, for the collection, removal, and disposal of miscellaneous refuse.

SEC. 2. That in case a price can not be agreed upon between the commissioners and the parties in interest, for the purchase or lease of all or such parts of said plants, equipment, buildings, and grounds as may be required, then, and in that event, all or such parts of the said plants, equipment, buildings, and grounds, hereinafter described as may be necessary, are hereby declared to be and the same are hereby condemned and appropriated to and for the use of the United States of America, to be used, operated, and controlled by it, by and through the agency hereafter provided, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as agents of the United States, be, and they are hereby authorized and directed on the 1st day of July, 1918, to take charge and possession in the name of, for, and by authority of the United States of America, of all or so much of the property, real and personal, described in section 1, paragraph 1, as may be necessary, and to use the same for the collection, removal, reduction, or disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That in the event the property hereinbefore described is not purchased or leased, and is condemned as hereinbefore provided, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to appoint a commission of appraisal and award, consisting of three persons, to appraise the value of the properties condemned and appropriated, and to award to the respective owners just compensation therefor. The said commission of appraisal and award shall, as soon as possible, file an inventory of the physical assets in use and useful in conducting the service of the collection and removal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse, and the value of the same, proper allowance being made for depreciation. Each commissioner of the commission of appraisal and award shall make oath before a judge of a court of the United States to faithfully perform such duty. The said commission of appraisal and award shall have power, and it shall be its duty, to summon witnesses with books and papers before it for all of the parties in interest and to require such witnesses to testify, and it shall give a full hearing on the compensation to be awarded, and give notice of the filing of such award to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the owners of said property, and any party in interest dissatisfied with the amount of such award may appeal from the same, which appeal shall be reviewed by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, which court is hereby vested with jurisdiction for such purpose; and an appeal may similarly be taken from the decision of such court of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States for a final review of the amount of the award. Such final award shall bear interest at the rate of 4

per cent per annum from the date the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have taken possession of the property until the date of its final payment.

SEC. 4. That the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or expenses of appraisal and award, or both, shall be paid out of such appropriations as are, or may be provided for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse.

SEC. 5. That not exceeding \$85,000 of the appropriation authorized herein may be expended for the purchase of the property of the garbage contractor; and not exceeding \$50,000 may be expended for the purchase of the property of the miscellaneous refuse contractor: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to acquire by lease all or any part of the plant, equipment, buildings, and grounds of either of the present contractors engaged in the collection and removal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse, or property used by them, or such other equipment, buildings, and grounds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. That should the Commissioners of the District of Columbia find that the garbage in the District can be disposed of in a sanitary manner and as economically by feeding it to pigs, live stock, and poultry on the land of the Home for the Aged and Infirm, located at Blue Plains, District of Columbia, or on the land of the workhouse and reformatory of the District of Columbia, located at Occoquan and Lorton, Va., or both, or on such other land as the said commissioners may be able to acquire by purchase or lease in the States of Virginia or Maryland, the said commissioners are authorized to use either or all of said designated lands, or to purchase or lease land in the States of Virginia or Maryland for the purpose, and to adopt the pig, live stock, or poultry feeding method of disposal.

SEC. 7. That not exceeding \$200,000 of the appropriation authorized herein may be expended for the purchase of pigs, live stock, and poultry.

SEC. 8. That should the Commissioners of the District of Columbia find that under existing circumstances the methods of disposal of garbage hereinbefore authorized are inadvisable, they are authorized to secure for temporary use sufficient land, and to acquire the necessary equipment to bury the garbage collected in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 9. That every person, corporation, association, or institution in the District of Columbia, under such rules and regulations as the commissioners may prescribe, may transport in closed metal containers from the place of origin to places outside of the District of Columbia any refuse, including meat, bread, and vegetables, not in a decayed or decomposed condition, to be fed to poultry, pigs, or other live stock at any place where such feeding is not prohibited by law.

SEC. 10. That products arising from any method of disposal adopted by the commissioners under the authority of this act may be sold, and the proceeds therefrom shall be repaid to the then current appropriation for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse.

SEC. 11. That in order to put into effect and operate such method of disposal as may be adopted by the commissioners under the provisions of this act, the said commissioners are authorized to secure the necessary means of transportation, including the hire or purchase of horses and horse-drawn vehicles and passenger-carrying and other motor-propelled vehicles; additional equipment, buildings and machinery; and to employ expert and other personal services and labor; and to pay travelling, maintenance, incidental, and contingent expenses.

SEC. 12. That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act an appropriation in the sum of \$620,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized, one-half to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, before the motion was made to rise at 3 o'clock I had 10 minutes left for general debate, and it was the understanding that when we went back into Committee of the Whole again those 10 minutes might be used. I do not want to use the entire 10 minutes, but I promised five to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON], and if it is proper now I will yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday, while the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, was being considered by the House, I read some correspondence between the United States Food Administrator, Herbert Hoover; the Department of State, signed by Robert Lansing and Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State; and myself, which may be found on pages 5305, 5306 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This correspondence was of such a character and disclosed such condition of affairs that I commented thereon briefly. I felt then that no reason existed why an order appointing Mr. Hoover Food Administrator should not be made public or a Member of Congress should be denied the right to read the same.

We enacted the law which created this office, and I believed we had a right to examine the instrument of appointment and learn the extent of authority conferred. Those letters show I was denied the right to read the order of appointment of the Food Administrator or obtain a copy of the same. Such a denial to a Member of Congress I criticized by suggesting there must be some reason therefor which would be discovered were the contents thereof made public.

Last Saturday afternoon I was called on the telephone by an official of the Food Administration and was amazed when he told me the Executive order appointing Mr. Hoover Food Administrator was a part of a public document of the House of Representatives numbered 890.

The mantle of secrecy thus raised, the private order suddenly discovered as public and had been since last January, I won-

dered how on the 18th day of last March it could have been "confidential," as stated by the Secretary of State in his letter to me refusing me my right to read the same.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to comment upon the views which apparently govern some executive and administrative officials of our Government in dealing with Members of Congress upon public matters.

Why did the Food Administrator, Herbert Hoover, on the 25th day of February last, notify me, in writing, that my request for a copy of the Executive order of the President had been referred to the Secretary of State, in whose custody it remained, when he, Herbert Hoover, on the 31st day of January last, in his report of itemized statements of purchases and disbursements of his organization from August 11 to December 31, 1917, inclusive, had included a copy of this Executive order?

Why did Mr. Hoover neglect to notify me that it could be found in that report?

Why did the honorable Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, in writing, on February 28 last, inform me that the Executive order of August 10, 1917, appointing Mr. Hoover United States Food Administrator had not been made public, and for that reason a copy could not be forwarded to Mr. Greeley?

Why did the Acting Secretary of State, Frank L. Polk, on March 6 last, inform me, in writing, "that the Executive order of August 10, 1917, appointing Mr. Hoover has not been made public, and for that reason I regret to say that your request can not be complied with."

Why did the honorable Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, on March 18 last, in writing, inform me "that inasmuch as the order is confidential, and as I have no authority to show it to you, it is regretted that I can not comply with your request"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. WASON. May I have one minute more?

Mr. CARY. I had only 10 minutes altogether, and I promised the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] five minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I will yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. CARY. All right, then; one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, the inaccuracy of the above statements of the several gentlemen mentioned is of little concern to me compared with the attitude of the Department of State, and at some later time, should a like situation arise between a Member of Congress and an executive or administrative official, I may attempt a protest to the extent of my ability against such denial of the inherent rights heretofore enjoyed by Members of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the four minutes remaining to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, in looking through an old book shop not long ago, I fell upon two volumes entitled the "Book of Days." Running through them, I found that every day in the year had some special history and significance. Every day in the year had been observed with some interest, joy, or solemnity by some nation, people, or community.

The book of American days would be a brief one. But as time goes on days of observance are increasing, and perhaps a century from now our days for observance or celebration will be many. Then will labor and business have more frequent relaxation, while opportunity for social enjoyment will be greatly increased.

Speaking of American days of either national or general observance, we can trace Christmas to old Judea. New Year's, celebrated by nearly all peoples, nations, and religions, is conventionally based upon the course and progress of the sun, and is varied by latitude. Pennsylvania gave us Independence Day; New England furnished Thanksgiving; Grand Army of the Republic gave us Decoration Day; the toiling millions have set aside a day for labor; and Nebraska, treeless plain of 50 years ago, fathers Arbor Day. [Applause.]

Arbor Day is recognized in every State in the Union. The founder of Arbor Day was J. Sterling Morton, one of Nebraska's early settlers and one of its greatest builders. He was a philosopher, a scholar, and statesman. He was the first Cabinet officer Nebraska ever furnished the Nation, being Secretary of Agriculture during President Cleveland's second term. As a farmer, editor, and statesman he left his impress upon his State and Nation. But he will be known in history best as the founder of Arbor Day. He believed that a man was doing part of his duty if he caused two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before. But he believed that he was more nearly fulfilling his full duty if he caused a stately tree to rise where only the annual plant had hitherto grown. [Applause.]

In 1872 Morton induced the Nebraska State Board of Agriculture to set aside a day for tree planting, to be known as Arbor Day. Three years later legislative enactment made it a legal holiday. Since that time all the States in the Union have followed, each one, however, selecting its own date in accordance with the time for planting trees.

