

E. J. Nolan, manager, all of Concord; and Red Cross Committee, by Dana A. Emery, president, of Manchester; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, telegrams from the following persons and organizations, all within the State of New Hampshire, advocating the continuance of the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor: Wales Line Co., J. A. Hassan, superintendent; Children's Home, Mrs. Sarah S. Wyatt, president; William Goss, cashier Merchants National Bank; Caroline H. Garland, librarian Dover Public Library; and Hon. George H. Yeaton, ex-county commissioner, all of Dover; Rumford Building and Loan Association, Isaac M. Savage, treasurer; and C. M. and A. W. Rolfe Sash & Blind Co., by Harold F. Rolfe, both of Concord; R. D. Hetzel, president New Hampshire College, of Durham; United Textile Workers and Central Labor Union, both of Lebanon; Tilton Electric Light & Power Co., William H. Moses, president, of Tilton; Thomas F. Nolan, grand knight, Manchester Council Knights of Columbus; Salvation Army, Herbert H. Saul, adjutant; Soldiers and Sailors Welfare Committee, Hon. Harry H. Spaulding, chairman; and Frank C. Livingston, chairman Community Labor Board, all of Manchester; Franklin Central Labor Union, R. W. Powell, secretary, Franklin; and Central Labor Union, R. S. Cotton, president, and William Fraser, secretary, both of Nashua; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Consumers' League of New York, urgently requesting that the United States Employment Service be made a permanent bureau in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Republican Club of New York, opposing indefinite retention by Federal Government of the railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and trans-Atlantic cable lines, and especially opposing Government control of railroads for five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Wholesale Grocers' Association, advocating the adjustment of postal rates so that each class of mail shall pay the full cost of its service, and that only; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Periodical Publishers' Association of America, indorsing daylight-saving system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: Protests of Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, and Philadelphia Bourse, Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia Cricket Club, Huntingdon Valley Country Club, William M. Lloyd Co., A. J. Reach Co., J. G. Brill Co., Madeira, Hill & Co., S. Rosenau & Co., H. Rosenberger, Joseph M. Jennings, C. E. Wyatt, and A. Saxon, of Philadelphia, Pa., against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Periodical Publishers' Association of America, indorsing the daylight-saving system and protesting against any effort for its repeal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Twentieth Century Club of Berkeley, Cal., favoring entrance of the United States into a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Freedmen's Aid Society of Methodist Episcopal Church, asking for passage of law for the suppressing of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of International Brotherhood Stationary Firemen, J. H. Featherstone, secretary, asking for appropriation to continue the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Shepard Bros. & Co., W. S. Kainee livery stable, Concord Ice Co., Holt Bros. Manufacturing Co., the George L. Theobald Building Mover, Reed's Laundry, Eagle Hotel, Highway Department, Concord Foundry, and Merrimack County agricultural agent, all of Concord, N. H., asking for appropriation to continue United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Boston Insurance Co., and J. Robinovitz, superintendent of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., of Roxbury, Mass.; Wright and Ditson, Boston, Mass.; Longwood Cricket Club, S. S. Pierce Co. (by E. J. Preston, treasurer), O. E. Linscott (superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.), and Walworth Manufacturing Co., all of South Boston, Mass., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Lawrence Rodney, superintendent of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Kistler, Lesh & Co.; Brown & Adams; and Pilgrim Rubber Footwear Co., all of Boston, Mass.; W. H. Dennison, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Quincy, Mass.; M. H. Keenan, superintendent of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., Dorchester, Mass.; and M. A. Ryan, superintendent of Metro-

politan Life Insurance Co., Roxbury, Mass., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of the McGraw Tire & Rubber Co., of East Palestine, Ohio, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of various citizens of Stellacoom, Wash., favoring legislation to deport persons who renounced their citizenship to avoid military service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Lutheran, Methodist Episcopal, and Presbyterian churches of Montoursville, Pa., with reference to polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of R. C. Schaffter, of Baltimore, Md., urging passage of Senate bill 5464 and House bill 15402; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Merchants' & Manufacturers' Association, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. F. Ireton and others, asking for passage of United States service employment bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of Morgan Mill Work Co.; E. W. Bartol, superintendent Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Commercial Credit Co.; R. C. Schaffter and 50 employees; and A. Schusster and 45 field employees, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Maryland Council of Defense in favor of United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Maryland Branch of the Anti-Prohibition League, protesting against the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pomona Grange, Talbot County, Md., unanimously indorsing Senate bill 4987 and House bill 15400, to establish a national department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of J. Maurice Buchheimer, Baltimore, Md., relating to tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. N. Brewington, Wicomico News, Salisbury, Md., asking protection for the potash industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of county superintendents, Baltimore, Md., indorsing the Towner bill (H. R. 15400); to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Lady Jefferson Democratic Club of the fifteenth assembly district of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the Hoke Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union, Minneapolis Local, No. 8, indorsing the proposed league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Letters and telegrams from business concerns of Boston, Mass., protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 27, 1919.

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

Almighty God, we have come before Thee upon a day of glad acclaim, when the National Capital is welcoming home her boys from beyond the seas. We bless Thee for their safe return. We thank Thee for the protection that Thou didst give to them. We recognize Thy grace to them in answer to the prayers of many faithful hearts, in keeping them clean and strong and brave, and in bringing them back gloriously victorious.

We pray that Thy blessing may be upon the boys; that the record they have made will be an incentive always to them as they turn back to civil life; and that all who have marched under the order and call of their country may be clothed with those virtues that have been forged in the furnace of a great conflict, that they may be the strong leaders of the days that are to come to achieve yet greater things than their fathers have achieved in the paths of peace and of righteousness and of truth.

Grant us now Thy blessing to enable us to discharge the duties of the day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR PHELAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following telegram from Senator JAMES D. PHELAN, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., February 26.

To the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to remarks alleged to have been made by Hon. William Howard Taft at recent meeting here to the effect that he would not trust certain Senators overnight, the following letter, signed by all of us, was to-day delivered to the editor of the San Francisco Chronicle:

"Your continued editorials with regard to President Taft's remarks at the noon meeting held at the St. Francis have created an issue of fair play which leads us to address you upon the subject. The men signing this note were in Mr. Taft's immediate neighborhood when he was speaking. The language he actually used was as follows: 'That he was afraid to trust these gentlemen overnight with the Constitution.' When he spoke the words 'that he was afraid to trust these gentlemen overnight' there was loud applause, which drowned, so far as the words were concerned, the balance of his statement. As Mr. Taft must be held responsible for what he said, we hope that you will make the proper correction of this mistake. The undersigned personally vouch for the correctness of the foregoing, as each distinctly heard the actual language used by Mr. Taft."

You are respectfully requested to present this telegram to the Senate for its information and with the request that it be entered on its records.

James D. Phelan, P. H. McCarthy, Robert A. Roos, Charles C. Moore, Jesse W. Lillenthal, Frederick S. Nelson, R. R. Rogers, H. A. Melvin, R. B. Hale, R. H. Marchant, Frederick Whittan.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Baird	Hale	Norris	Smoot
Bankhead	Henderson	Overman	Spencer
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Owen	Sterling
Brandegee	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Calder	Kellogg	Pittman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poindexter	Thompson
Colt	King	Pollock	Trammell
Culberson	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
Cummins	La Follette	Reed	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lewis	Robinson	Walsh
Dillingham	McKellar	Shafroth	Warren
Fernald	McLean	Sheppard	Watson
France	McNary	Sherman	Weeks
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gay	Moses	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Gore	Myers	Smith, Mich.	
Gronna	New	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained from the Senate on account of the serious illness of his wife. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day on each roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Petitions and memorials are in order.

LANDS IN MONTANA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 13th instant, certain confidential information requested by the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

LIFE-SAVING DEVICES (S. DOC. NO. 423).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 27th ultimo, certain information relative to the enforcement of title 52 of the Revised Statutes with respect to life-saving devices, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR (S. DOC. NO. 424).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 19th instant, certain information relative to comparative freight rates on wheat and wheat flour, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

FREIGHT RATES ON FERTILIZER MATERIAL (S. DOC. NO. 425).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, certain information relative to the proposed consolidated freight classification No. 1, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PRODUCTION OF MINERALS (S. DOC. NO. 422).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the Bureau of Mines transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all expenditures and disbursements made under the act to encourage the production, etc., of minerals, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a supplemental report from the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

VENTILATION OF SENATE CHAMBER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT,
UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1919.

The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

SIR: I beg to inform you, and through you the United States Senate, that, in accordance with the terms of the resolution passed by that body February 24, 1919, calling for improvement in the ventilation of the Senate Chamber, etc., the air furnished the Senate Chamber is now being taken directly from the open court adjacent to the Senate wing of the Capitol, and on the west side of the building, through inlets within a very few feet of the ventilating fans.

I desire to state further that I have ready for early consideration of the Senate Committee on Rules complete plans and specifications looking toward a full revision and improvement of the ventilating system of the Senate, including washing, purifying, and tempering of the air in cold and warm weather.

Very respectfully,

ELLIOTT WOODS,

Superintendent United States Capitol Building and Grounds.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2812) to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, and sodium on the public domain.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 12211. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 13308. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 14078. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15834. An act to extend the time for the construction by Kratka Township of a bridge across the Red Lake River, in Pennington County, Minn.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a memorial from the Kansas Legislature, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The memorial is as follows:

House concurrent resolution 22.

A resolution requesting the Government of the United States to take immediate action permitting all soldiers, sailors, and marines inducted into the great world war of 1914-1918 to retain all personal property, including uniforms and individual equipment, except guns or other special weapons of warfare.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein:

Resolved first, That the Congress of the United States be requested to pass with all convenient speed and dispatch a bill allowing the War Department to permit every soldier, sailor, and marine inducted into the Army of the United States during the years 1917-1918 to retain all their personal uniform, clothing, and equipment now in their possession issued to them by the Government of the United States, excluding therefrom the guns and other special weapons of warfare.

Resolved second, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby urged to secure such action at as early a date as possible on account of the fact that the demobilization of the forces is occur-

ring so rapidly that many of the soldiers, sailors, and marines will have to return their equipment unless such action is speedily taken.

Resolved third, That if Congress has already taken action in this regard, that the War Department be requested to issue the order in such plain terms and at as early a date as possible that these soldiers and marines may not be compelled to turn back to the Government the equipment described in the first resolution.

Resolved fourth, That the secretary of the senate and the chief clerk of the house are instructed to send engrossed copies of this resolution to every Senator and Representative of the State of Kansas in the National Congress, to the War Department, and to the presiding officer of each House of Congress.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and passed that body February 13, 1919.

D. A. N. CHASE,
Speaker of the House Pro Tempore.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the Senate February 19, 1919.

CHAS. S. HUFFMAN,
President of the Senate.
EMMET D. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved February 24, 1919.

By HENRY S. SOUTHOCK,
Assistant Secretary.
HENRY J. ALLEN, *Governor.*

Mr. STERLING. I have received many letters from my State, protesting against a continuance of the daylight-saving law and favoring a repeal of that law. I have this morning received a petition with a letter accompanying it. I ask that the letter, which is short, and the petition may be read.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were read, as follows:

FLANDREAU, S. DAK., February 22, 1919.

SENATOR STERLING,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing the names of a lot of farmers taken at a farm sale, which, I think, expresses the sentiment of the farmers of Moody County and the farmers at large regarding the daylight law, which we put up with last season as a war measure, but do not feel that we should be hampered with it again this season; and would ask that you urge the repeal of it. We are certain that it cost us, on the 1,700 acres that we operated, last season over \$1,000 for lost time, which we had to pay for. Trusting that you will do your utmost to get the law repealed, we are,
Yours, very truly,

GILES E. PETTIGREW & SON.

Whereas the daylight-saving law, as enacted by Congress has worked a hardship on the American farmer by being impractical for his use, causing him financial loss in the hiring of help, we, the undersigned, petition our Congressmen at Washington to have that law repealed.

E. M. DAILEY
(And others).

Mr. STERLING presented a petition of sundry citizens of Flandreau, Pipestone, Egan, and Sherman, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 11.

Whereas the United States Government has established offices of the United States Employment Service throughout the State of Oregon, serving the people of the entire State; and

Whereas the United States Employment Service, which was created and extended as a solution to the labor-employment problems growing out of war-time conditions, has proven its worth to the people of the State of Oregon and has been and is of material value and assistance both to employers in securing labor when workers are wanted and to labor when employment is sought; and

Whereas the people of Oregon believe that the usefulness of the United States Employment Service will not cease with the termination of the war, but, rather, that its fields of service will constantly become broader and more beneficial to the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That we do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of such legislation as may be necessary for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon to the Senate of the United States and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon to the House of Representatives of the United States and that copies thereof be transmitted by the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Oregon, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about an accomplishment of the ends and purposes indicated.

Adopted by the house February 17, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 5, 1919.

W. I. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMERLAIN. I also present a memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD:

The memorial is as follows:

Senate joint memorial 15.

Whereas the Hon. W. C. HAWLEY, Representative in Congress from Oregon, has introduced in Congress a bill "to reserve as part of the Oregon and Siuslaw National Forests in Oregon certain lands that were revested in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Company v. The United States" (H. R. 12770); and

Whereas the purpose of said bill is to protect the watershed from which the cities of Corvallis, Dallas, and Oregon City, in the State of Oregon, obtain their supply of water for municipal purposes; and Whereas unless Federal legislation exempting from sale the lands described in said bill is enacted there is grave danger that the water supply for said cities will not only be reduced in amount below that actually necessary for said cities by reason of the timber being cut therefrom without regulation, but also that by reason of the occupancy thereof by private persons the purity of said water will be impaired and the health of the inhabitants of said cities endangered: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby memorialize Congress to enact some suitable legislation that shall have the effect to withdraw from sale the lands found situated upon the watershed from which the cities of Corvallis, Dallas, and Oregon City, in Oregon, derive their supply of water for municipal purpose; that in our opinion H. R. 12770, above mentioned, is such a bill, and we hereby urgently petition the Congress of the United States to enact the same into a law; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the senate at once forward a copy of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Oregon a certified copy of this memorial.

Adopted by the house February 17, 1919.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 11, 1919.

W. I. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of the Ministerial Association of Dover and Foxcroft, of North Franklin Pomona Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of Phillips, and of sundry citizens of Orono, all in the State of Maine, praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a telegram embodying a resolution passed by the Kiwanis Club of Kalamazoo, in my State, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The telegram is as follows:

KALAMAZOO, MICH., February 26, 1919.

HON. WM. ALDEN SMITH,
Senate Office Building, Room 411, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was passed by Kiwanis Club of Kalamazoo to-day:

"Whereas the first and most pressing problem in the process of reconstruction is the industrial replacement of the discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

"Whereas the most important, feasible, and far-reaching single measure yet proposed for meeting this situation is Secretary Lane's plan for employing these men to reclaim our idle lands and to place them on ready-made farms; a plan which is being carried on successfully in Great Britain and the British Dominions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge on the present Congress the necessity of granting the appropriation of \$100,000,000 as a revolving fund, which the Department of the Interior has asked for with which to carry on this work.

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressman at Washington, and also to the Secretary of the Interior.

"DR. R. A. GLEZEN,
"DR. GEORGE F. INCH,
"PROF. LEN. F. SMITH,
"Committee."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Sunday school of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wayland, Mich., and a petition of Council No. 361, United Commercial Travelers, of Traverse City, Mich., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from J. B. Sherrard, of Detroit, Mich., and a telegram in the nature of a memorial from L. D. Berry, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the opening of public lands to private appropriation for coal, oil, and phosphate development, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the passage of the so-called McKellar-Keating civil-service retirement bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from sundry citizens of Saginaw, Muskegon, Petoskey, Marquette,

Ishpeming, Bay City, Battle Creek, Albion, Calumet, and Lansing, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry manufacturers and business men of Detroit, Saginaw, and Flint, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the early passage of the bill validating informal contracts, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry labor unions of Detroit, Muskegon, Saginaw, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Jackson, and Menominee, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of South Jefferson Grange, No. 182, Patrons of Husbandry, of Osseo, Mich., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of the Republican Club, of Detroit, Mich., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of Detroit and Flint, in the State of Michigan, praying for the repeal of the luxury tax, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. TOWNSEND) presented a petition of sundry employees of the Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic Railway Co., of St. Ignace, Mich., praying for the proposed five-year extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the continuance of the United States Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alabama, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Wm. P. Cobb, secretary of State, do hereby certify that the pages hereto attached contain a true, accurate, and literal copy of house joint resolution No. 54, adopted by the house of representatives on February 12, 1919, and by the senate on February 11, 1919, as the same appears on file and of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol, in the city of Montgomery, this 15th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL.]