In the days of our great Civil War, when Nebraska was a Territory and more than 30 per cent of her inhabitants were in the Union Army or fighting Indians, the grass grew, the game fed upon it, the prairie fire consumed what remained, while fugitive seeds, wafted by the winds, were burned or the life scorched out of their young sprouts. Only along the banks of some streams were a few sprouts allowed to become shrubs and those shrubs permitted to reach the doubtful dignity of trees.

The war being over, soldiers and others came to Nebraska, taking homesteads and timber claims. They found no rock or other materials for building. There were no trees out of which the homes could be built after the manner of their fathers' log dwellings farther east. They had recourse to the dugout and sod houses, now largely memories in Nebraska.

But as it was said "Necessity is the mother of invention," so might we say "Famine is the father of plenty." Man always values most highly that which he has not. It was then Morton came from the East, settling near the present site of Nebraska City, on the banks of the Missouri. He saw Nebraska's large want and proceeded to demonstrate the feasibility of its fulfillment. So he built a home and round it set out many trees from many parts of the Union. He watered them and protected them from fire. They grew and before many years their stately forms and spreading branches were a comfort in summer, a protection in winter, and to the vision of him who since became known as the founder of Arbor Lodge presented in miniature the change which was to come over our State.

"Plant trees" was written on the head of Arbor Lodge stationery. "Plant trees" was rung in the ears of every public audience. "Plant trees" was taught in the schools in spring-time. "Protect trees" was advised in the public press. Soon the trees themselves, protected from prairie fires, began to do the rest.

Now, in Nebraska you need not travel far for comforting shade or living landmark. It was estimated that in 1915 the growth of tree life in Nebraska was sufficient to furnish fuel for Nebraska homes.

In Saline County, near the city of Friend, in my congressional district, resides Josiah Miner, a veteran of the Civil War. Early after the close of the war he took a homestead and has resided upon it ever since. He has groves of varied species, deciduous and evergreen. From trees planted by himself he has sawed lumber for a large comfortable dwelling and many convenient barns, granaries, and other outbuildings. Among the trees which adorn this homestead are 10 acres of black walnut which he offers to the Government for making gunstocks. This is a type of Nebraska development.

Incidentally let me suggest that Nebraska has just gone grandly over the top in the third liberty loan. On thrift stamps Nebraska has a phenomenal statement, as the following published statement shows:

NEBRASKA BUYS TENTH OF WAR STAMPS SOLD—HER PER CAPITA IS \$11.06, WITH DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SECOND—OTHER FIGURES.

Nebraska has bought one-tenth of all the war savings and thrift stamps sold since the campaign opened nearly five months ago, according to a report issued by the national war savings committee.

Up to April 1 the total receipts from savings stamps sales were \$149,361,972, of which Nebraska contributed \$14,343,991. New York was second, with \$12,273,783, and Missouri third, with \$11,183,305. Pennsylvania has raised \$10,868,034.

Nebraska has raised \$11.06 for every man, woman, and child within her borders. The District of Columbia is second with \$3.75 per capita, and Missouri and Kansas follow with \$3.14 and \$3.11, respectively.

Of the 20 leading States, all but 5 are west of the Mississippi River. In 1895, being a member of the Nebraska State Senate, I introduced a resolution which passed, by almost unanimous vote, both branches of the legislature and was signed by the governor, Silas A. Holcomb. The resolution was as follows:

Whereas the State is preeminently a tree-planting State; and Whereas many honorable State organizations have by resolution designated Nebraska as the "Tree Planters' State": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, That Nebraska shall hereafter in a popular sense be known and referred to as the "Tree Planters' State."

Nebraskans would reverse the history and experience of many older cities, States, and countries. Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, Laodoea, and a hundred other cities which marked the sea coast and dotted the interior of western Asia, northern Africa, and eastern Europe are now in ruins or lie buried beneath the shifting sands, while round them lie the wind-swept barren plains once fertile, beautiful, and fair. The rapacity of man

destroyed the forests to build the town, let the soil parch under the sun, and, parching, lost its humus until it was lifted by the winds and blown hither and yon, stifling vegetation and leaving, except along the valleys, desert waste where once had been produced food enough for the millions of earth. The denuded forest tells a sad tale, the barren fields are still more pathetic, but most to be deplored is the vanished energy, fire, and patriotism of people once noted for culture, industry, and valor, but who now bow to the rule of petty tyrants and lead lives far in the rear of the world's progress. Their history is preserved only by their enemies and no worthy heritage is provided for the generations to come.

I have just received the annual proclamation for Arbor Day this day issued by acting Gov. Edgar Howard. It is as follows:

PROCLAMATION.

Obedient to the command of custom and the law of the Commonwealth, I hereby make proclamation that Monday, April 22, 1918, shall be set apart and observed as Arbor Day. To the pioneers upon the prairies the trees were only a memory of the homes from whence the settlers came, only the intrepid few among them being bold to even dream of the arboreal magnificence of our Nebraska in this present. Thanks to the intelligent endeavors of one sterling pioneer, the Hon. J. Sterling Morton, by the Nation now acknowledged as the "father of Arbor Day," the dream of trees has given place to the fact of trees, and all Nebraska has been adorned by practice of the precepts proclaimed by that far-seeing lover of the beautiful in nature.

In the Arbor Day proclamations uttered by the governors of the Eastern States runs a vein of sorrow and regret because of the vanished grandeur of the mighty forests which have gone down before the resistless march of civilization, and in each is a plea for speedy restoration in some measure of the vanished wealth of woods which once adorned the landscapes. To the people of our own Commonwealth come not the pangs of regret for the loss of tree glories, but only the anticipatory joys of the arboreal glory which shall some day be ours if we be faithful in the practice of the virtues of the pioneer fathers of our Arbor Day.

In the best spirit of our Arbor Day, I, Edgar Howard, acting governor of Nebraska, call upon the people of the Commonwealth, and especially upon those in charge of all public and parochial schools, for earnest endeavor to renew the health of the tree-planting spirit by appropriate public and private observance of the day.

And may I not in this hour of the Nation's peril plead with all our people to unite with me in supplication to the Father for the speedy dawning of that glad day when the forests of France and of all lands may again bless the earth with fragrance untarnished by the taint of war?

Given under my hand at the executive office in Lincoln this 15th day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-second, and of the admission of Nebraska to the Union of States the fifty-second.

By the governor:

EDGAR HOWARD,
CHARLES W. POOL,
Secretary of State for the State of Nebraska.

[SEAL.]

In harmony with the sentiment and enterprise of the pioneers and those who now live in our State, and in conformity with the proclamations annually made by our governors, we have planted the cedar of pride, the pine of symmetry, the apple of abundance, the maple of beauty, the ash of endurance, the oak of strength, the acacia of remembrance, and the elm of grandeur to temper the winds, the frost, and the sun, control the rainfall, and modify the climate and season for the comfort and delight of men in the generations to come. [Applause.]

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Call the roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Alexander | Dallinger | Gallagher | Kahn |
| Anthony | Darrow | Gallivan | Kearns |
| Austin | Davidson | Garrett, Tenn. | Kelley, Mich. |
| Bacharach | Dempsey | Godwin, N. C. | Kennedy, R. I. |
| Barkley | Denison | Gould | Kettner |
| Beshlin | Dewalt | Graham, Pa. | Key, Ohio |
| Bland | Dickinson | Gray, Ala. | Kieess, Pa. |
| Borland | Dies | Gray, N. J. | King |
| Bowers | Donovan | Gregg | Kreider |
| Brodbeck | Dooling | Griest | LaGuardia |
| Buchanan | Doremus | Griffin | Langley |
| Butler | Drane | Hamilton, N. Y. | Leshner |
| Caldwell | Drukker | Haskell | Lever |
| Campbell, Pa. | Dupré | Hefflin | Lunn |
| Carew | Dyer | Heintz | McClintic |
| Carlin | Eagan | Hicks | McCormick |
| Carter, Mass. | Estopinal | Holland | McCuloch |
| Carter, Okla. | Fairchild, B. L. | Hood | McKeown |
| Chandler, N. Y. | Fairchild, G. W. | Houston | McKinley |
| Chandler, Okla. | Ferris | Howard | McLaughlin, Pa. |
| Church | Fields | Hull, Iowa | McLemore |
| Clark, Fla. | Fisher | Humphreys | Magee |
| Coady | Flynn | Huchinson | Maher |
| Copley | Focht | Igoe | Mann |
| Costello | Frear | James | Martin |
| Curry, Cal. | Freeman | Johnson, S. Dak. | Merritt |
| Dale, N. Y. | Fuller, Mass. | Jones | Morin |

- | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Mott | Rankin | Siemp | Thompson |
| Mudd | Riordan | Small | Tinkham |
| Nicholls, S. C. | Roberts | Smith, Idaho | Towner |
| Nicholls, Mich. | Rodenberg | Smith, T. F. | Treadway |
| Norton | Rouse | Snell | Vare |
| Oliver, Ala. | Rowe | Snyder | Voigt |
| Oliver, N. Y. | Rowland | Stafford | Volstead |
| Oney | Rucker | Stegall | Walker |
| O'Shaunessy | Russell | Stedman | Watson, Pa. |
| Parker, N. Y. | Sanders, La. | Steele | Weaver |
| Polk | Sanford | Stephens, Nebr. | Webb |
| Porter | Scott, Iowa | Sterling, Pa. | Whaley |
| Pou | Scott, Mich. | Stiness | White, Ohio |
| Powers | Scott, Pa. | Strong | Wilson, Ill. |
| Price | Scully | Sullivan | Winslow |
| Purnell | Sears | Sumners | Wise |
| Ragsdale | Shackleford | Swift | Woodyard |
| Rainey, H. T. | Shallenberger | Switzer | Wright |
| Ramsey | Sherley | Tague | |
| Randall | Siegel | Templeton | |

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration H. R. 10613, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 244 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be entered on the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

Accordingly the committee resumed its session, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe Members will be impatient to get away so early in the evening, in view of the importance of this bill.

The present contract for the removal of garbage expires on the 30th day of June. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have advertised for new bids. The present contract calls for \$69,000 a year for the removal of the city garbage. New bids were received by the commissioners. The lowest bid was \$143,000, but when the low bidder came to comply with the terms of the contract under which he had bid he was dissatisfied with his own bid and forfeited a \$3,000 check rather than comply with the terms of his own bid.

When the 1st of July comes there will be no provision whatever for the removal of garbage from the District of Columbia. This bill authorizes a program which, if authorized, the Committee on Appropriations will put into effect.

On this short statement I hope Members will forego their impatience to get away and will let us dispose of this bill before we adjourn this afternoon. [Applause.] A critical condition faces the District of Columbia, and I think everybody ought to stay here and do his duty relative to that condition which faces us if we do not pass a bill upon which the Appropriations Committee can act when it comes up.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no prolonged discussion. Of course, there may be some features of the bill that Members may not like, but I hope that a short statement will satisfy the Members of the House as to the importance of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Why does not the gentleman let the Clerk read a section of the bill?

Mr. GARNER. Perhaps everybody is ready to pass it.

Mr. SISSON. All right. Let the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That in case a price can not be agreed upon between the commissioners and the parties in interest, for the purchase or lease of all or such parts of said plants, equipment, buildings and grounds as may be required, then, and in that event, all or such parts of the said plants, equipment, buildings and grounds hereinbefore described as may be necessary, are hereby declared to be and the same are hereby condemned and appropriated to and for the use of the United States of America, to be used, operated, and controlled by it, by and through the agency hereafter provided, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as agents of the United States, be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed on the 1st day of July, 1918, to take charge and possession, in the name of, for, and by the authority of the United States of America of all or so much of the property, real and personal, described in section 1, paragraph 1, as may be necessary, and to use the same for the collection, removal, reduction, or disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman if there are at present two contracts relating to the disposition and collection of garbage; and if there are two, whether both have expired, or will in the near future?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The contract does not expire until the 30th of June.

Mr. WALSH. Are there two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is one contract for garbage and another contract for other refuse—paper, ashes, night soil, and dead animals.

Mr. WALSH. The purpose is to take over the property of the present contractors for the District in the future to take care of the collection and disposition of refuse and garbage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is done only in case of the inability of the commissioners to get bids.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state where the plants are now located?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The garbage plant is in Virginia; I do not know how far it is from here.

Mr. MAPES. The statement of the commissioners is that it is about 30 miles.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The paper and ash plant is over on the Eastern Branch of the river.

Mr. WALSH. In the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Are the two plants engaged in this business in any other community, or is their business simply for the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my impression is that they are engaged here solely.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman any idea as to the sum of money that will be required for the acquisition of these plants?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The garbage plant has been appraised and found to be worth about \$85,000, and this bill provides that it may be taken over at not exceeding \$85,000.

Mr. WALSH. What information has the gentleman with reference to the refuse plant?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have no information as to that. If I am correctly informed, the man has thrown up the contract and the commissioners themselves are having the work done. They are removing the ashes, paper, dead animals, night soil, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to say that unless some remedy is provided by Congress that after the 1st of July the District of Columbia will be without means for taking care of the garbage situation or authorizing its disposition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is it exactly. When the 1st day of July comes, without the passage of this bill the garbage must go into the back yards and alleys without provision for its removal.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky, in line 5, page 1, why do you use the word "further?"

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Because there is already an interruption. There was an interruption in the ash contract. The man has quit removing ashes and the commissioners are now removing them.

Mr. LITTLE. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That not exceeding \$85,000 of the appropriation authorized herein may be expended for the purchase of the property of the garbage contractor; and not exceeding \$50,000 may be expended for the purchase of the property of the miscellaneous refuse contractor: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to acquire by lease all or any part of the plant, equipment, buildings, and grounds of either of the present contractors engaged in the collection and removal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse, or property used by them, or such other equipment, buildings, and grounds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In line 13, page 4, section 5, ought that not to be "a sum not exceeding \$85,000?"

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think the gentleman from Ohio is technically correct, but I do not think it is at all necessary. It would be quite clearly understood that \$85,000 means a sum of money. I do not think it is material.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That should the Commissioners of the District of Columbia find that the garbage in the District can be disposed of in a sanitary manner and as economically by feeding it to pigs, live stock, and poultry on the land of the Home for the Aged and Infirm, located at Blue Plains, D. C., or on the land of the workhouse and reformatory of the District of Columbia, located at Occoquan and Lorton, Va., or both, or on such other land as the said commissioners may be able to acquire by purchase or lease in the States of Virginia or Maryland, the said commissioners are authorized to use either or all of said designated lands, or to purchase or lease land in the States of Virginia or Maryland for the purpose, and to adopt the pig, live stock, or poultry feeding method of disposal.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the phrase "live stock," does not that include the word "pigs"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; live stock includes pigs.

Mr. FESS. Why should you set out something that is live stock as if it was not included in the term?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If I had written the bill, I would have omitted the word "pigs" and have said "live stock."

Mr. FESS. It is repeated in line 17 and further on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is synonymous all the way through.

Mr. FESS. Why should they do that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know; but it makes no trouble.

Mr. FESS. I suppose not. I will withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That not exceeding \$200,000 of the appropriation authorized herein may be expended for the purchase of pigs, live stock, and poultry.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Do I understand that the District government or some branch of it will purchase pigs, live stock, and poultry, in addition to acquiring these plants for the sole purpose of disposing of garbage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; that is an alternative proposition.

Mr. WALSH. Alternative to what?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. To the acquirement of a plant. We do not know just how quickly the plant can be put into operation. It may require a lot of improvement.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the plant running at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; but in an inferior way. It will require a lot of improvements.

Mr. WALSH. What would become of the live stock if they were bought temporarily while the plant was being put into first class condition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Sold, and the money returned to the fund from which it came.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will pardon me, I desire to ask him a question not pertaining to the section under consideration; but, as I understand, these condemnation proceedings instituted for the acquisition of this plant that is located in Virginia are vested in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. What page is that?

Mr. WALSH. Page 3, section 3, and in section 4.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a little unusual to vest jurisdiction over the acquisition of property in a court which is outside the jurisdiction where the property is located?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. The gentleman will notice that the proceeding is to be in the name of the United States, and the property is to be taken over in the name of the United States, and the United States has taken over property for public purposes of the District of Columbia in the States of Virginia and Maryland. Land for the Occoquan prison was acquired by the same kind of a proceeding.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the United States Court of Appeals?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; it is the Federal court.

Mr. WALSH. In the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Kentucky tell why the \$200,000 has been fixed for this particular purpose of purchasing pigs, live stock, and poultry? And before he answers, I call his attention to the fact that in section 5 \$85,000 is appropriated for the purchase of the property of the garbage contractor, and not exceeding \$50,000 for the purchase of the property of the miscellaneous-refuse contractor. More money may be expended than that, but if the property of the garbage contractor is to be bought at not more than \$85,000, and that of the miscellaneous-refuse contractor is not worth more than \$50,000, why \$200,000 to expend for live stock?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The live stock would not go to those places. It is an alternative proposition. One is to feed it without acquiring the property, and the other is to acquire the property and not feed it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It occurred to me from a hurried reading that that was a disproportionate amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. If the garbage is fed to live stock, it will take a large sum of money to buy the stock, because the stock is so high. The gentleman will bear in mind that this is only an authorization.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; not exceeding \$200,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; and the Committee on Appropriations will have to handle the appropriation of that money, and then would come the question to which the gentleman now refers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the District committee have any testimony showing that such an amount would be required?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; we had the commissioners before us.

Mr. MASON. And the engineer commissioner?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; the engineer commissioner has the matter largely in hand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was so large an amount suggested as \$200,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. My understanding is that if they can get this property in Virginia or can find a place to dump the garbage somewhere within the District, the commissioners will do so; otherwise the District commissioners are going into the pig business because they can get farms that are of no value for raising crops adjoining the District of Columbia, somewhere near by, and that they think it is a good proposition to get these pigs down on these farms so as to fertilize the land. They are going further into the pig business, then, to purchase pigs, but they are going also to buy female pigs of good variety and get males and go into the pig-raising business for a number of years. Now, that is what one of the commissioners of the District of Columbia said to the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That does not appear to be a function connected with the disposition of garbage. That is really a proposition of increasing the quantity of garbage, I would say.