WM. P. COBB,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 54.

Whereas the measure now pending in Congress, popularly known as the Byrnes soldier settlement bill, providing for the appropriation of \$100,000,000 to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of providing employment for and the opportunity of securing homes for returned soldiers and sailors is of great general importance to the entire country, involving as it does far-reaching plans of readjustment; and

Whereas immediate action by Congress is necessary in order that plans may be perfected and put into operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama be, and they are hereby, very earnestly urged to lend their earnest, enthusiastic, and immediate efforts toward securing the prompt passage of the said bill before the adjournment of the present session of Congress; and

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the governor under the seal of State to the said Senators and Representatives.

Adopted by the senate February 11, 1919.

Adopted by the house February 12, 1919.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry teachers of the public schools of New Castle and Kent Counties and a petition of sundry teachers of the public schools of Dover, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of the congregation of the Church of the Disciples, of Boston; of the congregation of the Payson Park Congregational Church, of Cambridge; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church, of Leominster; of the League for Democratic Control, of Boston; of the Pilgrim Club,

of New Bedford; of the Women's Club, of Quincy; and of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MERCHANTS & MINERS' TRANSPORTATION CO.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, several days ago the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] was calling attention to the Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co., and I presented to the Senate at that time a letter addressed to the counsel for the Director General of Railroads—Judge Payne—by Senators COLT, FLETCHER, and myself, representing a number of Senators who had been studying the question. I have received an answer from Judge Payne, and I think it should go into the RECORD that Senators interested may see the reply. I do not ask that it be read.

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

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 13, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Answering your kind letter of the 12th instant in which Senators FLETCHER and COLT join, representing the Senators who recently wrote me on the same subject:

I think you should know that after giving the best possible attention to the subject by the Railroad Administration, the loss from the operation of the boats of the Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co. from April 13, 1918, to December 5, 1918, the date of their relinquishment, was, in round numbers, \$700,000, and that the difference between the expenses of operation and the income since that time have been at the rate of \$100,000 per month.

In view of these rather startling losses, it does not seem to me possible that I can recommend to the Director General that the Government continue to absorb this loss. I have accordingly notified the Merchants & Miners' Co. that we would cease the operation of the boats on or before March 1, as I indicated at the conference at which you were present on Saturday.

My kindest personal regards.

Yours, very truly,

JOHN BARTON PAYNE.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I also present a letter from the Savannah Board of Trade on the same subject.

Mr. SMOOT. What is the subject?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co. The effect of my reading the letter without the answer might be misleading to Senators interested. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

SAVANNAH BOARD OF TRADE,
Savannah, Ga., February 21, 1919.

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

DEAR SIR: We understand that the releasing by the Railroad Administration of the Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co. and the Clyde Line have placed both of these steamship companies in such a position, due to increased cost of operation and control of the railroads by the Government, that they will be unable to operate except at extremely heavy losses, and indications are they will be placed in such an embarrassing position they will be compelled to cease operation.

The Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co., as you are no doubt aware, has a regular line of steamers between Savannah and Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Jacksonville.

The Clyde Line does not touch at this port, but does at other South Atlantic ports.

We feel that discontinuance of these two lines will seriously affect South Atlantic ports and will be pleased to be advised of the real situation of these two companies. The president of the Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co. filed with the Railroad Administration some time ago petition, contents of which we are not familiar with, therefore are unable to intelligently act at this time.

Thanking you for any and all information that you can give us and urging your support in our behalf, I am,

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS PURSE, Secretary.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT FOR THE DAY.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I offer a resolution of adjournment, for the cause stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the soldiers, sailors, and marines of this war assemble to-day in the District of Columbia, and the civilian population in a public procession do them the honor and show the respect to which they are entitled; and

Whereas the President of the United States has been absent for some months from the seat of government, having gone to and been present in various countries of Europe during that absence, and is now returned to the United States and is to-day in the District of Columbia, where he can communicate with coordinate branches of the Government in the discharge of his Executive duties; and

Whereas the people of the United States and Congress rejoice at his safe return and resumption of his Executive duties at the Capital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That in commemoration of the presence of the Executive and in respect to the soldiers, sailors, and marines so in this seat of government that the Senate do now adjourn until 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, February 28, 1919.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Regular order!
The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to adjourn is always in order. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I am compelled to withhold my vote, as I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is detained from the Chamber.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.
Mr. COLT (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to ask if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.
Mr. COLT. I have a general pair with that Senator, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is necessarily detained on official business. He is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. My colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], is detained on account of illness.
The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—8.			
Baird	France	Penrose	Sutherland
Calder	Gronna	Sherman	Weeks
NAYS—69.			
Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	New	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Kellogg	Norris	Smoot
Borah	Kendrick	Overman	Spencer
Brandegee	Kenyon	Owen	Sterling
Chamberlain	King	Page	Swanson
Cummins	Knox	Pittman	Thompson
Curtis	La Follette	Poindexter	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pollock	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Pomerene	Vardaman
Gay	Lodge	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gerry	McCumber	Reed	Walsh
Gore	McKellar	Robinson	Watson
Hale	McLean	Shafroth	Williams
Hardwick	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
NOT VOTING—19.			
Colt	Goff	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Harding	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Hollis	Phelan	Townsend
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Saulsbury	Warren
Fernald	Kirby	Shields	

So Mr. SHERMAN's motion was rejected.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SWANSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15539) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 777) thereon.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13350) to add certain lands to the Yellowstone National Park, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 783) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5611) granting to certain claimants a preference right to purchase public lands in the State of Arkansas, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 779) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5652) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 780) thereon.

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

S. 5607. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the county of Huron, in the State of Michigan, for a certain described tract of land for public-park purposes (Rept. No. 778);

H. R. 17. An act to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, Cal., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 781);

H. R. 11219. An act providing for the appraisal and sale of the Gig Harbor abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 782); and

H. R. 11368. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium and Consumptive Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain described tract of land (Rept. No. 784).

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate resolution 469, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to continue its investigations of Bolshevik propaganda during the recess of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. GORE. I object.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the calendar.

LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. KELLOGG. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably the bill (H. R. 13034) to validate and confirm certain erroneously allowed entries in the State of Minnesota. The bill has been once passed through the Senate and once passed through the House. This is simply a report from the Committee on Public Lands, substituting the House bill, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior; and I ask for its immediate consideration.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish also to present a report. If there is no debate on the bill reported by the Senator from Minnesota and if it can be disposed of at once, I shall not object; but if it takes any time, I shall object to its consideration at this time.

Mr. KELLOGG. If it takes any time, I will not press it. If anybody objects to it, I will not press it.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases where Chippewa Indian lands in Minnesota, ceded under the act of Congress approved January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L., p. 642), were assessed under the State drainage laws prior to the opening of the lands to entry, where the lands were subsequently opened to entry and were thereafter sold under the said drainage laws, and where cash entries for the lands were subsequently made as though authorized by the act of Congress approved May 20, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 169), such erroneously allowed entries, if otherwise regular, be, and the same are hereby, validated and confirmed.

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

EDUCATION OF ILLITERATES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the Committee on Education and Labor I report back favorably Senate bill 5464. I wish to state that this is the bill authorizing national cooperation with the States to promote the education of native illiterates and persons unable to use and understand the English language. This bill has received the most earnest support from all over the United States, and I will file during the day a full report in support of it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he proposes to bring up the bill during this session?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall be delighted to do so if it does not interfere with the necessary appropriation bills. If I should find a lull at any time when I thought I could bring it to the attention of the Senate and pass it without obstructing legislation that must be passed before the 4th of March, I shall do so.

Mr. KENYON. I hope the Senator will do so, as I believe it is the most important bill before Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have been simply astounded at the enthusiasm with which the suggestion has been received from one end of the United States to the other. Many, many leading newspapers, magazines, educational associations, and patriotic associations have poured in resolutions in commendation of

this bill, being perhaps more interested in teaching English to all in the United States who can not speak English than in the other portion of the bill. There is a feeling everywhere that it is absolutely necessary that in this country of ours every man, woman, and child should speak English.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator, if he has not the statistics—probably he has—that there are over 8,000,000 people in this country who can not speak the English language, and this bill is to help remedy that situation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the report which I have prepared and which I will furnish to-day to be printed I give quite a number of those statistics. In the South, on account of the Negro race, there is illiteracy. In the Eastern and Middle States, and even in the Western States, there are foreigners in large numbers who do not speak English, and the enthusiasm with which from all over the country the call is made that English should be the language used all over our land, that every man, woman, and child should be taught to speak English, is but another manifestation of the patriotism which carried us through the German War.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does not the Senator think that that bill is really more important than at least the ordinary appropriation bills, which are not really needed until the 1st of July?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are perhaps some that are more important than this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the order of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order of business is the reports of committees.

Mr. WALSH. I call for the regular order.

LINCOLN-DOUGLASS SANATORIUM.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably the bill (H. R. 11368) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium and Consumptive Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain-described tract of land. I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am anxious to call up the wheat-guaranty bill at the conclusion of the morning business; and I shall feel obliged to object to unanimous consent for the consideration of any other measure until that time arrives. Therefore I object.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I hope the Senator will withhold his objection for just a moment. This is only a matter of 80 acres. It is a sanatorium for colored people out near Fort Morgan, Colo., under a corporation organized in Colorado, whose office is in Denver. This is the ordinary bill with relation to matters of that kind. The amount is prescribed. The Interior Department approves it, and I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will let it pass.

Mr. GORE. The name of the sanatorium recommends it to me—the Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium. It is a monument to a dead President; but I shall have to object at this time.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to make a number of other reports from the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he intends to object to all these unanimous-consent requests or whether he has a special objection to the bill referred to by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. I have no objection whatever to the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado, and I was sorry to feel obliged to object to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Under those circumstances, I will not ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the last bill reported referring to a military reservation in the State of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5665) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of McKinney, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 5666) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Parmenter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 5667) to prevent the removal of pneumatic-tube properties in post-office and Federal buildings in certain cities prior to July 1, 1920; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) to extend the period of Government control and possession of the telegraph and telephone systems of the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOSES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$65,792.53 to pay Walston H. Brown and also \$26,400.30 to pay the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. the amounts found due them by the Court of Claims, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FIFTH LIBERTY BOND BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I present an amendment which I intend to propose to the bond bill, if some provision is not made in the committee covering the matter. I want this amendment read. I do not see the chairman of the committee here; but I want to advise the members of the Finance Committee that unless some action is taken covering this proposition in some way, I propose to insist just as strongly as I can, when that bill comes up for consideration, upon the adoption of some proposition of this sort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read:

The Secretary read the amendment, as follows:

That any owner of liberty bonds not exceeding \$500 par value shall be paid in cash the par value thereof and accrued interest thereon through any Federal banking institution upon making a satisfactory showing that he is the owner and original purchaser thereof and that he is disposing of the same to meet his present needs. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the question of a league of nations is of interest to the State which I have the honor in part to represent, and I desire to give notice that on to-morrow afternoon I shall address the Senate upon that subject.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT BOSTON.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the President's address at Boston be printed as a public document.

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

HOOR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. SWANSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 479), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the hour of the daily meeting of the Senate shall be 10 o'clock a. m.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 475), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That in order to prevent misunderstanding, either in this country or among other nations concerning the purpose and effect of the proposed league of nations, it is the judgment of the Senate that in any final draft of the constitution of the league of nations it should be clearly provided in substance as follows:

Nothing contained in this constitution of the league of nations is intended to imply any relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, nor is anything in this constitution of the league of nations to be regarded as limiting in any sense the power conferred by the Constitution of the United States upon the Congress.

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 476), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate by subcommittee the questions involved in Senate bill 5305, and for that purpose is authorized to sit in Washington or elsewhere during the period between the end of the Sixty-fifth Congress and the beginning of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and thereafter during the session or recesses of the Senate and to report in the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress by legislation or otherwise its conclusions thereon. And that the said committee or subcommittee is hereby given power and authority to summon witnesses, administer oaths, and to take testimony under oath, and to employ such clerical and stenographic assistance as may be necessary in the premises, the expenses of said committee to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I offer a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration. It is to authorize a committee to sit during the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does it carry an appropriation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 474) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs authorized to investigate the Gam Springs (Va.) Camp, and the affairs of Company 553, Motor Transport Corps, be, and it is hereby, authorized to sit and make such investigation after the adjournment of the Sixty-fifth Congress, and said subcommittee be, and is hereby, directed to report at the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon think this resolution will require any debate or lead to any discussion?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No. If it does I will withdraw it.

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

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and was agreed to.

PROPOSED EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 431).

Mr. FRANCE. I offer the following resolution and ask that it be read, and I also ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it be read first, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. I suggest that the Senator first ask that it be read before asking for its present consideration. I shall not object if it does not lead to discussion.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 14746, the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. GORE. I make a point of order against the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Maryland will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Senate resolution 477.

Whereas grave and pressing problems in connection with the reconstruction period now confront us and there is apparent much unrest throughout the country, due to unemployment, illiteracy, ill health, poverty, the underproduction and faulty distribution of the commodities and necessities of life, high living costs, and other undesirable but in part remediable conditions created, aggravated, or new discovered by the war; and

Whereas the President, because of his prolonged absence from the seat of government and from the country, and because of his careful occupation with international problems, has not been afforded an opportunity to become fully informed of such problems and unsatisfactory and distressful conditions and the immediate and imperative need of remedial legislation to meet them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it be the sense and judgment of the Senate that the situation is such as to make it seem desirable and advisable that an extra session of the Congress should be called for the 5th of March, 1919; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be respectfully submitted to the President for his consideration.

Mr. SWANSON. I object.

Mr. ASHURST. I object to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over under the rule.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I had the floor and I claim my right under the rule to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution went over under objection.

Mr. GORE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not 1 o'clock.

Mr. ASHURST. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. GORE. I rose to make that point.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. OWEN. I submit a resolution to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 478) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the delegates representing the United States at the peace conference assembled at Paris are hereby requested to offer amendments to the formulated plan proposing to establish the league of nations by the insertion of the following provisions, to wit:

Nothing herein contained shall ever be construed as granting any rights to the league over the internal affairs of member nations. Every member nation is hereby recognized as having the exclusive right over emigration and immigration, imports and exports, and all its domestic affairs.

The body of delegates and the executive council shall have no authority to make laws, but may propose international resolutions to be submitted to the member nations for consideration. When such resolutions shall have been ratified by all the States whose representatives compose the executive council and by three-fourths of the States whose representatives compose the body of delegates shall have the effect of international law.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 421).

Mr. OWEN. I present the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 5236) to amend the Federal reserve act. The report has already been adopted by the House, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The conference report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 5236) to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That that part of the first paragraph of section 7 of the Federal reserve act which reads as follows: 'After the aforesaid dividend claims have been fully met all the net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax except that one-half of such net earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 40 per cent of the paid-in capital stock of such bank,' be amended to read as follows:

"After the aforesaid dividend claims have been fully met, the net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax except that the whole of such net earnings, including those for the year ending December 31, 1918, shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital stock of such bank and that thereafter 10 per cent of such net earnings shall be paid into the surplus."

"Sec. 2. That that part of section 10 of the Federal reserve act which reads as follows: 'The members of said board, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall be ineligible during the time they are in office and for two years thereafter to hold any office, position, or employment in any member bank,' be amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency shall be ineligible during the time they are in office and for two years thereafter to hold any office, position, or employment in any member bank. The appointive members of the Federal Reserve Board shall be ineligible during the time they are in office and for two years thereafter to hold any office, position, or employment in any member bank, except that this restriction shall not apply to a member who has served the full term for which he was appointed."

"Sec. 3. That section 11 of the Federal reserve act as amended by the act of September 7, 1916, be further amended by striking out the whole of subsection (m) and by substituting therefor a subsection to read as follows:

"(m) Upon the affirmative vote of not less than five of its members the Federal Reserve Board shall have power to permit Federal reserve banks to discount for any member bank notes, drafts, or bills of exchange bearing the signature or indorsement of any one borrower in excess of the amount permitted by section 9 and section 13 of this act, but in no case to exceed 20 per cent of the member bank's capital and surplus: *Provided, however*, That all such notes, drafts, or bills of exchange discounted for any member bank in excess of the amount permitted under such sections shall be secured by not less than a like face amount of bonds or notes of the United States issued since April 24, 1917, or certificates of indebtedness of the United States: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this subsection (m) shall not be operative after December 31, 1920."

"Sec. 4. That section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5172. That in order to furnish suitable notes for circulation, the Comptroller of the Currency shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, cause plates and dies to be engraved in the best manner to guard against counterfeiting and fraudulent alterations, and shall have printed therefrom and numbered such quantity of circulating notes in blank or bearing engraved signatures of officers as herein provided, of the de-

nominations of \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$20, \$50, \$100, \$500, and \$1,000, as may be required to supply the associations entitled to receive the same. Such notes shall express upon their face that they are secured by United States bonds deposited with the Treasurer of the United States by the written or engraved signatures of the Treasurer and Register, and by the imprint of the seal of the Treasury, and shall also express upon their face the promise of the association receiving the same to pay on demand, attested by the written or engraved signatures of the president or vice president and cashier; and shall bear such devices and such other statements and shall be in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury shall, by regulation, direct."

ROBERT L. OWEN,
GEO. P. McLEAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

MICHAEL F. PHELAN,
JOE H. EAGLE,
E. A. HAYES,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it is difficult to follow from the reading the comparison between the bill which passed the Senate and the conference report, and I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma to explain any changes which have been made by the conference report varying from the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. OWEN. There was inserted the word "note," after the word "bond," so that the 10 per cent additional against which discounts might be made of notes offered by the banks and secured by Government bonds might be secured by Government notes as well, since the next issue is to be in the form of notes.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that the word "note" is a misnomer in a Government security; it should never be used.

Mr. OWEN. Still the statute uses the term "note," and, in order to prevent any misunderstanding about it, the committee inserted the word "note," so as to cover that point.

Mr. WEEKS. If the bill which is now pending applies the word "note" to a Government security to be issued, I shall make every effort to change that, because it is not applicable to that kind of an instrument.

Mr. OWEN. If it were not changed, then, of course, the banks would not be permitted to give credit to notes as a security, and that would, of course, be injurious to the standing of Government securities which are being offered to the public; that is all.

Mr. WEEKS. It strikes me that that is new matter, in the first place, and, in the second place, it is making use of a term which should not be used in any provision for issuing Government securities.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator will perceive that, if that word is stricken out, it will have the tendency of lowering the selling price and the market price of those securities; and I do not think the Senator would want to take the responsibility for that.

Mr. WEEKS. I certainly would not if that word is used in the pending bill.

Mr. OWEN. It is used.

Mr. WEEKS. I hope it will not be used; it should not be.

Mr. OWEN. I should make no point about it one way or the other; but if it is used, then it certainly ought to be placed in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Would the Senator object to having the conference report go over, so that we may have an opportunity to read it?

Mr. OWEN. Not at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like the report to go over and be printed.

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I myself think, I will say to the Senator, that if the bond bill passes as it passed the House, then the word "note" should be in this proposed law in order that the banks may use the notes as security; but really I should like to have the Senator allow the conference report to be printed and to go over.

Mr. OWEN. I will continue my answer to the Senator from Massachusetts. The words "Assistant Secretary of the Treasury" were stricken out of the second section, and in lieu of the word "appointed" the word "appointive" was inserted. Then the dividends which were earned by the Federal reserve banks during 1918 were added to the surplus funds of those banks, so as to allow the surplus to go up to 100 per cent, and thereafter 10 per cent of the earnings would go to additional surplus and the balance to the Government. It makes no change in the distribution, except that the banks get the benefit at present of their earnings in 1918 as a surplus, which was thought de-

sirable, because many foreign banks have a larger capital than our reserve banks, and the credit of the Federal reserve banks was impaired to some extent by that fact, so far as foreign balances are concerned.

I think that substantially covers the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to its going over?

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

PROPOSED CALL OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there are on the calendar a great number of bills of merit which appear to be receiving no attention. I ask unanimous consent that at 6 o'clock this evening the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar until the calendar is called once through for unobjected bills only. We ought to call the calendar once for unobjected bills during the session. We can not do it during the morning hour; the rule provides otherwise. I ask unanimous consent for that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, we have already made an order that the Senate shall meet hereafter at 10 o'clock. Members had an idea, I think, that if we met at 10 the calendar would be called. My impression was that at 10 o'clock tomorrow we were going to call the calendar.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will yield, there is no rule for calling it at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. SWANSON. It is in order for that to be done, however. We can do it by unanimous consent.

Mr. MYERS. Well, somebody is going to move to bring up an appropriation bill, and there will be no chance during the morning hour. From 6 to 8 this evening we can call the calendar. Senators who are not interested do not need to remain here, but those of us who are interested can stay and go through the calendar. There are going to be fewer Senators here from 6 to 8 than at any other time in the day.

Mr. SWANSON. I suggest that the Senator make it from 8 to 9.

Mr. MYERS. I am afraid Senators will not stay until that time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object to the Senator's request.

Mr. MYERS. I make the motion, then, that at 6 o'clock this evening we proceed to call the calendar for unobjected bills.

Mr. GORE. I object to that. I do not think it is in order during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not in order now.

MORGAN MUNITION PLANT EXPLOSION.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday I presented to the Senate a report (No. 776) from the Military Affairs Committee on the explosion at Morgans, N. J., and asked that it be printed in the RECORD. Objection was made, and the report was kept out of the RECORD. I renew my motion now, because this is a report of a very important investigation. The hearings contain a great deal of technical information that is very valuable, and the report should go in the RECORD. I now move that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

On October 24 last the Senate, by resolution, directed the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate the fire at the Morgan Munitions Plant on October 4 and 5; the plans, if any, adopted for its reconstruction; and the protective measures which had been employed in that plant and which were being employed in other munition plants.

Shortly after the resolution was adopted the armistice was declared, and in view of the fact that actual hostilities ceased and that steps were taken to limit production, your committee concluded to confine its investigation to the fire at the Morgan Plant and to the storage of explosives in large quantities near congested centers.

Following the signing of the armistice, we at once communicated with the Secretary of War, calling his attention to the danger of the storage of explosives and poisonous gases near populous centers. In reply he advised us that high explosives and poisonous gases would be shipped from New Jersey to sections of the country remote from dwellings and that military guards would be placed at the various plants during the removal.

To determine the causes of the fire at the Morgan Plant and whether same was the result of accident, negligence, or acts of enemies public hearings were held, many witnesses examined, and testimony aggregating over 1,900 pages was taken.

At the hearings the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., which was in charge of the operation of the plant, was represented by counsel. By agreement dated December 30, 1917, the company was employed by the Government to procure land at South Amboy for a shell-loading plant, which land the Government agreed to lease from the company and on which the company agreed to erect a plant for loading, assembling, and packing shells. We secured a copy of the contract, not for the purpose of determining whether its provisions were fair and equitable, but solely to ascertain what light it would throw upon the proper and careful operation of the plant. The company obligated itself to "deliver the loaded shells as soon as possible after the components have been received"

from the Government, while the Government agreed to pay all cost and in addition a certain percentage of the cost by way of compensation for the services of the company and to indemnify the company "against all and any risks by accident, fire, or explosion or otherwise arising or growing out of the construction and operation of the plant." In short, the Government desired to have shells loaded as rapidly as possible and agreed to indemnify the company against all risks. Under such a contract it would seem that it was the duty of the Government as well as the company to see that the plant was operated as carefully as was possible. Care was required not only for the employees but also for the protection of those living in the vicinity. It is perhaps unfortunate that a plant where in a short time was accumulated millions of pounds of high explosives should have been located adjacent to South Amboy, which had 7,500 inhabitants before any work was commenced and whose population greatly increased on account of war activities in the neighborhood, and within a few miles of Perth Amboy, whose population exceeded 40,000 before any work on the plant was commenced. Within a radius of 10 miles of the plant there was a population greatly in excess of 50,000.

Some idea of the damage done within a radius of 10 miles and of the terror spread among the people may be judged from the fact that representatives of the city of New York, which is more than 20 miles from the plant, attended the hearing, told of the dangers to the tunnels under the river and to their water mains because of the explosion, and protested against the accumulation of such large quantities of high explosives in close proximity to the city. The mayors of the cities and towns within a radius of 10 miles appeared before your committee and presented a vivid picture of the death, destruction, and desolation resulting from the fire and explosions.

The fire commenced shortly before 8 o'clock on the night of October 4 and continued until the night of October 5. As the fire progressed stores of munitions exploded and fragments of buildings and shells were scattered about for miles. The shock was felt within a radius of 25 miles. Within the radius, however, of 10 miles the shock was simply terrific. Windows were blown out, chimneys thrown down, roofs destroyed, and houses swayed back and forth. It is estimated that 10,000 people were compelled to leave their homes and remain in the open. Children were prematurely born in the fields, and many of those forced from their homes were attacked with the influenza, which was then very prevalent.

How many deaths caused by shock and influenza resulting from the disaster can not be stated. Eighty-seven deaths were directly caused by the disaster. The property loss of the Government was \$20,000,000. The loss of property to residents in the vicinity, together with various other claims against the Government because of the disaster, amount to about three and one-half million dollars. These claims have not yet been fully settled, and there is a strong contrast between the speed at which the Government was piling up explosions in the vicinity of Perth and South Amboy and the deliberation with which it is now repairing the damage to property of residents and settling their claims.

The site selected by the company for the construction of the plant comprised some 2,600 acres. The company was composed of Mr. T. A. Gillespie and his sons, who had been contractors, and who had some experience in the erection of buildings, and who had also been interested in the manufacture of high-explosive shells for the British and Russian Governments. The buildings were planned by one of their associates, who had been at one time connected with the Du Pont Powder Co., and they met with the approval of the Ordnance Department. They were hastily constructed, and judging by the experience gained from the fire, they were too close together and had defects which contributed to the rapid spread of the conflagration.

The location of the plant was not ideal. It doubtless was selected because of its proximity to a supply of labor and to the New York Harbor.

The fire protection consisted of fire extinguishers and fire pails located in all buildings. Manufacturing buildings were equipped with small hose which were supplied by a pressure water-pipe line from a million-gallon reservoir. There was an underground pipe line consisting of 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16 inch cast-iron pipe which supplied a large number of hydrants, each hydrant being equipped with an adequate supply of fire hose, nozzles, etc. This system was supplied by two 2-stage centrifugal pumps, each having a capacity of 1,800 gallons per minute and pumping from salt water. A 16,000-gallon tank on an 80-foot trestle kept the system full and the pumps primed. It was estimated that with both pumps running it was possible to get 12 fire streams with a nozzle pressure of 38 pounds. At the central fire house there was an auto chemical engine and an auto fire-hose truck. Valves on the underground supply lines were so arranged that the various units could be cut off in case of break and water left on the other units.

The first explosion completely demolished a large portion of the unit known as 6-1-1. The firemen promptly endeavored to extinguish it, but their failure is attributed to flying shells and continued explosions. What was the cause of the fire we can not tell. There was some suspicion that it was caused by an alien enemy, but the evidence would not justify a finding to that effect.

To load shells it was necessary to reduce the explosives to a liquid. For this purpose melting kettles heated by steam coils were employed. The evidence tended to show that it was dangerous in the process of melting to apply heat in excess of 110° centigrade. If heat in excess of that degree was applied fire was likely to result, especially if the explosives contained impurities. A fire probably did start in one of the melting kettles and was immediately followed by an explosion. There was some evidence that gauges on some of the kettles were broken and that at times gauges which were in operation recorded excessive temperature. Such evidence was, however, contradicted, and those who installed the gauges testified that the safety devices were such that they absolutely prevented a temperature beyond 110°. While it is not possible to state definitely what was the cause of the fire, it is possible to state some of the causes for its rapid spread and extent. This we will attempt to do very briefly.

It appeared in evidence that the fire protective committee of the War Industries Board had recommended that a system of automatic sprinklers should be installed. This recommendation was opposed by the company, who claimed that an explosion would render the equipment useless. It was also ignored by the Ordnance Department. Notwithstanding the claim that an explosion would render the equipment ineffective, we find that automatic sprinklers have been installed in various powder plants throughout the country and that at times they have operated successfully. In view of the great need for loaded shells it was necessary, in our opinion, to take every precaution for the preservation of the buildings, so that the flow of supplies would not be stopped by preventable accidents. Moreover, in view of the fact that more than 50,000 people resided in close proximity to this plant, every reasonable measure

which would contribute to safety should have been employed. We are not satisfied that automatic sprinklers would have been useless and ineffective, and we believe that both the company and the Ordnance Department did not give to the recommendation of the fire protective committee of the War Industries Board the consideration which it deserved.

At the beginning of the fire there was strong water pressure. As a result of one of the explosions, however, the water pressure failed. There had undoubtedly been a break in one of the mains, and as far as we can judge from the evidence, no one seemed to be sufficiently familiar with the mains and the various valves to cut off the water from where it was escaping.

In New Jersey a law was enacted shortly after the Halifax disaster regulating the construction of plants for the manufacture and storage of explosives. The statute was based in large part upon the American table of distances, a table prepared largely as the result of experience. The company, not certain whether the law applied to it or not, communicated with the War Department and was advised in effect that it need not be observed. It was not observed—there was more crowding of buildings and magazines than could have taken place under the New Jersey statute, and the fire, if it has shown anything, has demonstrated the wisdom of regulations such as those contained in the statute. Whether an observance of the statute would have seriously delayed production or merely increased cost is not entirely clear. The company and the War Department selected a site close to cities of substantial size, and if they chose to ignore a State regulation for the protection of its citizens, they should have themselves observed some precautions of equal value. They did not do so.

The Ordnance Department at one time apparently had in mind that there should be a limit to the quantity of explosives at the plant. It would seem to be a rule generally observed that not more than 15 days supply should be on hand at any one time. There is some evidence in the record that the Ordnance Department at some time considered that a supply of 45 days might be maintained and at other times a supply for even 60 days might be maintained.

In permitting such an accumulation little attention seems to have been paid to the actual capacity of the plant. The quantity on storage seems to have been regulated, if regulated at all, not by the actual capacity of the plant at the time but upon what months previous had been estimated would be the actual capacity of the plant. The Ordnance Department kept piling up the explosives. The company remonstrated, but without avail. Instead of a supply for at the most 60 days, it would seem as though, based on the capacity of the plant at the time of the fire there was a supply for nearly 300 days. Not only were explosives sent to the plant to be loaded into shells by the company, but the Government also sent loaded shells from other plants, so that at the time of the fire the plant was without question a real menace to the surrounding country. It would be unjust to say that the company was responsible for this menace. There is clear evidence to the effect that it appealed to the Government for relief and was promised some relief.

On the night of the fire the quantity of explosives at the plant, including not only what was in the magazines but also that in shells and on cars, amounted to 30,855,079 pounds. Of this quantity, 12,155,839 pounds were destroyed. Had the remaining 18,000,000 pounds been destroyed, no one can tell what would have been the damage.

The shells, just before the fire, consisted of the following calibers: Seventy-five millimeter, 3-inch, 5-inch, 155-millimeter, 6-inch, 8-inch, 9.2-inch, 240-millimeter, and amounted in the aggregate to 1,213,458. Of this number, approximately 25 per cent were destroyed. 905,219 remained after the fire. South Amboy and Perth Amboy and the many towns within 15 miles of the plant, and, in fact, New York City are perhaps fortunate that only 25 per cent of the shells exploded and that less than one-half of the total quantity of explosives on hand was destroyed.

We have not attempted to say who, if anyone, in the War Department is responsible for the vast accumulation of explosives and shells at the Morgan plant at the time of the fire. It is our opinion that a rigid inquiry should be conducted by the War Department into the matter. We can hardly believe that it was not responsible to have held back from the Morgan plant a substantial part of the explosives which were on hand at the time of the fire. As soon as it became evident that the supply was in excess of the loading and storage capacity of the plant and that loaded shells were being shipped in much more rapidly than they could be taken away by vessels for transportation across the seas, it seems to us that a place more distant from populous centers should have been found for storage. If no such place could be found, then the greatest possible precaution should have been taken to prevent fires.