Mr. LOBECK. No; it is to fertilize the land, so it shall become valuable for raising crops hereafter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What has that to do with the disposition of garbage?

Mr. LOBECK. If they go to work and feed the hogs it will fertilize the land at the same time and make the land valuable.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will permit me, in his time, to ask the chairman of the committee whether this is the real purpose of starting a hog farm—for the purpose of fertilizing the land?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If anybody has that purpose, I have not heard of it.

Mr. LOBECK. I heard it in the committee room by Col. Gardiner, one of the commissioners.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There was something said about that, but if a sow has pigs, what are you going to do with them, kill them or sell them? Of course, you do not want to—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is a fair proposition, but is the District of Columbia to be authorized to go into the business of fertilizing farms by purchasing pigs merely for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; they would not be purchased for that purpose, but wherever a pig is put the droppings will fertilize the land, as a matter of course.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if these farms become the property of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is no authorization to buy land or any extensive plant except the garbage-reduction plant.

Mr. LOBECK. There is live stock named in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But if you have the garbage and have no place to put it, it ought to be fed to something.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "two hundred thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "ten thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, strike out "two hundred thousand" and insert "ten thousand."

Mr. ROBBINS. I think, gentlemen of the committee, of all the ridiculous propositions that ever was put before a sensible legislative body this proposition of spending \$200,000 in buying chickens and pigs, which are to eat the garbage of the city of Washington, is the most ridiculous. Take the city of Pittsburgh. It has a garbage plant established in my district and there they are burning up and incinerating all the garbage of that great city, transported to this plant in closed cars, collected in the city in closed wagons and tanks, and out of that garbage they extract a certain amount of fertilizer, oil, metal, and other articles of value, which the contractor sells. Here you propose to feed it to pigs that are to be eaten by people as food and to chickens that are to be eaten by people, consumed as food by

human beings. Whoever heard of a proposition of that kind? Do you believe a pig that is fed on garbage of a great city would be fit to eat?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Of course they would be.

Mr. ROBBINS. It would produce in the first place cholera and diseases in the pigs and in the next place contribute it to the people who eat such pork.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There is not a farmer in the United States—

Mr. ROBBINS. Wait a minute; I have not yielded the floor, and the gentleman can ask a question when I get through with this statement. I do not know of a city that attempts to dispose of its garbage by feeding it to food-producing animals, such as pigs and chickens. The way to dispose of the garbage is to destroy it.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ROBBINS. I do.

Mr. LITTLE. I wish to say that Kansas City, Mo., used to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Louisville, Ky., is doing that. It got in a bad condition and could not handle its garbage, and it is to-day feeding its garbage to hogs.

Mr. ROBBINS. I never heard of a thing of that sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They are doing that now.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am not doubting the gentleman's word, but it is doomed to be a failure. The garbage of a city is the refuse of a city. It is the stuff that is thrown away as worthless.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman does not know anything about feeding pigs.

Mr. ROBBINS. I know something about it. I know a pig must be fed clean, wholesome food if it is to be a clean, wholesome animal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Every farmer in the United States feeds his garbage to pigs.

Mr. ROBBINS. But they feed it in the condition of sour milk and cullings from the table, and try to see that it is in clean, palatable condition and healthy. The farmers all give this careful attention.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. I will.

Mr. MAPES. I want to interrupt the gentleman to add my statement that Grand Rapids, Mich., disposed of its garbage for several years in such a way. It was fed to pigs, and very satisfactorily.

Mr. ROBBINS. But they have discarded it, have they not?

Mr. MAPES. Because they could not get the contractor to renew his contract.

Mr. ROBBINS. The pigs all died of cholera, I suppose.

Mr. MAPES. No; they did not.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. The reduction of table scraps to feed stock is the most modern method of all. The gentleman is confusing pigs and goats. Goats eat cans. We are talking about table scraps.

Mr. ROBBINS. Do not let us treat with levity at this time an appropriation of \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money. Let us be serious. You are proposing to invest \$200,000 in pigs and chickens to eat up the garbage of Washington City.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. In just a moment. If it were possible to select the meat cuttings and the bread culls and probably the apple parings, and a few of those things, and preserve them separate in proper receptacles, such selective table leavings might be fed with some degree of safety to pigs, but that is just exactly what you can not do in collecting garbage in a public way in a city. It is thrown into cans and mixed up with all kinds of refuse, dirt, and filth, and can not be kept sanitary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Hoover will not permit you to use that for feeding swine, will he?

Mr. ROBBINS. I have not seen any of Mr. Hoover's late edicts on that; he prescribes the bill of fare for men, not pigs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman, in talking of an appropriation, this does not appropriate any money. It authorizes an appropriation upon which you can vote at another time.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is true, but you are setting aside a sum, not to exceed \$200,000, for the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use, and you know how the District Commissioners use everything that Congress appropriates to them. You were the champion of the people against the profiteer. Now you are turning around to favor them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am turning around in order to have the garbage taken out and consumed in order to keep the people from dying from disease.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am not opposed to taking out garbage, but I object most earnestly to buying pigs to eat up the garbage. There are modern methods of treating city garbage by incineration, and that is the method that should be adopted in the Capital City of this Nation. This plan not only means to waste the sum of \$200,000 needed to support our gallant soldiers now fighting in France, but it is a method that will be fly breeding, disease spreading, and antiquated. This item can be stricken from the bill and not prevent the other provisions from being enforced. The promiscuous garbage of a city is an unhealthy conglomeration that even pigs can not eat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question. Has the committee investigated any other method of handling this? For example, the city of Berlin before the war had a method by which it reduced the entire produce of garbage to a fertilizer, and it had a large farm of its own, consisting of many hundreds of acres. Have you ever investigated any other methods than this one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No European method at all. There is a proposition here from a man who wants to take the garbage for the purpose of making alcohol, and it is perfectly feasible, too, but it came in after this bill was agreed upon.

Mr. LITTLE. It seems to me that if this committee is going to put so much in it, it should have investigated the new methods.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that the committee is undertaking to provide a means by which the garbage may be disposed of. It is an emergency case, and unless it is done when the 1st of July comes along they will have no means unless you provide a bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Why did you not do it six months ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I said a few moments ago, when the time came for letting the bids the contractor, who has disposed of the garbage at \$69,000, put in a bid of \$147,000, and now will not bid at all, and neither will anybody else.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Are they using pigs now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. The man who takes away the garbage now uses it in his own way.

Mr. ROBBINS. Did your committee investigate the question of an incineration plant to destroy the garbage by burning?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; but I think that is considered too wasteful to be thought of.

Mr. LITTLE. The modern method is to use it scientifically for some beneficial purpose. Instead of incinerating it, you can use it for fertilizer. The city of Manchester uses it for fertilizer and ships it out, or did a few years ago. In Kansas City, Mo., they fed it to the hogs. A gentleman had a contract, and he did pretty well. I was employed as an attorney in a lawsuit for him, in which the matter was quite thoroughly discussed, and I never heard of it making any hog sick or having any bad result. I was a little surprised that I did not hear of it; but I did not. I thought I would hear something of that kind. In China and Japan the refuse of towns and cities is always utilized as a fertilizer. To waste that product would be considered very foolish. It is the most valuable product of many cities. Scientifically handled, reduced to a liquid fertilizer, the city of Berlin, if my memory serves me, did, and perhaps still does, fertilize a farm as large as the city, which she owned, with much profit. We should have begun this discussion, or the committee should, long since, and should be prepared to use the very best modern methods. I am getting tired of committees waiting till the last minute and rushing through important matters under a fire alarm.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LOBECK. Gentlemen, this is a serious question, and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for this bill. I looked into this garbage question when I was on the District Committee some years ago. We authorized an expenditure of \$10,000 on a resolution here to look up the matter of garbage disposal, and a report to Congress was made by a gentleman who was brought here from a city in Ohio, where he had constructed a reduction plant, and in that report he stated that different methods of disposal of garbage could be employed either by incineration, by which power, heat, and light could be generated, or dispose of garbage by reduction, and by which the commis-

sioners would be enabled to sell grease and fertilizer, and so on. The cost of the different methods was stated to be about even. The methods used in England to-day or in any community or in any State that has looked into it for any considerable time can be investigated and studied. The best possible way, to my mind, to reduce garbage in order to take care of health is the incinerating method, but I do not care which method is used. If the District of Columbia, through its Committee on the District or through the Committee on Appropriations of this House, had taken the matter in hand four or five years ago when this engineers' report was brought to the attention of Congress we would not now face a condition that may cost this District of Columbia a tremendous lot of money and possibly result in providing a very poor way for the disposal of garbage.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why do we not resort to the incinerating process now?

Mr. LOBECK. Well, it would take some time to construct the plant, either if a first-class reduction plant or an incinerating plant were decided upon.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I notice that this bill proposes to appropriate in all \$620,000. That is a very large sum, I will say, for the District of Columbia, comparing it with other cities. In some of the cities the removal and disposal of garbage pays for itself and gives a profit to the contractor. I think that was the case in New York City some years ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The hearings that were held show that there was no city in the United States where it was paying.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some years ago we had some evidence here in the House as to one of the cities, where money was being paid for the privilege of removing the garbage, but this is a little old-fashioned method. Of course, live stock disposes of garbage on the farm. There is no disputing that question. But it seems to be a primitive method to resort to, and in this city it would involve a very large expense. If you are going to go into an undertaking of that kind, why not make it a permanent undertaking at once?

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

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, the limit of debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. LOBECK. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Nebraska may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. LOBECK. I asked for five minutes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman ought to have five minutes. He was interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBECK. It is regrettable that the District of Columbia, the Capital of the Nation, is going back to ante bellum methods, methods that are a hundred years old; going back to a method that no respectable city of this country of 50,000 inhabitants and over would resort to. That is what this bill means; but we have got to vote for it, owing to the conditions here. If Congress, through its District Committee or its Committee on Appropriations, had acted on the report of the engineer on which we had spent \$10,000, we would have been prepared to take care of the situation on the 1st of July this year. That is what that resolution intended to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman will recollect that the House passed an appropriate bill and sent it over to the Senate, and it died there.

Mr. LOBECK. I know it died there. I said that Congress had not acted.

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the gentleman realize that the condition with which we are confronted is caused by the fact that the Committee on the District of Columbia never brought up this matter until recently?

Mr. LOBECK. Oh, it was brought up in 1911 and 1912, and the records are here. It was fully discussed at that time. The gentleman from Wisconsin remembers it very well. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] remembers the discussion. He is not here now. But this is the condition with which we are confronted: I do not think it will pay to buy or rent a farm and go into the hog business at this time. Hogs are worth \$15 to \$20 a hundred, and I do not know that you can buy stock

hogs at this time of the year. You might buy them in the fall, but not when grass is green. Then, you run the risk of hog cholera. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was asked if he knew anything about raising hogs.

I have not been in the hog business for many years, but there was a time when I knew something about it, and I raised and fed and shipped as good hogs as any man in the country. I know it is a risky proposition. I am opposed to the commissioners going into the hog business. I do not believe it would be wise to do so now or any other time. I have no objection to buying this plant down in Virginia. We have got to do something. It is all right to take care of this rubbish plant out on the Benning Road, which is a disgrace to the city of Washington at this time. What the District of Columbia ought to do is to set an example to the cities of this country and have some up-to-date method to take care of the garbage of this city. It can be done if Congress will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not know that this alternative provision will ever be accepted if it becomes a law, but it is an undeniable fact that since they have been vaccinating hogs they no longer die from cholera. On my farm I never had a hog die since we have been practicing vaccination.

Mr. LOBECK. That is so. I want to say that I raised and fed hogs for years without inoculation and luckily did not have hog cholera among my hogs, but this cholera cure from the Agricultural Department does not always give good results, although I may add that I know of good results when the remedies proposed by the Agricultural Department have been utilized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$10,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBBINS) there were—ayes 15, noes 40.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$50,000."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania moves to amend page 5, line 15, by striking out "\$200,000" and inserting "\$50,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word or two on this proposition. We are going back to early methods, and very crude methods at that, of disposing of the garbage of a great city. If we are going into the business of garbage disposal as a municipal proposition, why not go into it right? This is the Nation's Capital and we ought to be up to date. We could construct an incinerating plant and put it under the direction of the commissioners, apparently, with the money that is appropriated in this bill for experimental purposes. We should start right. I have moved to strike out \$200,000 and insert \$50,000 because I do not believe we ought to go into the wholesale poultry and cattle business through the District commissioners. We ought to be businesslike in this matter, involving the health of the Capital City of this Nation, and not do it in a doubtful way or by halves.

Mr. SLOAN. The greatest source of losses of hogs now, as demonstrated at the various packing establishments, is not cholera, but tuberculosis, and the largest source of tuberculosis in hogs is garbage and that which accompanies garbage, the rejected milk of dairies, creameries, and so on. I have made considerable investigation of this subject. Congress has made an appropriation for the purpose of reducing and finally eradicating tuberculosis, of which, as I say, the most growing source in hogs is through feeding them garbage. That is the undisputed evidence of all the men who have given testimony before the committee, the scientists and all who discussed this matter. So if you buy hogs for the purpose of feeding them garbage, you are entering a dangerous field and what will be an unprofitable business.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word before my time expires. I thank the gentleman for his support, but I did want to say that this is an experimental proposition and we ought not to go into it wholesale. If you are going to try out the pig, live-stock, and poultry business, let us begin in a small way and use \$50,000 instead of \$200,000.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman will permit me, this is purely an authorization, and I believe that the Appropriations Committee will go into every phase of it before it makes an appropriation. Does not the gentleman think he can trust the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am willing to trust the Appropriations Committee. I was willing to trust the District Committee, but it has brought in a bill that is not altogether satisfactory. Does not the gentleman believe that we should strike

out this appropriation for pigs, live stock, and poultry and put it into an incinerating plant? I think we could get one started for \$200,000.

Mr. GARNER. I am not enamored with the proposition to go into the business of raising pigs myself, but I think the Appropriations Committee will thrash it out in all its details.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. So far as the pigs are concerned, it is purely a socialistic proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting to gentlemen of the House to know what the commissioners say about this proposition, and incidentally it is a condition that faces the people of the District and not a theory. This incinerating plant, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has spoken, was recommended several years ago by the commission which the gentleman from Nebraska spoke of, and the reason why the District Commissioners do not recommend building it at this time is because it would be absolutely impossible to erect it by the time the contract for the disposal of garbage in the District expires, namely, the 30th of June.

Another reason is because of the abnormal cost of putting up such a plant at this time. The commissioners recommend this proposition of feeding hogs as one of three different ways which may be adopted. It does not necessarily follow that because this is put in the bill as one of the alternatives for the disposition of garbage that the commissioners will adopt it.

Let me read one or two sentences from the letter of the commissioners to the chairman of the committee recommending this bill:

This method was represented to be the most satisfactory and the most economical. It was set forth that the cost of the necessary plants and equipment would be \$885,900. Under present abnormal conditions this cost would be increased to about \$1,200,000. Even if sufficient time were available to provide for such plants it is believed that the present excessive cost would not justify the adoption of this course of action.

The advisability of adopting temporary expedients is believed to be clearly indicated. If satisfactory arrangements can not otherwise be made, it should be within the power of the commissioners to conduct any or all of the operations incident to the services under consideration as municipal functions. The granting of such power is the purpose of the proposed legislation. Such authority or power should be obtained at the earliest possible moment in order that adequate and timely preparations may be made.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What has been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Michigan and the other discussion here bears out what I said privately some time ago, that when you begin to dig around in this bill you will find that there is a little garbage in the bill. This matter of jumping the thing through this evening in a slipshod way ought not to go on, because when you look at section 9 it means to let the farmers come in with a tin wagon or anything of that sort and take out what garbage they want. The necessity of this bill is 50 days away, when you are going to need the money, and if this bill is so important, we can attend to the garbage plant later. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to make an explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has made a point of no quorum and no business can be transacted until after that matter is decided. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Alexander	Crago	Foss	James
Anderson	Curry, Cal.	Frear	Johnson, S. Dak.
Anthony	Dale, N. Y.	Fuller, Ill.	Johnson, Wash.
Austin	Dallinger	Fuller, Mass.	Jones
Bacharach	Darrow	Gallagher	Kahn
Barkley	Davidson	Gallivan	Kearns
Beshlin	Dempsey	Gard	Kelley, Mich.
Borland	Denison	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.
Bowers	Dent	Goodall	Kettner
Brand	Dewalt	Gould	Key, Ohio
Brodbeck	D. Kinison	Graham, Pa.	Kless, Pa.
Browne	Dies	Green, Iowa	King
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Gregg	Knutson
Buchanan	Dooling	Griest	Kreider
Butler	Doremus	Griffin	LaGuardia
Caldwell	Drukker	Hamil	Lehlbach
Campbell, Kans.	Dunn	Hamilton, N. Y.	Leshar
Campbell, Pa.	Dupré	Hamlin	Longworth
Cannon	Dyer	Harrison, Va.	Lufkin
Carew	Eagan	Haskell	Lunn
Carlin	Elston	Hayes	McClintic
Carter, Mass.	Estopinal	Heintz	McCormick
Chandler, N. Y.	Evans	Heintz	McCulloch
Chandler, Okla.	Fairchild, B. L.	Hicks	McKenzie
Church	Fairchild, G. W.	Hood	McKeown
Clark, Fla.	Ferris	Houston	McKinley
Clark, Pa.	Fields	Howard	McLaughlin, Pa.
Classon	Fisher	Husted	McLemore
Coady	Flood	Hutchinson	Madden
Copley	Flynn	Igoe	Magee
Costello	Focht	Ireland	Maher