At the time of the fire about 6,500 men were employed; 392 were guards. The company evidently realized that the plant was not properly guarded, and appealed to the War Department for a detachment of Regular soldiers. Doubtless upon an investigation by the War Department the reason for the failure to comply with such a reasonable request will be made plain or those who ignored it will be punished. Nothing was more important than the guarding of such a plant. The 392 guards were divided into three shifts, and it was obviously impossible for these guards to make certain that no one entering the premises carried matches, or even to see that no one on the premises smoked.

Haste, no doubt, was demanded so that our troops in France could have an ample supply of ammunition. We might overlook the danger to which residents and property in the vicinity of a plant were exposed if there was a certainty that the plant could be relied upon to supply our soldiers with the necessary munitions. It needs only the statement of the fact to show that the failure to observe precautions for the protection of residents and property in the vicinity also exposed our soldiers to the danger that the supplies would not be forthcoming. A fire occurred at the Morgan plant. It is possible and perhaps probable that it was accidental.

It is not, however, probable that a veritable catastrophe would have resulted from the fire had precautions been taken in the location and construction of the buildings and magazines, and had some care been exercised not to ship into the plant explosives greatly in excess of its capacity and loaded shells greatly in excess of the facilities for transportation. A catastrophe did result, and were it not for the fact that our enemies abandoned the fight, our soldiers in the field would have suffered even more, perhaps, than was suffered by the residents in the immediate vicinity of the plant. In the haste for speed, the need of great care seems to have been lost sight of. While a disregard of proper precautions may have resulted in a larger supply for the moment, such disregard led, because of the destruction of the plant, to an

entire stoppage of the supply. The haste which was shown in the effort of increased production led to some disregard of reasonable care on the part of the Ordnance Department and might probably have been a calamity to those fighting for us on the other side. For this reason we can not see that the alleged need for great haste is an excuse for the practices pursued at the plant.

As stated above, the New Jersey statute regulating the manufacture and storage of explosives was ignored. There is no Federal statute on the subject. We have learned much in the past four years regarding the manufacture and storage of explosives. The lesson should not be forgotten. From the knowledge gained it should be possible to prepare rules on the location of plants for the manufacture and storage of munitions for the Government and regulating such manufacture and storage.

We recommend that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be requested to confer on the subject and to submit to the Senate a proposed bill thereon.

We further recommend that the Secretary of War be requested to cause a rigid inquiry to be made into the conduct of the officers charged with supervision in behalf of the Government of the construction and operation of the Morgan plant and of the shipment of explosives and loaded shells thereto.

OIL AND GAS LANDS.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy regarding the oil bill which is now pending in the Senate. He has requested me to have it printed in the RECORD and read to the Senate. In the letter he states his opposition to the oil-leasing bill now pending in the Senate. I will ask that the letter be read and incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. GRONNA. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. SWANSON. I simply ask that a letter from the Secretary of the Navy in reference to the oil-leasing bill may be read.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, February 27, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that a statement has been made by some Member of Congress that the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy favor the land legislation reported by the conference committee on public lands of the two Houses. You know my position all the time has been that while not opposing the leasing bill, which I favor, I have opposed incorporating any provision with reference to the naval reserves in such legislation. I do not favor the bill that has been agreed upon; I do not think it is just to the Government; and while it is better, so far as the naval reserves are concerned, than the original bill, my attitude is that the naval reserves ought not to be touched by legislation but ought to be settled by the courts.

I did agree with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior upon a provision sometime ago that would protect the naval reserves and would confer upon the President power to operate the going wells. I did this because I did not wish to assume to be standing in the way of the passage of legislation of importance which I favored, and I write you because I hope you will correct the impression that I have changed in my attitude. I believe that the naval interests require that whatever in the naval reserves belongs to the Navy by law should go to the Navy, though the final matter should be settled by the courts, unless the provision referred to, which the Attorney General and myself agreed to sometime ago, is incorporated. I think it would be a great mistake to go further than that. I will be glad if you will make my position known.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. CLAUDE SWANSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield for a moment.

Mr. KING. I wish to inquire whether the request of the Senator from Virginia was to have the letter placed in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no way to keep it out, it having been read.

Mr. KING. I wish to express my dissent to such a proceeding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When matter is read at the desk, the reporters have to take it down, and it goes into the RECORD.

FIFTH LIBERTY BOND BILL.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me to present a report?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Out of order, from the Committee on Finance, I wish to file a favorable report upon House bill 16136, to amend the liberty bond acts and the War Finance Corporation act, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to object to the receipt of the report at this time. I hope that the committee will give consideration to the amendment that I introduced to-day and had referred to the committee relating to this matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that the committee had already acted upon this measure before the amendment was probably introduced in the Senate, certainly before it was called to the attention of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then my objection will give the committee some time in which to consider the amendment between now and to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. I withdraw the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report is withdrawn.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 26, approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 68. An act to amend section 269 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary";

S. 3079. An act to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes;

S. 5342. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern judicial district of the State of Texas; and

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing that one term of the United States district court for the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there are a large number of nominations on the Executive Calendar waiting to be acted upon. I am not disposed to ask the Senate to go on with any on the calendar to which there is objection, but I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that at the close of morning business to-morrow morning the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for unobjected bills, and continue the call until the calendar is called once in its entirety for unobjected bills only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRICE GUARANTIES OF WHEAT.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill (H. R. 15796) to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919, and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. I wish Senators would examine the rules occasionally. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. GORE. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. ASHURST. I object to that.

Mr. GORE. Certain Senators out of love of good literature or to facilitate the business of the Senate desire to have the bill read in extenso. I ask that it be read.

Mr. SMOOT. A number of Senators were not aware that the bill was to be taken up at this time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum, that they may be here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Borah	Kellogg	Overman	Sterling
Brandeggee	Kendrick	Owen	Sutherland
Calder	King	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Knox	Pittman	Trammell
Colt	La Follette	Poindexter	Underwood
Curtis	McCumber	Pomerene	Wadsworth
France	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh
Gay	McNary	Sherman	Warren
Gore	Moses	Shields	Watson
Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harding	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have no desire to seriously interfere with the bill which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has in charge. The bill undoubtedly will pass. It appropriates only \$1,000,000,000, and therefore I apprehend that all opposition to it will be futile. If it appropriated \$15,000 or \$20,000 for some really proper purpose of the Government, it, of course, would not pass, but since it carries a billion dollars, to be ladled out of the Treasury, of course, it is going to pass this Congress.

I know the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will give us some reasons why he thinks it should pass. I believe he is perfectly honest in thinking it ought to pass. Of course, the beneficiaries of the billion dollars are anxious to have it pass, and so those who are waiting hat in hand for this money to be ladled out to them are impatient with anyone who would seem to obstruct it.

I shall claim the floor but a few moments unless I am interrupted, but I feel that I ought to make an explanation. Half a dozen members of the Committee on Indian Affairs have approached me, and one of them approached me in a manner that I considered offensive, charging me with delay and neglect of the Indian appropriation bill. I want here to say that I have been guilty of no delay and no neglect in pressing the Indian appropriation bill. It was the unfinished business last Friday, and over my protest—and I made only a short speech of half a dozen sentences—the conference report on the leasing bill was made the unfinished business and the Indian appropriation bill was thereby displaced.

Now, Senators in whom I have confidence—I have confidence in all Senators, but Senators in whose judgment as to the business of the Senate I have confidence—approached me from both sides of the Chamber. I will not mention names. They told me they felt I ought not further to press the Indian appropriation bill; that I ought to withdraw my opposition to these other bills and allow the conference report on the Post Office bill to be adopted, which I did. Then the same Senators, and they are Senators who are charged with leadership in the Senate, said to me that I ought to permit the Diplomatic and Consular bill to pass. That appealed to me, and I did. I did not interrupt the Diplomatic and Consular bill, although I sat around here for two or three days. Then they said to me, "You should allow the fortifications appropriation bill to pass." That appealed to me, and I think it appealed to every Senator here. How much longer am I going to be asked to yield the Indian appropriation bill? At all times Senators were assuring me that they would assist me to bring up the Indian appropriation bill just so soon as those bills were passed.

Now, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] was not a party to these statements. I must acquit him of any part in those statements. Therefore he is not breaking faith with anybody in bringing up the wheat guaranty bill. Of course, he can not break faith with anybody in ladling a billion dollars out of the Treasury. Everybody is for that.

Now, I would have the Senate understand that while I do not regard the Indian appropriation bill—as I have stated at least four times—as the most important bill, it is nevertheless a large, important appropriation bill. The fact that I am soon to be displaced as chairman does not lessen my interest in that legislation. The fact that I am no longer to direct in a small way the affairs of the committee does not lessen my interest in the legislation. This bill has been considered by 15 or 16 serious-minded Senators; it is, I think, one of the best Indian appropriation bills we have ever reported, and it is the result of a good deal of reflection, the result of a good deal of investigation. Some of the investigations have gone back years in time. As the Irishman said, "I did not come to town yesterday," but when I was sworn into the Senate I was not familiar with its processes. You are all a body of high-class gentlemen, but it is human nature in the closing days of a Congress for everybody to follow the rule that whosoever can will get his bill through, and all promises to assist to bring up this bill or that bill amount to nothing. I make no complaint of it; I have had no unjust treatment; nobody here mistreats me; but I think it is due to the Committee on Indian Affairs that I make this explanation. The members of that committee have sat here patiently waiting, and several times I have urged them to remain, that I was going to bring up the bill. Is it fair to me to continually ask men who are very busy to be here all the time that I may bring up the Indian appropriation bill? If

the Senate does not wish to consider the Indian appropriation bill, very well; that is the business of the Senate; I will make no complaint.

The other day when the conference report on the leasing bill was taken up a number of Senators approached me and asked me what was my attitude in the matter. I said I was indifferent; that I would not ask and never have asked a Senator to vote one way or the other, and nearly always when appealed to by Senators and asked how I should vote, I declined to answer. They vote the way they see fit, as I do. But I do say at this particular time I am impressed by the force of the idea that there was an unwritten understanding that the Indian appropriation bill should follow the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and then that it should follow the fortifications appropriation bill. I do not mention names, but I can appeal to 20 Senators here and they will say I am correct in my statement.

Just in order to test out what the Senate wants to do, without any heat in the matter, without any feeling, but in order that I may know and the Committee on Indian Affairs may know, I am going to move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Before that motion is put, Mr. President, permit me to say if the Senate prefers to consider the bill to guarantee the price of wheat, I have no complaint to make. Why should I seek to set myself up or my little judgment up against the rest of the Senators? I ask Senators now to give me the yeas and nays, so that we will know whether the Senate is to consider the wheat guaranty bill or the Indian appropriation bill, and I will be content with any expression the Senate makes. I am entitled to the yeas and nays upon my motion.

So, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

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

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. COLT. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to announce my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] is detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON].

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—10.			
Ashurst	McLean	Shafroth	Sutherland
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Shields	
King	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
NAYS—36.			
Bankhead	Kendrick	New	Smoot
Borah	Kenyon	Norris	Spencer
Brandegee	La Follette	Page	Sterling
Calder	Lenroot	Poindexter	Swanson
France	McCumber	Reed	Thompson
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Gore	Moses	Sherman	Walsh
Gronna	Myers	Smith, Mich.	Warren
Kellogg	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	Watson

NOT VOTING—50.

Baird	Goff	Lodge	Simmons
Beckham	Hale	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Colt	Hardwick	Nugent	Thomas
Culberson	Henderson	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	Hitchcock	Penrose	Trammell
Curtis	Hollis	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	Johnson, Cal.	Pittman	Vardaman
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pollock	Weeks
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Williams
Fletcher	Kirby	Ransdell	Wolcott
Gay	Knox	Robinson	
Gerry	Lewis	Saulsbury	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the yeas are 10 and the nays are 36. Senators CURTIS, GOLF, CHAMBERLAIN, and OWEN being in the Chamber and not voting, the motion is lost.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I resume my request that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill is very short, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of this bill, but I want to make a short statement, if I may be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it is obvious from the vote just taken that the Senate does not wish to consider the Indian appropriation bill. Of that I make no complaint; the Senate is the master; and I think the Senate should determine as to the measures it desires to take up. That is, as I assume, how the Senate shall do business. When the Senate does not want to do business it should vote a bill down, and when it wishes to do business it should vote it up. I congratulate the Senate on the celerity with which it solved that question, and if we would do that in the future, instead of employing other means not so direct, it would be better for the procedure of the Senate.

I repeat, I make no complaint that the Indian bill has been delayed, but I say in all courtesy—not as a threat, for I do not believe in making threats but in all courtesy—that so soon as I can obtain the floor after the pending bill has been disposed of I give notice that I will make another attempt to get up the Indian bill for consideration.

Mr. GORE. I desire to pledge the Senator my support in that effort.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether he desires to explain the pending bill before it is subjected to discussion? If so, as I intend to say a few words on the bill, I shall wait until the chairman has explained it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say as the bill really has not been read at this time it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of it. I am very anxious to speed its passage in order to make way for other legislation. I appreciate the importance of the measure, however, and I will say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, in order to facilitate its progress, did not recommend any fundamental changes in the bill.

There were two or three amendments which we deemed advisable; one perhaps necessary—the omission of semolina among the articles enumerated to which the prohibition as to importation could be applied. It might open the gates for the importation of a good deal of semiprepared flour in that form and flood our markets with it. We thought that amendment was necessary.

There is another amendment, which enables the President to administer the measure in a way to enable the people of the United States to purchase flour at a reasonable price. It is not a mandatory provision. It is very difficult to standardize a proposition of that sort. It is rather an indication or declaration of policy. I think, apart from that, there are no amendments of any serious consequence, except that the House bill provides for the expiration of this and all other laws on the subject upon June 1, 1920.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture thought there might be circumstances existing at that time which would make it impossible to cut squarely off the entire policy and leave no elasticity for winding up the affairs of the Grain Corporation and its final withdrawal from business. We therefore vested the President with discretion to extend the period for 60 days within which to dispose of wheat that the Government might have on hand and to wind up the affairs of the Grain Corporation, limiting the powers to those two objects.

Upon further reflection I am inclined to think that perhaps that amendment ought to be rejected by the Senate, for Congress will be in session during the coming winter and spring, and we can determine next spring whether such a situation will arise. The situation can be provided for at that time if it

seems to be necessary or desirable to do so. So I rather think that that amendment ought to be disagreed to.

Apart from that, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota there are no other important amendments reported by the Senate committee. Of course, the Senator and other Senators are familiar with the bill as it passed the other House.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think I fully understood the Senator's explanation, at least with reference to a suggested amendment to fix a lower price than the price now fixed for flour.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it would only be by interpretation that the Senate could attribute that meaning to the language. It says "to enable the people of the United States to purchase wheat products at a reasonable price." That is a declaration of policy that the people should be placed in a situation where they can buy flour and bread at a reasonable price. There is no definition and there is no indication as to what a "reasonable price" would be; no standard is sought to be established upon that subject. An effort of that sort was made in the House, but was rejected by the House, and we did not desire to introduce into this measure seriously controverted propositions.

I assume that everybody is of the opinion that the people ought to be permitted to purchase wheat products at a reasonable price, and if the world price for wheat should be considerably lower than the price in the United States, I take it that a great many people would think that the American people ought to be permitted to purchase bread as cheaply as anybody else, or, at any rate, if it should become desirable or become necessary to meet the situation in this country and to assuage discontent, that power ought to be vested somewhere.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator think, if the wage earnings of the American people have increased three times over what they were in 1914, that paying a double price for flour would be an imposition upon them?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not think that one mistake justifies another. I do not mean by that to intimate that a mistake has been made with respect to wages, but on the assumption that a mistake has been made, the wage earners of this country and the consumers of this country are not responsible for this artificially high price of wheat, if it should prove to be an artificially high price. I do not believe in penalizing the innocent for the mistakes of—I will not say the guilty, but for the mistakes of the Government.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, is the producer of wheat at all responsible for the higher price of labor and the higher price of everything that he purchases?

Mr. GORE. Not at all; and I think that is one reason in justification of this measure. The Senator from Arizona asked why this amount should be paid. Of course, he did not ask the question seriously, but in a Pickwickian sense. It ought to be paid because we have promised to pay it. That is one reason, and a sufficient reason, why it ought to be paid. There is another reason indicated by the Senator—

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator. If the Government has promised to pay anything, I will withdraw all I have said; if the Government has promised to pay this amount, I cheerfully retract anything I have said. In inveighing against the bill, I did not know that the Government had agreed to pay this amount. The Government should keep its bargain. But here is what struck me, if the Senator will pardon me for a moment, and then I will bother him no more: I am a firm believer in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. I firmly believe that, if the wheat growers of Oklahoma, North Dakota, and Montana are entitled to a largess or gift or bounty out of the Treasury, the cattle growers and sheep growers of Arizona are also entitled to money out of the Federal Treasury. That is the reason, and the only reason, why I never voted for the wheat price-fixing bill. That constitutes the only objection I have or can see to it.