Mann	Purnell	Shouse	Talbot
Martin	Ragsdale	Siegel	Templeton
Merritt	Rainey, H. T.	Sims	Thompson
Miller, Minn.	Ramsey	Slayden	Tinkham
Mondell	Rankin	Siemp	Towner
Montague	Rayburn	Small	Treadway
Morin	Riordan	Smith, Idaho	Vare
Mott	Roberts	Smith, C. B.	Vinson
Mudd	Robinson	Smith, T. F.	Voigt
Nelson	Rodenberg	Snell	Volstead
Nichols, Mich.	Rowe	Snyder	Walker
Nolan	Rowland	Stafford	Walton
Norton	Rubey	Stegall	Ward
Oliver, Ala.	Rucker	Stedman	Watson, Pa.
Oliver, N. Y.	Russell	Steele	Weaver
Olney	Sanders, La.	Steenerson	Webb
O'Shaunessy	Sanford	Stephens, Nebr.	Whaley
Overmyer	Scott, Iowa	Sterling, Pa.	White, Ohio
Padgett	Scott, Mich.	Stevenson	Williams
Palge	Scott, Pa.	Stiness	Wilson, Ill.
Parker, N. Y.	Scully	Strong	Winslow
Peters	Sells	Sullivan	Wise
Porter	Shackleford	Summers	Wood, Ind.
Pou	Shallenberger	Swift	Woodyard
Powers	Sherley	Switzer	Wright
Price	Sherwood	Tague	Young, Tex.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the bill H. R. 10613, found itself without a quorum, that the roll was called and 199 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the names of the absentees to be entered in the Journal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order at this time to move to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. The House automatically goes back into the committee. The Chair made up his mind a long time ago, after he got caught once, never to recognize anybody in this situation for anything. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I hope that no motion of that kind will prevail. There is no need to try to kill a good bill by filibustering.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the motion is clearly in order.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 59, noes 59.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 63.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$50,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 46, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That every person, corporation, association, or institution in the District of Columbia, under such rules and regulations as the commissioners may prescribe, may transport in closed metal containers from the place of origin to places outside of the District of Columbia any refuse, including meat, bread, and vegetables, not in a decayed or decomposed condition, to be fed to poultry, pigs, or other live stock at any place where such feeding is not prohibited by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph be now closed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion is not now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order until debate has been had.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If gentlemen will look at that section for a minute, they will see what a proposition we are opening up. It provides that every person, corporation, association, or institution in the District of Columbia, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed, may collect garbage. That is the kind of system they have in villages of about two or three hundred inhabitants, where the farmers can come in there with their wagons, under some sort of an arrangement that might be made, and go down to the hotels, load up what stuff they want, and simply take that old, worn-out, repudiated, haphazard system of collecting garbage. Now, it is just this kind of stuff in this bill that makes it really and truly a garbage bill, and when you stop and look at that paragraph of only eight lines, think just a moment and see where you turn the matter of the collection of garbage to anybody who will haul a barrel a day instead of holding it down to a municipal collection system under one provision and

one plan, and you can begin to see what this bill means. Now, I move to strike out section 9.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, section 9 is one of the best provisions of the bill. There are institutions in this city that have meat and bread scraps left on their tables which they themselves desire to haul out in sealed containers to feed to hogs, to their own hogs, on their own farms—Providence Hospital is one of them—and under the law as it stands to-day they can not do it. I say they ought to have the right to do it. They should feed the bread and meat scraps on the table that have never gone to the garbage can, which, under present laws, can not be hauled out to their own stock, and under the provisions of the bill it can be done. It is one of the best provisions of the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I see by this paragraph it is to be done under such rules and regulations as the commissioners may prescribe, so it is not a haphazard system at all.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Does the gentleman contend that stuff from this hospital ought to be used to feed to hogs?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If it is fed to human beings it is certainly good enough to be fed to hogs.

Mr. MEEKER. Diseased human beings?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Diseased human beings do not eat that which is left on the table and nobody else does.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman allow me to make a unanimous-consent request for permission to extend my remarks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will withhold the motion for a moment.

Mr. ROBBINS. On this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, 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. 10613 and had directed him to report it back to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MEEKER. I make the point there is no quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had not been recognized for anything.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to get it straight. Does the gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. MEEKER. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But the gentleman was not recognized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Missouri was within his rights and will count.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, before the announcement of the result I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be taken up to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of matter on the Speaker's table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. THOMAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Will it be in order to move that the bill and all amendments thereto be laid on the table?

The SPEAKER. You can not do anything unless you have a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. If we have a quorum, will that be in order?

The SPEAKER. Why, of course, if you get a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

The SPEAKER. One hundred and twenty-six gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. What about my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. You can not have a unanimous-consent request without a quorum.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves a call of the House.

Mr. MEEKER. I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House adjourn. The motion to adjourn is next to the highest motion that can be made in the House.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MEEKER. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 34, yeas 76.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

Alexander	Fields	Lever	Sanford
Anderson	Fisher	Littlepage	Scott, Iowa
Aswell	Flood	Longworth	Scott, Mich.
Austin	Flynn	Luffin	Scott, Pa.
Bachrach	Foss	Lunn	Scully
Barkley	Frear	McClintic	Sells
Beshlin	Fuller, Ill.	McCormick	Shackleford
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Sherley
Borland	Gallagher	McKenzie	Shouse
Bowers	Gallivan	McKeown	Siegel
Brand	Gard	McKinley	Sims
Britten	Garner	McLaughlin, Pa.	Slayden
Brodbeck	Goodall	McLemore	Slemp
Browne	Goodwin, Ark.	Madden	Small
Browning	Gould	Magee	Smith, Idaho
Burnett	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Smith, C. B.
Butler	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Smith, T. F.
Caldwell	Gregg	Martin	Snell
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Snyder
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	Mondell	Stafford
Cannon	Hamill	Montague	Stegall
Cantrill	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Steele
Carew	Hamlin	Morin	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Hardy	Mott	Stephens, Nebr.
Chandler, N. Y.	Harrison, Va.	Mudd	Sterling, Pa.
Church	Haskell	Nicholls, S. C.	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Hayes	Nichols, Mich.	Stines
Clark, Pa.	Heaton	Nolan	Strong
Classon	Heflin	Norton	Sullivan
Coady	Heintz	Oliver, Ala.	Summers
Cooper, Ohio	Hensley	Oliver, N. Y.	Swift
Copley	Hicks	Olney	Switzer
Costello	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Tague
Curry, Cal.	Hood	Overmyer	Talbott
Dale, N. Y.	Houston	Padgett	Templeton
Dallinger	Howard	Palge	Thompson
Darrow	Husted	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Dempsey	Ireland	Powers	Towner
Denison	James	Pratt	Vare
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Voigt
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Volstead
Dickinson	Jones	Ragsdale	Walker
Dies	Kahn	Rainey, H. T.	Walton
Donovan	Kearns	Ramsey	Ward
Doelling	Kelley, Mich.	Randall	Watson, Pa.
Doonittle	Kelly, Pa.	Rankin	Watson, Va.
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Rayburn	Weaver
Doughton	Kettner	Riordan	Webb
Drukker	Key, Ohio	Roberts	Whaley
Dunn	Kless, Pa.	Robinson	White, Me.
Dupré	King	Rodenberg	Williams
Dyer	Kitchin	Rowe	Wilson, Ill.
Eagan	Kreider	Rowland	Wilson, La.
Elston	LaGuardia	Rucker	Wilson, Tex.
Estopinal	Lazaro	Russell	Winslow
Evans	Lee, Ga.	Sabath	Wise
Fairechild, B. L.	Lehbach	Sanders, La.	Wright
Fairechild, G. W.	Leshner	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.

A quorum failing to appear, the following took place:

The SPEAKER. One hundred and seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Speaker issue warrants for the arrest of the absentees, and instruct the Sergeant at Arms to bring them to the bar of the House.

Mr. MEEKER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order that the motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the Speaker issue warrants for the arrest of the absentees, and instruct the Sergeant at Arms to bring them to the bar of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MEEKER. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 71, yeas 33.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Is that in order under the present circumstances, right while the yeas and nays are being called, and in the middle of a roll call? There is but one motion in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. QUIN. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. QUIN. There was a motion pending, and it failed to develop a quorum, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] made a motion that these men be arrested and a quorum brought in here.

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily the yeas and nays are called simply for the purpose of verification of the vote, and the Chair thinks a Member has a right to the yeas and nays. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Speaker, they have not a sufficient number.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of taking this vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-five gentlemen have risen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. ROGERS. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed to taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-five is a sufficient number in this House. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What was the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky?

The SPEAKER. To have the Speaker issue a writ or warrant for absent Members, to bring them in.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It does not take a quorum of the House to bring in the absentees.

The SPEAKER. No; it does not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then the point was made that no quorum was present. It does not require a quorum.

The SPEAKER. That was not the point.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I misunderstood the situation.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers as to whether there was an insufficient number.

Mr. WALSH. That is not in order.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is clearly dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is. The Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion that the Speaker issue his warrant to bring in the absentees.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 116, yeas 33, answered "present" 1, not voting 280, as follows:

YEAS—116.