The wheat growers of this country are just as patriotic as are the cattle growers and just as patriotic as the sugar-cane growers and the cotton growers, and if it be a matter of favor, if the Government is to be administered on principles of favoritism, I would be inclined, indeed, to favor the farmer before any other class, if we are going to favor anybody; but how can you, sir, as a Democrat justify taking large sums of money out of the Treasury to stabilize the price of one product when you neglect to stabilize the price of beef, the price of mutton, the price of labor, and of other commodities?

Mr. McCUMBER. Are we not taking money out of the Treasury to-day to stabilize the price of labor, and taking it out by the hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Arizona is very easily answered. He compares the wheat growers with the sheep growers and the cattle producers. If a man who has not a United States bond secures such a bond, his bond ought to be paid. If the live-stock men of this country had the solemn obligation of the United States that they would be paid a certain amount in a certain contingency, then they would be entitled to payment. That is the only answer.

Proceeding further, in response to the question of the Senator from North Dakota and in answer to the Senator from Arizona, a further reason, in addition to the obligation, is the very fact mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota, that in procuring the wheat crop, particularly those who sowed wheat last winter, they had to buy seed wheat, they had to buy implements, and they had to buy labor at the high rates then prevailing. Nobody could penetrate the future and see that peace was so near at hand. They incurred these extraordinary expenses in preparing the current crop. That is an additional justification for this high price for wheat, if it should prove to be a high price.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that the farmers were offered this price as an inducement to increase their acreage, and as a result the amount of wheat planted was increased in every wheat-growing State in the country?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; and if it proves to be a high price, and if the taxpayers have to reimburse the Treasury for this outlay, I may say to the Senate, that it is a good deal like junking munitions of war. Millions of dollars' worth of war munitions will be cast into the sea and will be destroyed. They are utterly worthless because now they are unnecessary, and everybody rejoices that these munitions are unnecessary and that they can go to the junk heap, instead of going to our Army in Europe to be fired at the enemy. That is a justification for this measure.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator could go a step further, and could also say that we are now perhaps to take the enemy's warships, sink them to the bottom of the ocean, and then spend millions and billions of dollars for a Navy in order that we may uphold the price of labor to a war standard throughout the United States.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and aid the manufacturers of steel and the manufacturers of ordnance. I may say, if I can say it with propriety, that if those ships be sunk, it will be conclusive proof that the fool-killer is not off on a furlough but that he is dead. Such folly is unimaginable.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator—and I wish the Senator from Arizona and other Senators to hear this—that the farmers at the time the wheat price-fixing legislation was passed protested against it, because the market price at that time was, on an average, \$1 a bushel higher than the price fixed in the law? I am ready to prove—and I shall challenge contradiction of that proof—that the American farmers lost by the enactment of that law more than a billion dollars. I make that statement, and I challenge any Senator to disprove it.

Mr. GORE. I will ask the Senator if he does not think that when the farmers receive payment under this bill they will come out just about even, as compared with the losses which were enforced upon them by the Government, that ought to protect them against unjustified loss?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in reply I will say that may be true, if the farmers now get the price as fixed by the President of the United States on the 2d day of September, 1918—and that proclamation was based upon the law enacted by Congress. I want to say to the Senator from Arizona that this is a bond as genuine as any of the liberty bonds we have issued. If you want to repudiate, begin right now.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. I take the Senator's word for it that this is a bond, whether it is as good as a liberty bond or not, and if it is a bond in morals, I am going to vote for it.

Mr. GRONNA. It is a bond issued by the President of the United States under authority of law, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, having in no sense been an opponent, now I am an advocate of the bill; but it was a very poor transaction that we entered into when we initiated and made this bond.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator, and I opposed it; but the Senator then refused to assist me.

Mr. ASHURST. I voted against it.

Mr. GRONNA. Against the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. I voted against the bill fixing the price of wheat.

Mr. GRONNA. Against the food bill?

Mr. ASHURST. No; I did not vote against the food bill.

Mr. GORE. That was the bill in which it was incorporated.

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, I simply want to say this. If the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to me, I can state my position in a very few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Has my colleague the floor?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have the floor; yes; but I have been yielding; and if my colleague will allow me to finish, I will do so in a very short time.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I first want to reply to the suggestion made by the Senator from Arizona. Let us for a moment glance at the situation.

The only benefit that the farmer can get out of an increased price for his product is by being able to use that increased price in the purchase of things which it is necessary for him to live on. The Senator will agree with me upon that simple proposition. Then we should inquire what affects the price of the things which the farmer must purchase. Is not the price affected more by the increased price of labor than by any other one element? There is nothing in the world that is used in its raw state. The ore in the ground is raw material to the miner. It is his finished product as it is converted into pig iron for the use of the manufacturer. In turn the pig iron is the manufacturer's raw product. In every instance it is the raw material of some one who impresses labor upon it and increases its value. Now, by reason of the higher price of labor and the great diminution in the effectiveness of labor, we have increased the price of everything that the farmer must purchase from 100 to 300 per cent. That has been done advisedly and intentionally, by the Government, not only during war times, but the Government proposes to continue that condition now that the war is over.

What steps have we taken to continue it? Let me enumerate a few of them.

The first step was to prevent, as far as possible, a surplus of labor. An order of the War Department was made that no man is compelled to leave the service of the United States until he secures a job that is entirely satisfactory to him. Therefore he can stay there, in the employment of the Government, receive the salary, small though it may be, receive clothing and board, and his family receive the stipend that is paid by the Government under a war necessity. All that is done so that there will not be a surplus of labor over the demand for labor, and so that the price of labor will not be driven downward. That action is all right provided that you exercise the same effort to maintain the price of other things which must be traded for that labor.

We do not even stop there, however. Fearing that labor prices might go down to meet the general conditions of trade, we voted \$200,000,000 to go to digging down hills and making roads for States that have not made them as yet, upon the condition that the States will put another \$200,000,000 into the enterprise and thus spend \$400,000,000 for that particular purpose.

All of that is done to maintain the present standard price of labor. I am not complaining of it at all. I simply want to cite it for the purpose of measuring like justice to the men who have to buy the products of that labor by selling the products of their own labor with which to make the purchase.

Nor have we stopped there. We now propose to enter upon an enormous program of constructing public buildings so as to maintain a higher standard of wages for labor.

Nor do we stop there. We propose to build an enormous Navy and merchant marine for the United States, the latter at a cost of nearly \$300 per ton, when we can purchase it outside for about \$90 a ton; or, in other words, we propose to pay from three to four times as great a price as we can get the same work done for in other places in order that labor prices may not decline.

Nor are we stopping there. We are now proposing, and I understand that a bill for that purpose has already been introduced and reported favorably, to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to reclaim land so that our soldiers may take that land and produce farm products upon it.

There is not a single thing produced on the farm in the United States of which there is not a surplus. Therefore the farmer must struggle against surpluses in marketing his every product. We are spending billions of dollars of the public money to prevent a surplus of labor and maintain a higher standard of labor wage. On the other hand, you propose to take hundreds of millions of dollars to increase the already surplus of farm products and thereby drive the prices downward. Why, we are

raising more wheat to-day than the American people can use; we are raising more cereals throughout the United States than the American people can consume; and yet you propose to take the dollars that are saved by the rigid economy of farmers of the United States to purchase more land, so that their surplus may be increased to such an extent that it will drive down the price below a living price. Why do you so favor one class and disfavor the other class?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. I have listened closely to the distinguished and very able Senator, and I do not speak the language of flattery when I say that he is a very convincing and well-informed speaker. He tells us that the wheat crop this year is far in excess of what the American people can use, and yet the price of bread is astonishingly high.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not astonishingly high—

Mr. ASHURST. It is high.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not when compared with the astonishingly high prices of the goods that the wheat purchases in the market. On the contrary, to-day your flour is the cheapest thing on the face of the earth, compared with the amount of labor that is required to produce it, and the Senator knows that. No one will ever deny it.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well. I am glad to have the Senator put that into the Record. Now, I wish to be understood as making no objection to the prosperity of the farmer. Like all politicians, I am glad to see the farmer prosper. There is not a man in public life—or if there is he ought to get out of public life—who envies anybody an honest share of the prosperity that is due, and rightfully due, an American citizen.

It so happens that my State is not a leading wheat producer. It produces wheat, but it is not one of the leading wheat producers; but here is something that to me is inexplicable: It is not Democratic. It is not in accordance with the Democratic faith, to which I have always adhered. Agreeing that the farmer is a very worthy citizen, and, indeed, agreeing that he is the backbone of our country—that he is the producer—how can such distinguished Senators as my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] single out one interest, and that the interest in which all people are interested, and guarantee a price, when they forget the miner, who goes down into the bowels of the earth and brings up the raw material that goes to make the steel and the iron?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not forgetting the miner. How much is he receiving a day?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. How much is the miner receiving a day, as compared with what the farmer is receiving for a day's work?

Mr. ASHURST. I want to say for the Record that there are six or seven thousand miners in my State out of work now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. ASHURST. Let me finish my statement. If the Government had guaranteed and fixed a price on copper—which I do not want them to do—chrome, manganese, iron, silver, and had fixed the price on all these other metals just as it fixed the price on wheat, I could not complain. All persons would have been treated equally. I do not want a price fixed on copper.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator answer me just one question? Then I will yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ASHURST. Why, certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask him what wages are being paid to the laborers in the mines of Arizona to-day?

Mr. ASHURST. They are paid on a sliding scale. It depends on the price of copper in the copper market. As the price of copper goes up the wages go up.

Mr. McCUMBER. What are the maximum and minimum prices?

Mr. ASHURST. The minimum is about \$3.75 per day.

Mr. McCUMBER. Three dollars and seventy-five cents a day up to what?

Mr. ASHURST. That is, of course, the minimum wage.

Mr. McCUMBER. Up to what? What is the maximum?

Mr. ASHURST. It may go as high as \$5.40—that is, during the war. I am not speaking of prices after the war—after the armistice was signed—I am speaking of prices during the war.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am speaking of the present prices. I want to know what they are now.

Mr. ASHURST. Oh, eight or nine thousand men are out of work in my State now.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but that is not the question, whether they are out of work or not. The question is, What prices are those receiving who are doing work to-day?

Mr. ASHURST. The prices range from \$3.50—

Mr. McCUMBER. To \$10.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, wait. They range from \$3.50 to \$5.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and above that. I can show the Senator that he is away below the mark.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator says so—

Mr. McCUMBER. And for how many hours a day?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a minute.

Mr. ASHURST. It depends upon the character of the work. There are certain characters of work where our laws do not permit men to work over eight hours in the deep mines.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, in no case do they work over eight hours. Then there is your half holiday on Saturday with full pay and your price and a half for hours over eight hours. Now, can the Senator point to me a farmer on the face of the earth who is getting \$3 a day or who is getting \$2 a day or he and his family are getting \$1 a day?

Mr. ASHURST. That does not seem to touch the deep philosophy of this question. The question is, Shall the Government take a class, whether it be the farmer or the copper miner, and say, "Here, you are not prosperous; we are going to pass laws to make you prosperous?" I do not want to single out a class.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why, of course you should not take the producer of grain unless you take the others; but I say, let them both alone from the beginning. If you leave the laborer alone, leave the carpenter alone, to hunt his own job, and then I say you may leave the farmer alone to hunt the price for his product; but you are not doing it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. GORE. In that connection, and in response to the allusion of the Senator from Arizona to the fact that this was un-Democratic, and to his inquiry as to how I, as a Democrat, could support this sort of policy, I wish to say to the Senator that I agree with him entirely that it is un-Democratic. I think it is un-Republican. I thought it was uneconomic. I thought it was unconstitutional.

I thought that when we put the price of wheat lower than the market price we were taking private property without due compensation, and that we violated the Constitution of the United States, both in letter and in spirit. I protested, in season and out of season, against that act of injustice, against that injury being inflicted upon the farmers of this country. I voted against the measure which conferred upon the President the power to fix a price on wheat. I knew that we were parting from economic principles. I knew that we were sowing the wind, and that we would inevitably reap the whirlwind. There was no escape; the harvest is at hand. I expostulated with the Senate time and time again. I cited instances of failure all through the European countries that had embarked upon this policy. It failed everywhere. It did not have a chance to succeed. My fear was that the billion-dollar loss would fall on the farmers. It is a mere matter of chance and good fortune from their standpoint that it did not. The billion-dollar loss will now fall either upon the consumers of the country, who have had a billion-dollar benefit heretofore, or else the billion-dollar loss will fall upon the taxpayers of the United States; but that a loss must be entailed when we embarked upon this policy was as inevitable as death itself. I thought it was the perfection of folly. I thought it was a tragedy of error. I think so yet. But we did embark upon this high and troublous sea of experimentation. We cast the laws of economics to the wind. We must make port in the best way possible, and I am supporting this now as the minimum of evil. I told the Senate on one occasion when the measure was under consideration that my desire was to keep the inevitable mischief down to the irreducible minimum.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rose to discuss this matter from a somewhat different standpoint. I felt, in view of the statements that had been made on the floor of the Senate and in view of the publications in the press that we were about to take \$1,000,000,000 of the people's money to bolster up the price of wheat, that some one ought to explain the absolute falsity of any such statement.

In the beginning the bill was for \$1,250,000,000; but even at \$1,000,000,000 there is not a Senator on this floor who could not take \$300,000,000 and maintain this price and without a loss of more than \$300,000,000 to the people of the United States.

What else have we produced or promised to produce during the war period that we could get out of our contract as cheaply as we get out of this agreement to pay the farmer? Not only that, but you have taken from the farmer at least \$1,000,000,000 and your utmost loss should not exceed \$350,000,000, and therefore you should be ahead \$650,000,000 in the transaction,

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?
 Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.
 Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the loss of \$300,000,000 will be the maximum loss if this bill shall go into effect and the machinery herein provided for shall be utilized to carry it into effect?
 Mr. McCUMBER. If the machinery could be just knocked out of the bill and allow the department to go right on under the old law there would not incur a loss of more than \$350,000,000, and I propose to show that to the Senate so conclusively that no one can gainsay it. It is this wild extravagance on the part of all departments calling for two or three times the amount of appropriations that we actually need for any particular purpose that is the reason why they are calling to-day for \$1,000,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a further question?
 Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.
 Mr. KING. I shall listen with great interest to the statement of the Senator. Has he an amendment prepared which he proposes to offer as a substitute for the measure submitted by the committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have not prepared any amendment, because I never knew what the bill would be until it was finally reported. We now have it before us, and I think the only amendment that is needed is to strike out all of it and simply appropriate \$350,000,000, or, I would say, not to exceed \$500,000,000, for the purpose of maintaining the price of wheat. I shall vote, perhaps, for the billion dollars, if the department says that it may need to use that much, but I insist that it is not necessary, and I further state that it is not an expenditure of money raised by tax, but nothing more than a revolving fund to assist in buying wheat and reselling it.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator will pardon me, as I understand the Senator, it is his opinion from his investigation that at least one-half of this sum would be all that would be required.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is.
 Mr. ASHURST. Five hundred million dollars instead of \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is, if the department in charge will perform its duty. Of course, it can pay salaries amounting to \$500,000,000 if it sees fit; it can be as extravagant as it wants to be; it can throw away the money or burn it, if it so desires, but I simply insist that \$500,000,000 would handle the crop.

Mr. ASHURST. Then if it were true that \$500,000,000 would handle the crop, and we are not bound by contract or in morals to appropriate a billion dollars, why not change the bill so as to give \$500,000,000 instead of \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know what the department would do. It might say that it was not enough. It might throw away and squander the \$500,000,000, and then not be able to maintain the price. But I will give the Senator my reasons. The Department of Agriculture has recommended an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 as the bill has been amended. It has recommended it for the purpose of maintaining the price of the 1919 crop of wheat as fixed by the order of the President.

Were we discussing an appropriation involving two or three thousand dollars, I am certain I could secure the attention of the Senate if I would challenge the necessity of such an appropriation.

But when an appropriation reaches the billion dollar mark, every attempt to inquire into its necessity or to challenge its propriety seems to be met with a rebuff until it has become well known among Senators that the larger the appropriation the more certain is the passage of the bill carrying it. I, therefore, have little hope of changing the attitude of the Senate until a condition akin to bankruptcy shall bring our minds back where we are capable of measuring our expenses with the possibility of our income.

We are asking in this appropriation for \$1,000,000,000 to maintain the price of a fair estimate between 800,000,000 and 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat. Is this necessary? In ordinary times the Senate would ask itself this question. May I venture to ask it even in this period of reckless extravagance? Why is \$1,000,000,000 necessary to maintain our guaranteed price of the 1919 crop? How is that sum to be used?

Certainly if the Government were in one transaction to purchase the entire crop at \$2.26 a bushel, this sum would not be sufficient.

You would have to pay more than \$2,000,000,000 if you were going to buy it all at one time.

If, on the other hand, the Government were to use the sum as a revolving fund, purchasing and reselling during the 18 months in which the farmer is allowed to dispose of his 1919 crop, it would not need the investment of more than \$500,000,000. The Government simply could not purchase and store

that much wheat at one time. There is not sufficient storage capacity in the United States to hold that much grain. But the Government does not intend to do that. I do not recall just what the previous appropriation for this purpose was. Whatever it was, it was sufficient to maintain the price without calling for a further sum.

I wish the Senator from Oklahoma would inform me, as he undoubtedly could, just what we appropriated when we passed the food bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Government appropriated \$150,000,000 for the so-called Wheat Corporation. The Wheat Corporation borrowed a large amount of money in order to be able to guarantee that the Government would take any wheat offered by anyone who had purchased it, and the borrowing at times amounted, I think, to from \$150,000,000 to \$250,000,000 in addition to the \$150,000,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, less than \$500,000,000 took care of the wheat crop of 1918 and is taking care of it up to the present time.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator will allow me—
 Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. There is this difference between the 1918 crop and the 1919 crop. In 1918 foreign countries which had guaranteed a larger price were ready and willing and anxious to take all, or practically all, of the 1918 crop, and all the Government had to do was to have money enough to take the surplus as it was offered and carry it until it could be sold to foreign countries.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has struck just the key to this situation. All the Government has to do is to take care of the surplus that will not be consumed by the American public. That is everything the Government has got to do with it.

But, Mr. President, the Government has not maintained the \$2.20 a bushel by buying in all the wheat at that price and selling it again. How is the price maintained at the present time? It is maintained by the simple edict of the President of the United States under the law fixing the price at the terminal markets at \$2.20 a bushel and through rules and licenses which require everyone purchasing grain to pay this Government price and every miller to pay the price specified and to sell the product in flour to the public at a certain fixed price. That keeps the price at just exactly what it is fixed. The law under which this price is fixed and maintained is still effective, and will remain effective for a period ending June 1, 1920. If we accept the estimated acreage which has been or will be planted for the 1919 crop, as given by the Senator from Oklahoma, at 75,000,000 acres, and if we accept the average yield in the United States at 13 bushels to the acre, we will have 975,000,000 bushels of wheat raised in 1919. We will require about 650,000,000 bushels for home consumption and for seed for the next crop. That would leave 325,000,000 bushels of surplus.

So, Mr. President, if we maintain the present system, the Government will be required only to take care of this surplus. If the Government were to pay cash for this surplus at the guaranteed price, and if it bought it all at one time, it would need to invest \$733,000,000. But we all know that the Government could not purchase all of this surplus at one time. If it would purchase \$100,000,000 worth a month and sell it for export at the world's market price, it could get rid of the 325,000,000 bushels within eight months. And yet we are appropriating for this purpose ten times that sum.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it seems a great pity that the interesting discussion by the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope that the Senator will not call for a quorum.

Mr. MOSES. I suggest that this is a most important proposition, involving a great deal of money, and it is a very grave problem for the country. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	McNary	Smith, Mich.
Beckham	Hardwick	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Henderson	Myers	Smoot
Brandegee	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Owen	Thompson
Curtis	King	Page	Underwood
Dillingham	Kirby	Penrose	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Pomerene	Walsh
Fletcher	La Follette	Reed	Warren
France	Lenroot	Robinson	Weeks
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Shafrath	Williams
Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gore	McCumber	Shields	
Gronna	McKellar	Simmons	
Hale	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. McCUMBER. This proposed expenditure is on a plane with just what the Government has been doing ever since we entered this war. The Government has been spending, in my opinion, from five to ten times what it should have expended to secure what it has secured during all of the war. I can not see that we are checking our extravagance in the slightest degree three or four months after the war has practically terminated. It means, in my opinion, that the larger portion of this sum appropriated will be used to pay needless expenses and to meet rank extravagances. If handled properly, I believe that \$300,000,000 would be ample, and certainly half a billion dollars, in my opinion, would be more than sufficient.

Now, I am not going to vote against the billion-dollar appropriation. Were it an actual appropriation to be expended in anything but the purchase of the surplus of the grain I would probably vote against it, but I simply want to say to the American people, who must pay the bill, that if the food-control department comes out at the end of the year with a loss of more than \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000 it will be guilty of the grossest extravagance in the handling of this matter.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I apologize for interrupting the Senator in the midst of a sentence. I had in mind when he was giving the amount which he estimated would be sufficient as a revolving fund, with existing agencies to carry on the work involved in the understanding or contract of the farmers, a provision in the bill in lines 18 and 19, on page 3. After speaking of the authorization and what was to be done by the instrumentality employed under the bill I find that they are to use this money not only to purchase wheat but flour produced therefrom. Does not the Senator think, and I ask for information, because he has given this subject attention, and I have confidence in his judgment, that the bill contemplates that this commission shall engage in a sort of speculative business, that they are to buy and to sell not only wheat but flour, and that by embarking upon that policy it will need a tremendous business organization, larger capital, and of course a great many more employees, warehouses, storehouses, and so forth?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly, if it goes into the purchase of flour as well, it will require a slightly greater capital to handle the surplus flour, but the surplus flour produced in the United States is inconsequential as compared with the surplus wheat raised in the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me to make a few observations in reply to the Senator from Utah, I will state that that clause, I understand, was put in the bill for this purpose: The Government does not wish to furnish all the money to buy the wheat; it wishes to invite all the capital of the country and permit those who buy it to sell it to the millers at the same price. On the other hand, when the Government is exporting, it much prefers to export flour than wheat, and the Government must take that instead of the wheat if it is going to carry out the guaranty. That is the only object.

Mr. McCUMBER. Assuming that the price of flour is considerably more than the price of wheat, it would cost a little more to handle the flour than it would the wheat proportionately, but it would not require any great amount more simply because wheat and flour are the same article and are not two separate articles; the one goes into the other. You do not first purchase the wheat and then purchase the flour.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think the Senator from North Dakota is correct in that statement.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, Mr. President, a word on the merits. The Senator from Oklahoma says that the Government should purchase all of the wheat at this higher price and sell it to the consumer for whatever the world's price may be. He says that the consumer should not be penalized by being compelled to pay a high price for his bread. Let us look into this and see whether or not the consumer is penalized by paying this price for bread. This country is divided into two great classes. One-third produces the food for the other two-thirds. The two-thirds produce the other things needed by the producers of food and by all of the population of the United States. Then the Government entered into this war. The immediate effect of that war was to increase the value of food products,

and especially of wheat, 200 per cent above the normal price. The Government immediately adopted a policy whereby it increased the labor wages of the two-thirds 100 to 200 per cent higher than the normal.

That was the natural law of supply and demand that the Senator from Arizona is contending for. The Government immediately then adopted a policy whereby it increased the labor wages of the other two-thirds from 100 to 300 per cent above the normal, and when you compute it by the efficiency of labor in products necessary to carry on the war you will find that it increased it even to a greater extent. The result of this was that the hundreds of things which the food producer must purchase were increased in value from 100 to 300 per cent.

If the administration had allowed the natural law of supply and demand to work out as between the two-thirds and the one-third of our population it would have worked about equal justice. But what did we do? We immediately reduced the price of the farmer's wheat nearly one-third. Did we cut down anything else produced by human labor except that which was produced by the farmer? Was there any other article of necessity—clothing, or anything else produced in which we laid upon it the hard hand of the Government and said you shall not advance above a certain price?

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, I think he will recall that the price was fixed for coal and steel and copper.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; the price was fixed for coal, but was the price of coal cut down below what it was before the war?

Mr. PENROSE. I think so.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator, I think, is right in saying that there were two or three things reduced.

Mr. PENROSE. And copper.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the copper price was fixed away beyond—fully 60 per cent greater than it was prior to the war.

Mr. PENROSE. If the Senator will permit me, I am in entire sympathy with his contention. I do not want him to think I am opposed in any way to fixing a fair price of wheat as long as it has got to be fixed. I am against all price fixing, but I did not want him to pass along with that inaccuracy when other products, Pennsylvania products particularly, have been cut in a very savage way.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not remember particularly that they were cut down, but I remember particularly that they were not allowed to raise according to the law of supply and demand.

Mr. PENROSE. Coal, steel, and copper I recall as having been cut down.

Mr. McCUMBER. The farmer's price was cut down when wheat was selling at \$3.07 a bushel to \$2.20.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, copper was selling and there was a ready market for it at 32 to 35 cents per pound, and the price-fixing board cut it down to 23.

Mr. McCUMBER. Twenty-six.

Mr. PENROSE. Later.

Mr. KING. Later it was cut to 22 or 23 cents a pound, and now it is very much less than that.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think copper and coal were reduced. The farmer and the miner were the only parties, as I remember, whose products were held down below the supply and demand value.

Mr. PENROSE. And steel.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I would like to say in this connection that while the price was nominally and perhaps actually fixed on coal, copper, and perhaps other articles, that price was arrived at by a sort of agreement between the War Industries Board and some other board representing the Government and the producers of coal and copper. That may not have been a voluntary agreement. It may not have been reached by their free consent. There may have been a sort of compulsion. But this price was fixed on wheat not after a full and free conference with the farmer. It was recommended by a board on which the farmers had perhaps one or two or three representatives, but it was fixed over the protests of the wheat producers of the country from one end of the country to the other, and it had the force and effect of law, assuming that the statute and proclamation are constitutional. The statute contemplated fixing a minimum price only. The proclamation assumed and has been construed to fix a maximum or an absolute price. Congress intended no such thing.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. There is another distinction. Congress did undertake to give the right to fix the price upon coal. Whether it had that constitutional right or not I do not pause to con-

sider, but it did undertake to do that thing. Congress never did undertake to fix the price of wheat. It never authorized anybody in the world to fix the price of wheat.

The price of wheat was fixed by the arbitrary exercise of the power of license. The power of license was intended to keep dealers in grain and dealers in flour from cornering the market or from forestalling the market or from fictitiously advancing prices. It was not intended for any price-regulation purpose, except to stop those practices which have always been denominated illegal. But that power of license was arbitrarily exercised by a private citizen in this wise: The food controller said to the grain dealer, "If you pay more than the amount I name, I will take away your license." He said to the miller, "If you pay more than the amount I name, I will take away your license." Having in that way taken away the market of the farmer for his wheat at any other prices than those he had arbitrarily fixed, he compelled the farmer to accept those prices.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REED. There was no law and no justification for that.

In the case of coal there was the color of law, at least, and as the Senator who has the floor I believe stated, there was to a large extent an agreement between the coal producers, whereas the farmer was not consulted at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will refer to the law under which the agreement was made he will find that the guaranty of \$2.20 a bushel provided that it should not be less than that sum; instead of that being the maximum, that was to be the minimum; but the food controller, instead of allowing the price to run according to the law of supply and demand above that, immediately assumed that that was the intention; or whether he assumed it or not, certainly, through the instrumentalities which the Senator has mentioned, he prevented the farmer receiving more than \$2.20 a bushel for wheat.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator has just stated is correct. I desire to say further that, so far as the producers of coal or the producers of copper were concerned, it is true that they came to an agreement with the War Industries Board as to the price for which those commodities could be sold. I want to say to the Senator, however, that it was forced upon them; there is no question about it, for they would have been treated just the same as were the producers of wheat if they had not agreed upon the price for copper and coal.

Mr. McCUMBER. One of the peculiarities about the enforcement of this law and the laws which we passed in reference to it has been that the farmers have to buy clothes, and they must sell their wheat to get money with which to buy something to wear. While we cut down the price of the farmer's product it never occurs to anyone to cut down the price of cotton or of cotton goods. So the farmer has to pay three or four times as much for his cotton goods as he before paid. Had the law of supply and demand been allowed the farmer would probably have received from \$3.50 to \$4 per bushel for his 1918 crop of wheat.

Now, what did we do with reference to the other two-thirds? This is the way we treated the one-third who are producing wheat. Did we cut down the price of labor below the law of supply and demand? Did we cut down the price of the things which the farmer must purchase from the higher price to even double the normal price? On the contrary, we did everything to maintain that price and send it higher. We not only did this, but by our system of contracts and by our surrender to every demand, just or unjust, we allowed labor to decrease in efficiency from 35 to 50 per cent, so that, while wages increased from 100 to 300 per cent, the actual product from that labor fell off from one-third to one-half.

Does anyone think that under these conditions the consuming public, whose earning capacity has been doubled and trebled, is penalized by paying double the price for just this one article which the farmer produces, namely, wheat?

The war is now over, or at least supposed to be over, but are the wages or are the prices of the things which the farmer must purchase coming down? On the contrary, the Government purposes to continue construction of ships at a cost of three times what they should cost under normal conditions. The Government has already enacted a bill to enter upon a system of road making in which it has appropriated \$200,000,000, together with a like appropriation from the States of \$200,000,000, or \$400,000,000. It is safe to say that the Government is now engaged and engaging itself to spend billions of dollars, at a time when the whole policy of the Government should be re-

trenchment, in order not so much to give employment as to maintain the standard price of employment at a war-time basis. The farmer is to be taxed. Every one who has any property on which the Government can fasten its tax grip must pay these extra sums to maintain the war standard of prices. Is not the consumer, and especially the laborer, getting the best of the farmer by the maintenance of his wages upon a war basis?

Mr. President, the Senator speaks of bread being the staff of life. The people of the United States pay for their bread, this staff of life, less than 1 per cent of their earnings. The most ordinary labor is receiving to-day at least \$5 a day. If the laborer works 300 days in the year he earns \$1,500. The increase in the value of his barrel of flour by reason of the Government fixing the price is about \$5. He earns this increased price in one day. A little over two days' earnings will buy all the staff of life that he consumes in a whole year.

Senators do not stop to think how cheap flour is as compared with the other things which the American people consume. The average consumption to-day is about one barrel of flour per capita. One barrel of flour is worth about \$12.50, I think, to-day. At that rate it would require, on an average, two days' labor to buy all of the flour that is consumed by one individual for a whole year. Can any Senator point out to me any other article of consumption that is so cheap to-day as is flour, compared, at least, with the labor that is required to produce that barrel of flour? Measured by the labor employed to produce a barrel of flour, this staff of life to-day is the cheapest thing that can be bought in the whole United States. So long as this war standard of prices is maintained there is no occasion in the world for the Government to purchase the farmers' wheat at a war price and then sell it to the public at a prewar value, while at the same time the public is receiving war prices for labor and war prices for everything produced by that labor. The two ought to be maintained together or the two ought to go down together. I do not care if a laborer receives \$10 a day, if he will do an honest day's work, provided that he will allow other people who also labor to receive a price for their products that will enable them to buy his \$10 per day product. That is all he has a right to ask, and he certainly should grant the same privilege to the other producing people of the United States.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the wheat producer has been the only person who has ever been penalized by a reduction in the price of his produce. The Senator from Oklahoma admits that the wheat producers lost by reason of the Government fixing the price of their product \$800,000,000. He bases that upon a loss of 80 cents per bushel on 1,000,000 bushels of wheat. In the first place, we raised 1,125,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1918, and the price, instead of being 80 cents more, would probably have been a dollar and a half or even \$2 more had we allowed the law of supply and demand to work out its natural result.