Almon	Davis	Green, Iowa	Mapes
Ashbrook	Decker	Hamilton, Mich.	Mason
Baer	Delaney	Harrison, Miss.	Mays
Barnhart	Denton	Hastings	Miller, Wash.
Beakes	Dillon	Hawley	Moon
Bell	Dixon	Hayden	Morgan
Black	Dominick	Helm	Nichols, S. C.
Blackmon	Dowell	Helvering	Overstreet
Blanton	Drane	Hilliard	Phelan
Burroughs	Elliott	Huddleston	Polk
Byrnes, S. C.	Emerson	Jacoway	Quin
Campbell, Kans.	Esch	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, J. W.
Candler, Miss.	Fairfield	Kehoe	Raker
Caraway	Ferris	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer
Carlin	Flood	Kincheloe	Reavis
Cary	Focht	Lee, Cal.	Reed
Classon	Foster	Linthicum	Romjue
Claypool	French	Little	Rouse
Cleary	Gandy	Littlepage	Rubey
Collier	Garland	Lobeck	Saunders, Va.
Connelly, Kans.	Garrett, Tex.	London	Schall
Cooper, Wis.	Glass	Lonergan	Shallenberger
Cox	Goodwin, Ark.	Lundeen	Sherwood
Cramton	Graham, Ill.	McAndrews	Sinnott
Crosser	Gray, Ala.	Mansfield	Sisson

Snook
Stephens, Miss.
Sweet
Taylor, Ark.

Chandler, Okla.
Cooper, W. Va.
Currie, Mich.
Edmonds
Ellsworth
Farr
Fess
Francis
Gillett

Thomas
Tillman
Timberlake
Van Dyke

NAYS—33.

Greene, Vt.
Hadley
Heaton
Hersey
Hollingsworth
Hutchinson
Knutson
Kraus
Langley

Vestal
Vinson
Watkins
Welling

Larsen
McFadden
Meeker
Moore, Pa.
Parker, N. J.
Robbins
Rogers
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, N. Y.

Wheeler
Wingo
Wood, Ind.
Young, N. Dak.

Smith, Mich.
Sterling, Ill.
Waldow
Walsh
Woods, Iowa
Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

La Follette

NOT VOTING—280.

Alexander
Anderson
Anthony
Aswell
Austin
Ayres
Bacharach
Bankhead
Barkley
Beshlin
Bland
Bocher
Borland
Bowers
Brand
Britten
Brodbeck
Browne
Browning
Brumbaugh
Buchanan
Burnett
Butler
Byrns, Tenn.
Caldwell
Campbell, Pa.
Cannon
Cantrill
Carew
Carter, Mass.
Carter, Okla.
Chandler, N. Y.
Church
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Pa.
Coady
Connally, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio
Copley
Costello
Crago
Crisp
Curry, Cal.
Dale, N. Y.
Dale, Vt.
Dallinger
Darrow
Davidson
Dempsey
Denison
Dent
Dewalt
Dickinson
Dies
Dill
Donovan
Dooling
Doolittle
Doremus
Doughton
Drukker
Dunn
Dupré
Dyer
Eagan
Eagle
Elston
Estopinal
Evans
Fairchild, B. L.

Fairchild, G. W.
Fields
Fisher
Flynn
Fordney
Foss
Frear
Freeman
Fuller, Ill.
Fuller, Mass.
Gallagher
Gallivan
Gard
Garner
Garrett, Tenn.
Glynn
Godwin, N. C.
Good
Goodall
Gordon
Gould
Graham, Pa.
Gray, N. J.
Greene, Mass.
Griest
Griffin
Hamill
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hamlin
Hardy
Harrison, Va.
Haskell
Haugen
Hayes
Hebin
Heintz
Hensley
Hicks
Holland
Hood
Houston
Howard
Hull, Iowa
Hull, Tenn.
Humphreys
Eusted
Igoe
Ireland
James
Johnson, S. Dak.
Johnson, Wash.
Jones
Jull
Kahn
Kearns
Keating
Kelley, Mich.
Kennedy, Iowa
Kennedy, R. I.
Kettner
Key, Ohio
Kiess, Pa.
King
Kinkaid
Kitchin
Kreider
LaGuardia
Lazaro
Lee, Ga.

Lehbach
Leshar
Lever
Longworth
Lufkin
Lunn
McArthur
McClintic
McCormick
McCulloch
McKenzie
McKeown
McKinley
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Pa.
McLemore
Madden
Magee
Maher
Mann
Martin
Merritt
Miller, Minn.
Mondell
Montague
Moore, Ind.
Morin
Mott
Mudd
Neely
Nelson
Nichols, Mich.
Nolan
Norton
Oldfield
Oliver, Ala.
Oliver, N. Y.
Olney
Osborne
O'Shaunessy
Overmyer
Padgett
Paige
Park
Parker, N. Y.
Peters
Platt
Porter
Pou
Powers
Pratt
Price
Purnell
Ragsdale
Rainey, H. T.
Ramsey
Randall
Rankin
Rayburn
Riordan
Roberts
Robinson
Rodenberg
Rose
Rowe
Rowland
Rucker
Russell
Sabath
Sanders, La.

Sanford
Scott, Iowa
Scott, Mich.
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shackelford
Shouse
Slegel
Sims
Slayden
Slomp
Sloan
Small
Smith, Idaho
Smith, C. B.
Smith, T. F.
Snell
Snyder
Stafford
Stearns
Stedman
Steele
Steenerson
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Pa.
Stevenson
Stines
Strong
Sullivan
Sumners
Swift
Switzer
Tague
Taibott
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Templeton
Thompson
Tilson
Tinkham
Townner
Treadway
Vare
Veuable
Voigt
Voistead
Walker
Walton
Ward
Wason
Watson, Pa.
Watson, Va.
Weaver
Webb
Weity
Whaley
White, Me.
White, Ohio
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Tex.
Winslow
Wise
Woodyard
Wright
Young, Tex.

Mr. BRAND with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. BRITTEN.
Mr. CHURCH with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
Mr. BANKHEAD with Mr. AUSTIN.
Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BOOHER with Mr. TREADWAY.
Mr. COADY with Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. CONNALLY of Texas with Mr. CRAGO.
Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. CURRY of California.
Mr. CRISP with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. DALE of Vermont.
Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GOULD.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HASKELL.
Mr. FIELDS with Mr. DEMPSEY.
Mr. FISHER with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. DENT with Mr. FESS.
Mr. GARD with Mr. ELSTON.
Mr. DOOLITTLE with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.
Mr. DERWALT with Mr. DENISON.
Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DRUKKER.
Mr. GARNER with Mr. GOODALL.
Mr. DICKINSON with Mr. FORDNEY.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GLYNN.
Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. DIES with Mr. FREEMAN.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. DYER.
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.
Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. DILL with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.
Mr. GORDON with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. GREGG with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. FREAR.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. HARDY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. HICKS.
Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. HULL of Iowa.
Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. JAMES.
Mr. LUNN with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. KEARNS.
Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. HUSTED.
Mr. HOOD with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
Mr. HULL of Tennessee with Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
Mr. KEATING with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. IGOE with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. KETTNER with Mr. HEINTZ.
Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. JUUL.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. KING.
Mr. JONES with Mr. KINKAID.
Mr. HELVERING with Mr. LEHLBACH.
Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANN.
Mr. LAZARO with Mr. LONGWORTH.
Mr. LEVER with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. LUFKIN.
Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. LaGUARDIA.
Mr. LESHER with Mr. McARTHUR.
Mr. MAHER with Mr. McCORMICK.
Mr. MARTIN with Mr. McCULLOCH.
Mr. NEELY with Mr. MERRITT.
Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. MOTT.
Mr. OLIVER of Alabama with Mr. McKENZIE.
Mr. PADGETT with Mr. MAGEE.
Mr. POU with Mr. MORIN.
Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MADDEN.
Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. McKINLEY.
Mr. PARK with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY with Mr. MONDELL.
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MUDD.
Mr. RANDALL with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan.
Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. OSBORNE.
Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
Mr. RUCKER with Mr. PAIGE.
Mr. SABATH with Mr. PETERS.
Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. NORTON.

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
Mr. ASWELL with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. DARROW.
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. DAVIDSON.
Mr. BUCHANAN with Mr. ANDERSON.
Mr. BESHLIN with Mr. DALLINGER.
Mr. BURNETT with Mr. GOOD.
Mr. BORLAND with Mr. CANNON.
Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. BLAND.
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. BROWNE.
Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. ANTHONY.
Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
Mr. AYRES with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SEARS with Mr. PLATT.
 Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. SNELL.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. SLOAN.
 Mr. STEDMAN with Miss RANKIN.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. STEENERSON.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. SNYDER.
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. STINESS.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. STRONG.
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. SWITZER.
 Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. TEMPLETON.
 Mr. VENABLE with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. RODENBERG.
 Mr. WALTON with Mr. ROBERTS.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. SCOTT of Michigan.
 Mr. WELTY with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.
 Mr. WHALEY with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. WASON.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. WOODYARD.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. VOIGT.
 Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am paired with my colleague [Mr. DILL]. I see he is not present. I withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant at Arms will prepare his writ and the Speaker will sign it.

Subsequently,

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and that the previous question be ordered upon the bill under consideration. If I can get that agreement, why, I shall be very glad indeed to move to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can not get unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. No. When you have no quorum present you can not do anything except the things that have direct reference to the call of the House and the obtaining of a quorum. It does not take a quorum to do anything necessary to be done to secure the presence of a quorum. Outside of that, nothing can be done, not even permission to extend remarks in the RECORD. A motion to adjourn is in order. That is in order at any time.