The world had to have our wheat. Our allies were willing to pay \$5 a bushel for that wheat if they could get it. It was said that we owed it to our allies that they should not pay such exorbitant prices for our wheat. Did we not owe it to our allies that they should not pay four times as much as they ought to have paid for their war materials? Yet we charged them any price that our people had the conscience to demand for the other things that we furnished to them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator will remember that at the same time we were cutting the price of wheat from \$3.50 to \$2.26 a bushel our allies were charging the United States the highest price that was ever known in the history of the world for everything that we purchased from them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am well aware of that. They got the best price they could, and we got the best price that we could for everything that we produced. We were playing an equal game; each of us was doing the best for ourselves, with one exception. That exception was the farmer. He was not to have the best price that he could get; he was to be the "goat" in the transaction.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma admits, as I stated, that the farmers lost \$800,000,000. Then the consumer of flour got the benefit of that \$800,000,000, did he not? If the consumer of the flour during the war time got a benefit from the farmer of from \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000, then, in Heaven's name, should not the consumer of flour be willing, now that the war is over and the price of his labor and his services are maintained at the old high rate, at least, that the farmer shall make back that loss—not make anything new or anything in addition to what he would have made; that he should, at least, recoup that loss by maintaining the price fixed by the President?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The farmer, of whom I was speaking in regard to the loss to which the Senator from North Dakota is referring—which, by the way, this farmer denied—stated that even if there were a loss by reason of the action of the Government in fixing the price of wheat, it was more than compensated for by the increased price which the farmer got for corn, oats, and those other substitutes which the people were compelled to purchase at very high prices in lieu of wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. Was the compensation above that of the law of supply and demand for those articles?

Mr. KING. His contention was that the Government had made a market for corn, oats, and other cereals, which otherwise would not have existed, by reason of its taking charge of the wheat in order to furnish wheat to the allies; that by furnishing a market to those other cereals it had given an enormous impulse to the price; and that the farmer had made very large profits out of those products.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the first time I have ever heard the argument made that by striking down the price of one product the farmer produces you increase the value of his other products. On the contrary, corn, rye, oats, barley, and everything that the farmer produces of a cereal character always responds to the rise and fall of wheat, although not to the same extent; but I never heard of a case in which wheat went skyward and the other products went downward at the same time. On the contrary, the whole rule of trade is that a high price for one product tends to give buoyancy to the price of every other like product or a product that can be converted into it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, generally speaking, I think the rule the Senator announces is correct; but I regard the position of this intelligent farmer to whom I have referred as a rational and logical one. If the Government, by reason of restricting the use of wheat at home for food purposes in order to supply it to our allies abroad, furnished a market for other cereals, obviously it would enhance the price of the cereals, while perhaps fixing the price of wheat might have reduced its price below what the natural market would have been.

Mr. McCUMBER. That had nothing to do with it. The advance in the price of other cereals was not based upon the lowering of the price of wheat, but, on the contrary, it was the result of the other proposition enunciated by the Senator, namely, compelling the American people to eat something else. Of course, if they are compelled to consume something else, it will increase the price of the commodities which they are compelled to consume.

I think the farmer will wait a long time for a just answer to the questions I have propounded. As I have already stated, all the food department has to do to handle this matter is to continue the present system. That system requires every miller to purchase wheat at a certain price; it compels the miller to sell the wheat, in the shape of flour, for a certain price, and that price takes care of 650,000,000 bushels of wheat. That will leave 325,000,000 bushels of surplus. What are you going to do with the surplus? If the Government bought it at the present price, and bought it all at one time, it would need only \$733,000,000 to purchase it; but if it buys it at the rate of \$100,000,000 a month and then sells that to Great Britain and to other countries at the world's market price, we would lose about \$1 a bushel. If we should lose \$1 a bushel, then the entire loss would be \$325,000,000, or only about one-third of the loss that the farmer suffered in 1918 by reason of his price being cut down.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. If I understand the Senator correctly, he thinks that if this fund is properly handled the loss may be limited to \$300,000,000?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; to about that.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not, if the President had asked Congress last December or January to enact legislation repealing this law, so far as it applies to spring wheat, thereby saving any loss on spring wheat, there would have been a loss at all?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there would have probably been no financial loss, but there would have been a loss of honor on the part of the Government, because the Government had already agreed to insure the crop on the supposition of the con-

tinuance of the war and to maintain the price fixed; and, having agreed upon that, we can not meet that with the argument that, because the wheat was not sowed, we could violate our contract with reference to the part which was not sown, because the farmer arranges for conditions; he sells his seed wheat or retains it, according to his necessities; makes his arrangements for his help for the ensuing year; and makes his other contracts in anticipation of future prices.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator has raised a great many contingent possibilities, some of which may be real, but some of which sound quite the reverse to me. Certainly we were not in a state of war in December or January, and certainly the farmer, where spring wheat is raised, had not taken any steps to produce any spring wheat other than possibly to set aside his land for that purpose.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would the Senator, then, provide that winter wheat shall be priced at \$2.20 and that the farmers of my State shall receive only \$1 for their wheat?

Mr. WEEKS. I am not thinking about the farmers of the Senator's State or of any other State; I am wondering why we could not, without doing injustice to anyone, have saved this dollar a bushel which the Senator says we are going to lose on wheat which had not been sown.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I will explain to the Senator from Massachusetts what the facts are. In order to have a successful crop of spring wheat, the plowing must be done in the fall. No farmer thinks of sowing spring wheat in my section of the country with spring plowing. They all do their plowing in the fall, before the ground freezes, and they plow in the fall if they can, even for oats and barley; but, above all things, fall plowing is required for the wheat crop. So all that work was done before the time to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred.

Mr. WEEKS. If that were done, and the farmer did not use his land for the purpose contemplated, I think he would have a claim which he might make for damages to that extent.

Mr. McCUMBER. On the other hand, if he wishes to raise flax, he would raise that following the spring plowing; but it gets back to the proposition that even the farmer has to look ahead and arrange his plowing and other affairs according to the situation as it then confronts him. Let the Senator remember that at that time the farmer could not get any kind of help short of \$5 and \$6 a day per man to do the plowing.

Mr. WEEKS. If he has paid out \$5 or \$6 a day, then that could go into his claim. It is not very fashionable to try to save money; and yet it seems to me that there would have been an opportunity to have saved perhaps \$200,000,000 and have done no injustice whatever to anyone.

Mr. McCUMBER. To me it would have been a rank injustice, first, by fixing \$2.26 a bushel for one kind of wheat raised across a line in one part of the State and allowing only a dollar a bushel, or the world market price, for the wheat that happened to be raised across that line in the same or another State. Some of our farmers also raise winter wheat, winter rye, and so forth, and the farmer who was lucky enough to have provided for his winter wheat would get double the price that another farmer would receive for his spring wheat. There are a great many objections to the proposal made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the peculiar condition we would have been in. While one crop, winter wheat, is sown in the fall and the other sown in the spring, they practically mature at about the same time; there is not much difference in the time of maturity. In the far southern States the farmers begin to harvest wheat in June, while in the north they begin in July. In my section of the country there is probably not a month's difference between the harvesting of the grain that is sown in the fall and that sown in the spring. So the man who sows winter wheat when he gets his grain thrashed would receive full price for it, while the man who sows spring wheat and thrashes a month later would not begin to get that price.

Mr. WEEKS. All I have to say is that the plan I have suggested was not followed, and so it is almost idle to discuss it; yet it seems to me that, if I had been responsible, I would have asked Congress to have passed that kind of legislation, coupled with it the provision that farmers could present their claims for any actual loss which they might have sustained because of having plowed the ground or taken some other action.

Mr. McCUMBER. Our courts, I am afraid, would have had some work to do in order to take care of the claims of

33,000,000 people in the United States. Possibly the Senator could have seen a way to have met that situation.

Mr. WEEKS. That number would have been limited to 330,000, I imagine, instead of 33,000,000 people.

Mr. McCUMBER. Even if it only affected 330,000, I think it would take 15 or 20 years to try all their cases.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it not worth while to spend some time to save \$200,000,000, if it can be done? Have we gotten to the pass where we can deliberately throw away money to that extent?

Mr. McCUMBER. There have been more than \$300,000,000 of salvage thrown away on account of this war, more than \$3,000,000,000 of it, and we have issued our bonds and we will have to pay for it, whereas in this particular case, if we lose a couple of hundred million dollars, it can be allowed as an offset against the billion dollars that have been taken out of the pocket-books of the farmers for their 1917 and 1918 grain crop.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it any excuse, Mr. President, that we are losing a great amount of money in salvage. The Senator from North Dakota is not responsible for that, and neither is the Senate. The executive departments of the Government are responsible for that; and the executive departments of the Government are responsible for the failure to attempt to adjust this situation, in my judgment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think that it could have been adjusted as the Senator thinks it ought to have been. I was perfectly willing to allow the farmer to receive the price for his crop that the law of supply and demand fixed all the way through this war, and then to let him take his chances after the war. The farmer was willing to do that, and he objected to the fixing of the price of \$2.20 a bushel upon his grain. What he asked was, "If you subjected him and his product to the law of supply and demand, that you should allow that law to apply in every other avenue of trade and business."

Mr. President, in the discussion of this subject the other day the Senator from Missouri questioned the authority of the President, as I understood him, to maintain an embargo against the importation of wheat into the United States in order to maintain the price of wheat fixed by him. The unfinished business coming before the Senate at that moment prevented my replying to his question. The power is very clear and explicit. The provision is found in section 14 of the act approved August 10, 1917. I shall quote only sufficient from that section to make that clear. This is the way it reads:

SEC. 14. That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided for in this section, he is authorized, from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit.

In that is the power. Then the law proceeds:

When the President finds that the importation into the United States of any wheat produced outside of the United States materially enhances or is likely materially to enhance the liabilities of the United States under guaranties of prices therefor made pursuant to this section, and ascertains what rate of duty, added to the then existing rate of duty on wheat and to the value of wheat at the time of importation, would be sufficient to bring the price thereof at which imported up to the price fixed therefor pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall proclaim such facts, and thereafter there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon wheat when imported, in addition to the then existing rate of duty, the rate of duty so ascertained.

Mr. President, here is the power to fix the rate, and here is the authority to fix an importation charge that will protect the Government against any loss. The importation charge to protect the Government against any loss must necessarily be sufficiently high to prevent any importation at all. In other words, it must approach as nearly as possible an absolute embargo against any importation.

On September 2, 1918, in pursuance of this authority, the President proclaimed, after reciting the act, as follows:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the powers conferred upon me by said act of Congress, and especially by section 14 thereof, I do hereby find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided in said section, and in order to make effective the guaranty by Congress for the crop of 1919 and to assure such producers a reasonable profit, I do hereby determine and fix and give public notice of a reasonable guaranteed price of No. 1 northern spring wheat and its equivalents at the respective principal primary markets as follows, to wit:

Then follow the prices, ranging from \$2.39 a bushel at New York to \$2.21½ at Minneapolis, \$2.18 at Omaha, and \$2 at Spokane and points in Utah, Montana, and Idaho.

The proclamation then proceeds:

The sums thus determined and fixed are guaranteed by the Government of the United States at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned to every producer of wheat of any

grade so established under the United States grain-standards act, upon condition that said wheat is harvested in the United States during the year 1919 and offered for sale before the 1st day of June, 1920, to such agent and employee of the United States or other person as may be hereinafter designated at any one of the above-mentioned cities, which are hereby declared to be the principal primary markets of the United States.

My whole address here is a protest against the claim that the people of the United States are to expend a billion dollars of the money of the United States to maintain the price of the farmers' product. I think I have shown clearly enough that a revolving fund of \$500,000,000, if properly expended, would take care of the entire crop of 1919, and that in no case is it necessary for this Government to lose more than \$350,000,000, if it maintains the price of all of the wheat up to the price now fixed by the order of the President of the United States.

We are not losing anything. We are paying back to the farmer just about one-third of that which we took away from him in 1917 and in 1918; and I protest against the claim that we are imposing a burden upon the consumers of wheat when we have given those consumers a benefit of over \$100,000,000 a year, and are maintaining the earning capacity of the consuming public up to two or three times what it was when the farmer was receiving a dollar a bushel for his grain.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what he would think about this phase of the matter: If we are going to take this wheat at the price fixed, ought there not to be some arrangement whereby we would understand that the acreage would not be increased over that of last year?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not know how you would enforce a rule of that kind. That would seem to be an impossibility; and, above all, it probably would not amount to a difference of \$25,000,000 even if we attempted it, and I doubt if it could be worked out.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I would not take the time of the Senate to discuss this bill were it not for the fact that the people of my State, and in fact all the people of the Northwest, are vitally interested in its provisions.

I appreciate the importance of a bill coming before the Senate appropriating a billion dollars to fulfill the guaranty of the Government. It is one of the results of a price-fixing policy. I did not believe originally that price-fixing was wise. I believe it would have been better to have controlled the exports from this country, and to have allowed the natural elements of supply and demand to establish the price. But, Mr. President, I realize that I may have been mistaken. It was, of course, of the most surpassing importance at that time that we should produce in this country enough wheat to enable us not only to feed ourselves but to feed our allies and the armies fighting with us on the soil of France. Without a wheat surplus the war could not have been won, and this guaranty is in effect a war expenditure.

Conditions existing when this food bill was passed will readily be recalled, and there was included in its terms a provision permitting the President to guarantee a minimum price for wheat.

In the dark days of 1917, and even later, when the last guaranty was made, it seemed to the Government absolutely necessary, if we were to win the war, to increase the production of wheat in this country. This was the only Nation, or practically the only Nation, to which the world could turn for a supply. The U-boats had completely cut off shipping from Australia, Argentina, and India. Russia was in a state of revolution, with no possibility of producing any surplus for export. The only hope of production, therefore, rested in the United States and in Canada.

The wheat shortage in foreign countries—I mean principally the allied countries whose production had decreased—and the smallness of the 1917 crop in this country alarmed the allies and the people of this country, for if the shortage had recurred in 1918 it would have been impossible to have fed the armies and won the war.

I wish to insert in the RECORD after my remarks tables showing the wheat production of the various countries and the prices prevailing in this country when we passed the food bill and authorized the President to prescribe a guaranteed price. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the exhibits, but allow me to state that in August, 1917, when the food bill was passed, it developed that our total wheat crop was only 636,000,000 bushels, which represented the normal requirements in this country alone for food and for seed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the tables referred to will be printed as an appendix to the Senator's remarks.

Mr. KELLOGG. There was a deficiency of 400,000,000 bushels, compared with the previous year's crop. Allow me also to

suggest that in France the 1917-18 crop yielded only 144,000,000 bushels, as compared with a normal crop of about 300,000,000 bushels, and the prewar crop frequently amounted to 375,000,000 bushels. England's small production had also been reduced. Canada produced a fair crop; but the entire available crop when the food bill was introduced and when it was passed was absolutely insufficient without the most strenuous economies and substitutions of other food products for wheat to carry on the war.

That being the case, let us observe the price and market conditions as they existed in 1917, because good reason undoubtedly existed for the guaranty which the President made.

In May, 1917, when the food bill was under discussion, buyers from foreign countries were competing in our markets for wheat at any price. England was bidding against France, France was bidding against Italy, and neutral countries were bidding against all three, in a feverish anxiety to buy wheat. In May, 1917, when the necessity for market regulation developed in the United States, wheat was selling in Chicago at \$3.42 a bushel and in San Francisco at \$5 a bushel, and those prices continued during that summer, gradually being reduced as the passage of the food bill, with the authorization to fix prices, became more certain day by day, and on August 12, when the bill was finally passed, wheat in Minneapolis was selling at \$3.50 a bushel and in San Francisco at \$3.40 a bushel. Of course, the fact that the President had the power to fix a minimum price and that Congress was about to recommend a minimum of \$2, and, by reason of the licensing provision, the power to place an embargo on all foreign shipments, the authority vested in the President to establish a minimum of \$2, if expedient, had a resulting tendency to reduce the price.

In August the bill was passed. Congress fixed a minimum price of \$2 per bushel for 1918 and authorized the President to proclaim a guaranteed minimum price in the following language:

That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat and that it is essential that the producers of wheat, produced within the United States, shall have the benefit of the guaranty provided for in this section, he is authorized, from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain standards act, approved August 11, 1916.

There existed therefore a congressional enactment for a minimum of \$2 per bushel. The President immediately took under consideration the production in the United States and the production in foreign countries. He had estimates of the wheat required to support the armies, or allies, and certain neutral countries which were depending upon this country to avoid starvation; and the President found that \$2 a bushel was not sufficient to encourage proper production even for 1918, and he fixed the price at \$2.20. I am now speaking of the Chicago market. The others were graded according to freight rates. This was afterwards increased 6 cents to make up for the increase in freight rates prescribed by the Government after the railroads were taken over.