Subsequently,

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. OVERSTREET) there were—ayes 32, noes 65.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands the yeas and nays. [After counting] Fourteen Members, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand. The yeas and nays are refused, and the House refuses to adjourn.

Subsequently,

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

Mr. THOMAS. Dilatory nothing! This is the first time I ever made the motion to adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I make the point of order that that is dilatory. There has been no intervening business.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, no intervening business can take place in the absence of a quorum. I suggest that it is not dilatory to repeat a motion to adjourn after we have waited a reasonable time and no quorum has developed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion and take the sense of those present. We have a gentleman's agreement that this bill shall be taken up in the morning.

As I understand, under parliamentary law unanimous consent can not be granted, because we can transact no business in the absence of a quorum. There may be a gentleman's agreement. I understand that any Member who is now absent might come in and object to it; but I assume that no gentleman who is absent and who is relieved from being brought from his home in contempt of the House for being absent without leave will object to an agreement made among the gentlemen who are present taking care of his interests; and I suggest that a gentleman's agreement be made that this bill shall be taken up to-morrow after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CRISP took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement what the gentleman from Illinois has said. Of course, in the chair the Speaker can not talk about gentlemen's agreements. There is a moral public sentiment in this House that no Member can afford to ignore. If the Members here present enter into a gentlemen's agreement, it does not become any part of the record, but, of course, no one that is here will raise a point of order about it, and no man who is not here can afford to do it, because inquiry would be made as to why he was not here. That is the truth about it. It is perfectly apparent that we are not going to get a quorum unless we stay here all night. If it was an important question, on which the Government depended, Members would be willing to stay here all night. The suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is entirely right, and with his permission I ask those here to enter into a gentlemen's agreement that to-morrow morning, as soon as the Journal is read and business on the Speaker's table is transacted, the previous question shall be ordered and this bill voted on. If there is any objector, let him stand forth.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, with that suggestion I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 23, 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 Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of the inner channels of Humboldt Bay, Cal. (H. Doc. N. 1064); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Tolovana River, Alaska (H. Doc. No. 1065); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4292) to conserve the gold supply of the United States, to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide for silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 504), 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,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2446) for the relief of Oscar Knight, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 503), 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. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 11598) to provide preferential homestead entries for soldiers and sailors of war with Germany and Austria; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11599) to prevent interstate commerce in timber products upon which labor has been permitted to work more than eight hours in any day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELLING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 282) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease to the United States Fuel Co. certain lands in Carbon County, State of Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARK: Resolution (H. Res. 318) authorizing the employment of six expert transcribers of proceedings of the House for publication in the Record; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for the consideration of H. R. 11259; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11600) granting a pension to Sylvester Vandusen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 11601) granting a pension to David J. Hanger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11602) granting an increase of pension to Washington Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 11603) granting a pension to George W. Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11604) granting an increase of pension to Louis Sherard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 11605) granting a pension to Annie B. Shirey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11606) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Hartline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to Theresa Starnier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11608) granting an increase of pension to Adam P. Maize; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 11609) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 11610) granting an increase of pension to George Burks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11611) granting an increase of pension to David H. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11612) granting an increase of pension to Irvin Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 11613) granting a pension to James Duff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11614) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11615) granting an increase of pension to James B. Chesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 11616) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11617) granting an increase of pension to Washington M. Sydenstricker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11618) granting a pension to Harriet M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 11619) granting a pension to Eugenie Schottmueller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 11620) granting an increase of pension to James A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11621) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester A. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 11622) granting a pension to Rose Vollkommer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 11623) granting an increase of pension to Sherwood Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11624) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Hughes, Rounds, Schurman, and Dwight, of New York, protesting against the activities of L. W. Amerman and John D. Gluck relative to the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Educational Press Association against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, urging the payment of income and excess profits in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, for legislation to permit payment of war taxes in installments; also petition of the Illinois Society of Engineers, for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Papers in support of H. R. 8625; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Granite State Dairymen's Association; Monday Club of Webster Groves, Mo.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of St. Albans, W. Va.; Hesperian Club, of Denver, Colo.; Ohio Division of the Travelers' Protective Association of America; Woman's Club of Oregon City, Oreg.; faculty of Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio; Tacoma (Wash.) Business Women's Club; Manuscript Club of Boston, Mass.; and the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fay Parker, E. R. Harper, L. C. Nichols, and 11 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Adelaide Davis, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anna E. Kenan, Josephine Haskin, Inez B. Waddill, William Belt, N. E. Boggs, C. J. Newman, Walter L. Young, Rose Roach, and 34 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Patriotic League of the University of Colorado, urging the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act increasing second-class postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William J. Mummery, George W. Wilson, Mrs. T. G. Tice, Mabel W. Edwards, and 14 others, all of Denver, Colo., praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. F. L. Snyder, Minverva Kinney, Paul A. Calbert, Pattie H. Flint, and 10 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Belmont Central Trades and Labor Assembly, Bridgeport, Ohio, favoring election of all Federal judges for short terms and power of recall in the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 141 citizens of Rhode Island, citing that American soldiers who desert or violate Army regulations are given long terms of imprisonment, dishonorable discharge, etc., while spies, traitors, and those who destroy property are imprisoned for short terms or interned, and petitioners urge infliction of more severe punishment on spies, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters from Kohn & Pollock and C. J. Benson & Co., both of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3076 and House bill 9683, proposing the use of prison labor in furniture making; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from the Gantner & Mattern Co., of San Francisco, Cal., urging support of Senate bill 3962; also, a letter from Alexander Ragle, Pleasant Valley, Cal., urging the enactment of a law placing a tax on dogs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by several voters of Eldorado County, Cal., protesting against the sentence of death imposed upon Thomas Mooney, of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, telegram from the people of Shasta County, Cal., urging enactment by Congress of legislation suppressing the German language press, the dissolution of German societies, and the end of German instruction in the schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, pledge cards of the United States Food Administration, signed by two women of Placerville, Cal.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants' Association of New York, advocating the retention and extension of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Fresno, Cal., urging support of Miss RANKIN's resolutions for Ireland's rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging that Congress enact legislation making the ports of this country free ports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions favoring partial payments of war excess and profit taxes from Utica Knitting Co. and Oneita Knitting Mills, Utica, N. Y.; Wonder Dress & Costume Co., Neinsheimer Bros., I. Zimetbaum Co., Joseph Berlinger Co., Valentins & Bunker, M. R. Silverman, d'Albert Godde Eadin & Cie., Andover Silk Co., Perret Gros & Million, J. Rapoport & Co., Max Mayer, Star Skirt Co., Blauner Bros. & Co., Lindenman, Bross & Hindes, M. J. Smith Silk Co., Marx-Singer Co., M. Shidlovsky & Co., King & Applebaum, Weisen & Goldstein, I. D. Karpas & Co., New York City; Kavanaugh Knitting Co., Waterford, N. Y.; High Rock Knitting Co., Philmot, N. Y., Monarch Knitting Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Ess-Arr Knitting Co., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rockford Knitting Co., Cheltenham Knitting Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Simons, Hatch & White Co., Boston, Mass.; A. Schottland, Paterson, N. J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petitions of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, against the enactment into law of House bill 8859, proposing to authorize payment of claims of certain individuals out of tribal funds of said Indians, and protesting against payment of large fees and expenses of certain members of said tribe in Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Chiroprody Society of Pennsylvania, asking for the passage of House bill 3649, regulating the practice of chiroprody in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Trade Press Club, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 23, 1918.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, we pray Thee to confirm our hearts' desire to work and think and speak for Thee. Give to us such power of spiritual appropriation that we shall desire no glory but Thine, and our highest welfare to work and sacrifice and suffer, if it be Thy will, that Thy will may be accomplished in us as a Nation. We ask these blessings for Christ's sake. Amen.

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

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives upon Senate joint resolution 123.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into immediate military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

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

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

Bankhead	Fletcher	Harding	Lenroot
Beckham	France	Henderson	McKellar
Brandegge	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Wash.	Martin
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Kellogg	Nelson
Fernald	Gerry	Kirby	New

Nugent	Ransdell	Smoot	Trammell
Overman	Saulsbury	Sutherland	Underwood
Page	Sheppard	Swanson	Vardaman
Phelan	Sherman	Thomas	Walsh
Pittman	Smith, Ga.	Tillman	Williams

Mr. THOMAS. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who are now engaged on a conference committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. KNOX, Mr. McLEAN, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

Mr. GALLINGER. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is unavoidably absent. I wish this notice to stand for the day.

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained by illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained, taking part in the third liberty-loan campaign.

Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. COLT, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. McNARY, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. JOHNSON of California entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD CO. (S. DOC. NO 219).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of November 6, 1913, a supplemental report of the financial relations, rates, and practices of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway Co., and other carriers, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BURNETT, Mr. SABATH, Mr. RAKER, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. JOHNSON of Washington managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed 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, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9784. An act incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10891. An act to amend and reenact an act for the establishment of a probation system for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 11231. An act to regulate the hours of duty of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4292) to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and, for the above purposes, to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, relative to Senate bill 3910, which provides penalties for national banking associations who charge illegal rates of interest on loans, notes, or discounts, and so forth, which I ask to have printed in the Record.