In February, 1918, the President fixed the price at \$2.26 in Chicago and corresponding prices in other markets of the country. I wish to place at the end of my remarks that part of the proclamation of the President giving the specific prices in each of the markets of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KELLOGG. Now, Mr. President, let me state in a few words the history of price fixing for 1919.

We must remember that while in August, 1918, the German Army had met with reverses at Chateau-Thierry and on the Marne it had not been decisively defeated. No one, I believe, thought the war would close in November. I believe almost everyone expected the war to last at least another year. The President was confronted with the realization that we were cut off from Australia, from Argentina, from India, that Roumania and Russia were producing nothing, so, I have no doubt, that it seemed imperative to the President that the price for 1919 should also be fixed at \$2.26.

In passing, let me say that we are not the only country which fixed a high price for wheat. I ask to have inserted in the Record here, as a part of my remarks, a quotation from the hearings before the Agricultural Committee of the House which shows the prices fixed in the foreign countries for 1918 and 1919; and it will be noted that prices in the United States and Canada were the lowest, compared with other countries. Prices soared as high as \$4.44 for wheat in Italy, and varied between that figure and \$3.30 in other countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FROM THE HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. HAUGEN. We will settle this price business. I have before me the prices fixed by the various countries. Italy, for instance, fixed the price of hard wheat for 1918 at \$3.60; soft wheat, \$3.18; in 1919, hard wheat, \$4.44; soft wheat, \$3.96. France, in 1919, \$3.84; 1918, \$3.96. All the time the United States got \$2.26. Holland, for instance, in 1919 fixed the price at \$3.30; in 1918, \$2.96. Switzerland, \$3.18 for 1919, \$3.36 for 1918. Norway, \$4.09 for 1919 and \$4.58 for 1918. The United States and Canada, \$2.24 for 1918.

Mr. KELLOGG. The other countries in Europe were apprehensive, as we were, that the war would last at least another year. They knew that food was absolutely necessary and that the price was of less importance than production. To be sure, the war ended suddenly, and it is quite likely that if we had not guaranteed the price for 1919, owing to the ability to some extent to ship grain from Argentina and from Australia, the price would be less than \$2.26. That is one of the things I shall discuss, and it is one of the risks we assumed when we gave our pledge, which the United States of America must and will keep, as it has kept all of its pledges.

Mr. President, it is true that it is always difficult to pay for a "dead horse," as they say. We only look at the amount that we are going to pay if there is a loss on this crop, and we observe the enormous amount of this appropriation, and all, of course, regret the necessity for it. I do not think the loss will reach a billion dollars. I shall discuss that matter later.

I have taken some pains to inquire of the best experts on the prices of wheat and flour, men who knew the conditions in 1917, to determine, if possible, the extent of the loss to the American people if the price had not been fixed. Now, in passing, let me say this:

There seems to be a general impression that the farmers asked to have the price fixed and guaranteed. I think the Senators will remember that neither the farmers nor representatives of farmers' organizations urged the fixation of prices in 1917. In fact, resolutions and protests from farmers and farmers' organizations against the fixing of prices were submitted from every section of the country.

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

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that there were a number of petitions presented in Congress for some form of fixing the price of wheat, or at least of curbing the activities of those who purchased wheat and who dealt in flour? As I recall, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota appeared here upon the floor on a number of occasions and urged that Congress fix the price of wheat.

Mr. KELLOGG. When the food bill was before the Congress the protests, with which I am familiar and which came to me, opposed action by the Government in fixing any price for wheat, because they knew that the price was at that time very much higher than the Government would recommend. I stated in the Senate on July 18, 1917, that—

the farmer is not asking you to single him out and guarantee him a minimum price. What he asks is that his market shall be left the same as all the other markets in the country, free and open. If you are not going to do that, if you are going to take away his market and control prices, then it is for the interest of the whole country more than it is for the interest of the farmer that the President be authorized to guarantee him a good, liberal minimum price.

I shall further answer the question. While the bill was pending it provided a minimum price of \$2, and while it was under consideration petitions and communications that I received were opposed to any price fixing at all, and why?

Wheat was selling, as I said before, in May, 1917, at \$3.42 a bushel in Minneapolis, and at from \$4.50 to \$5 in San Francisco. Is it reasonable to suppose that the farmer who knew the world crop was short, who knew that there was a very short crop in this country, would ask Congress to fix a price of \$2 when he was getting \$3.42 in my part of the country? Certainly not. The fact is that most of the petitions which I had came from people in the cities who feared the increase of prices beyond all reason, and they were properly very anxious about the subject.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. KING. There was some period, was there not, within the past two years, and even a short time before that, when the prices of flour were so great in proportion to the price of wheat, the disparity was so great, as to lead the farmers to a strong movement in favor of legislation that would at least give them a

higher price for their wheat measured by the price at which the flour was sold or bring the price of flour down nearer to the price of the wheat?

Mr. KELLOGG. I will answer that question in this way: The farmers submitted no petitions urging that the price of wheat be fixed at \$2 a bushel when it was selling in the market at \$3.42. In 1917, when the market for wheat was utterly beyond control and the market for flour had become inordinate, flour was proportionately too high compared with the price of wheat. The farmers sold the bulk of their wheat before May, 1917; in fact, they sold it in the autumn and winter of 1917, for the Senator knows that winter wheat is marketed fairly early in the autumn, and spring wheat during September, October, and November, at least, to a very large extent.

As to the demands of the farmers, after the President had intimated that he would himself fix the price in 1917 and 1918, and that the guaranteed price of \$2 a bushel as fixed by the Congress was inadequate, the farmers then petitioned the President to fix the price at \$2.50. I remember some of them did, and I presume that others asked a much higher price than that, because they knew that prices in the market would not normally have been less than \$2.50 and undoubtedly would have exceeded \$5.

I shall return, now, to the question of how much the American people have really lost, even if we should sacrifice the entire billion dollars, which I do not apprehend.

As stated, I have made a careful inquiry of men who were familiar with market prices in 1917, with the enormous demands of foreign countries, the wheat shortage here and in Europe, and the following is, I believe, a fair recital as to what might have occurred. I quote from a memorandum which was handed to me.

When you consider the fact that flour at the mill door went to \$16.75 a barrel in May, 1917, and without the stabilizing influence of the Food Administration would, no doubt, have gone to \$25 a barrel, you can readily see the saving to the public as represented between the difference of these prices and the price actually prevailing, which is under \$10 a barrel.

When that was written the price was still under \$10.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator state when that memorandum was written?

Mr. KELLOGG. It was written on February 17, 1919. It continues:

Assuming that flour would have gone to \$20 a barrel, the saving to the American consuming public was \$1,100,000,000, which in itself is a fair estimate of the actual saving effected.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator have before him the price of flour per barrel in Great Britain and in France and in South American countries at the time he says some expert says it might have reached \$25 a barrel except for the activities of the Food Administration?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not have information as to prices prevailing at that time in foreign countries. In Canada it was substantially the same as in this country. In South American countries, of course, they could not sell their crop, and they do not present fair illustrations of market prices. Argentina was unable to export her crop, because it could not be shipped. I can not give the Senator the prices, but I shall be glad to procure them if he desires.

Mr. KING. I have them generally in my mind, and I know they did not nearly approximate the maximum stated. I think that is a good deal of a fiction upon the part of the expert to whom the Senator refers. I think there is a determined effort upon the part of some, and, of course, I do not include the Senator nor any Senator for that matter, to make it appear that the losses to the farmer were extraordinarily great by reason of the passage of the Food Administration bill. I am in favor, of course, of the Government carrying out any contract which it made, but speaking generally I think it may be said that the farmers of the United States during the progress of the war have fared pretty well. They have received a good price for their farm products, for their cattle, their sheep, their pork, and certainly for their corn and cereal products on the farm. I do not think we make much by trying to have the farmers believe that the hand of the Government has been arrayed against them.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am not attempting to establish any such a case. I am simply stating the facts, for I know the Senator is aware that one of the reasons for the passage of the bill was that wheat then sold at \$3.42 a bushel and there was general anxiety in the country that it would greatly exceed that figure.

I recall that a number of men who were familiar with market conditions told me in May, 1917, that they had no idea where

wheat would go unless the Government controlled it, and I believe, and it was a perfectly proper consideration for the Congress, that one of the important inducements for passing the bill was that flour and wheat prices should not rise too high; and it had equal influence in guaranteeing the increased production. I simply state that as a part of the history.

We made a pledge. The Congress thought it was wise. The President thought it was wise. The fact is that the solemn pledge of the Government has been made and we must redeem it. What means are to be employed and in what manner may we protect the Government from the greatest loss, minimize that loss to the country and furnish food to the people at reasonable and fair prices? This bill provides a means of purchasing the crop by the Government and selling it in the market. There have been three plans suggested and discussed at great length before the Committee on Agriculture, and, with the permission of the Senate, for a few moments I desire to state those plans.

One plan contemplated opening the markets of the country and allowing grain to be sold at prices declared by the various grain exchanges in the markets of this country and in Europe, and settling with the farmer for the difference between the price he actually received at his market and the price he would have received had he been paid the Government guaranteed price of \$2.26.

There seemed to the committee, as I understand, though I am not upon the committee, various objections to this, namely, that it would require the vast machinery of the Government to deal with millions of farmers individually; that the farmer would feel an uncertainty as to what price he was going to receive from the Government; and that he would have to institute a claim against the Government and collect it. I believe it may be said without reflecting upon public officials that the people do not look with favor upon the practice of collecting their losses from the Government. Throwing open the grain exchanges of the country would also have tended to manipulation. Foreign countries could enter the markets or refuse to compete; and either crowd prices down and increase the loss to the Government or push them up after the farmers had sold their grain. In any event, it seemed to the committee that it was an impractical way of adjusting the loss and compensating the farmer, who would have had to deal with each local elevator or grain market agent in every village, town, and market of the country, and the Government would have been compelled to make that agent its representative for adjusting the credits and losses with the individual farmer. So that plan was not adopted.

The second plan was to buy the grain and to sell it to the American people, or so much of it as could be sold, at the guaranteed price, thereby compelling the American people to pay for their flour on the basis of \$2.26 per bushel for wheat, irrespective of the price charged by us for the surplus which we might sell in foreign countries, and irrespective of the price that foreign countries would pay for their bread. It seemed, I believe, to the committee that we ought not to charge the American workingman and the American business man and the millions of people in this country who must have bread a higher price than other countries were paying for it or any more than what would ordinarily be the normal market price.

The third plan, which I understand to be the one really adopted by the committee, was to authorize the President to purchase the grain at the guaranteed price and to sell it at a fair world market price. There is a provision in the bill which is supposed to effectuate that object.

It provides that the President may purchase "for cash, or sell, consign, or contract for the sale of, for cash or on credit, wheat of the said crops of 1918 and 1919 and flour produced therefrom at the said guaranteed prices or at such other prices and on such terms or conditions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and to enable the people of the United States to purchase wheat products at a reasonable price."

Of course, the Grain Corporation, which is the machinery to be used to purchase and sell this crop, may undoubtedly have some influence in foreign markets in fixing the world's level of prices, because whatever amount Europe draws from Argentina, from Australia, from Canada or India—and those are the only countries from which the European countries can obtain a supply—in all human probability she must still purchase from us from 250,000,000 to 350,000,000 bushels of wheat, depending upon the world's crop; and while we may have a much larger surplus than that, yet I think anybody will realize that our selling agency may have some influence in the European countries in fixing prices. But undoubtedly should there be a great

world surplus we could maintain the world market at \$2.26 a bushel. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has discussed the necessity for having a billion-dollar appropriation. I realize that that is a very important question in view of the enormous appropriations which this Congress must make. In order to decide whether the appropriation should be a billion dollars we must understand the conditions under which the grain is marketed, and 1918 is not a fair illustration of what 1919 will be. In 1918 the Government created a grain corporation with a capital of \$150,000,000, and that corporation borrowed from other departments of the Government and from the banks in amounts ranging, I understand, from \$250,000,000 to \$350,000,000, and perhaps \$400,000,000. I have not the exact figures before me. Why was it necessary to have \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 this last year? To be sure, the Government could sell most of the grain it purchased as soon as it could transport it to Europe, but in this country there are thousands of elevator companies—the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] will correct me if I am in error—and I think there are three or four thousand farmers' elevators in the Northwest owned by the farmers.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. KELLOGG. There are hundreds of line elevators and many terminal elevators in the cities all the way from New York to the Pacific coast. All those companies have large capital. The farmers' elevators have some capital, but not as much, of course, as others mentioned, but they are usually not included in line systems. They were perfectly willing to invest all their capital to purchase the grain, provided there was assurance that the surplus would be taken off their hands at the Government guaranteed price. The result was that every elevator in the country was authorized to purchase grain at a fixed price. They were authorized themselves to sell to millers at a fixed price and to turn over to the Government at any time the surplus in the form of wheat tickets, or what are known as warehouse tickets, and receive their pay from the Government; and the Government stood ready and did at once accept through the wheat corporation every bushel of wheat offered.

There were about 319,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat in this country last year out of a crop of 917,000,000 bushels. As I understand, the United States Grain Corporation has already sold over 250,000,000 bushels at the guaranteed price, plus the cost of handling, and it will undoubtedly sell the remainder this year at the guaranteed price to foreign countries. So the Grain Corporation will have a capital of \$150,000,000 and probably \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 as handling charges for the crop.

Mr. CURTIS. I think at a committee hearing a few months ago it was shown that the Grain Corporation already had a profit of some \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; the Grain Corporation derived a profit from the sale of grain to foreign countries of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 some five or six months ago, and they hoped to increase that when the whole crop this year is sold. I understand there will be a capital of \$150,000,000 to \$160,000,000 or \$170,000,000 to begin with.

We will be confronted with the same condition this coming year. But before I come to that let me say that I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] intended to state that money had been wasted. My opinion is that the Grain Corporation, through Mr. Barnes, who is a very able man, handled the wheat crop of 1918 with great ability and has not wasted any money and will really make a profit for the Government in the sales to foreign countries. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is more familiar with the details of it than I am, but I believe that to be true.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is estimated by the Agricultural Department that there have been about 49,000,000 acres sown to winter wheat, which would be an increase in acreage of 16 per cent over last year; that if the spring wheat is increased in the same proportion there will be about 75,000,000 acres, and we may expect a crop ranging from 950,000,000 to 1,100,000,000 or 1,200,000,000 bushels, and possibly more, though I quite agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that it is unlikely that we will realize the larger amount. We rarely realize the expectations of February and March.

But assuming that there should be a billion bushels of wheat, the Grain Corporation must be prepared to take every bushel of wheat offered by any elevator or mill company or any purchaser in order to invite all the private capital in the country to invest in wheat. No purchaser, whether it is a farmers' elevator, a line elevator, or a mill, will buy grain at a Government guar-

anteed price unless that customer knows it can sell the wheat at the same price. In fact, as I said yesterday in the Senate, if we should fail to pass this legislation and the Government guaranty of \$2.26 should continue, there would not be a dollar of capital in this country nor any of the facilities of the elevator companies and mill men throughout the country available to handle the crop of 1919.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that the Government should have repealed the law providing for a guaranty of \$2.26 for spring wheat because the spring wheat crop had not then been planted. I suppose the Senate is familiar with the fact that the winter wheat crop is on an average double the amount of the spring wheat crop. If we should have a billion bushels of wheat it is probable that 650,000,000 bushels or thereabouts would be winter wheat and 350,000,000 bushels would be spring wheat. To be sure the spring wheat is not yet planted, but spring wheat is planted with winter wheat all the way from Texas to the northern boundary of this country. Generally speaking the spring-wheat country consists of Iowa to some extent, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; considerable is raised in Nebraska, Kansas, and the amount diminishes as you go south.

If the Government was to repeal the law as to spring wheat, to say nothing about good faith at this time, it would be entirely and absolutely impracticable. The spring wheat will begin to be planted in a very few days, if it has not already commenced in the Middle Western States. Not only that, but if anyone knows how they could maintain an open market in this country for spring wheat and a closed market for winter wheat existing side by side, they know more about economics in handling grain than I do. It can not be done. Furthermore, whenever a farmer takes his wheat to the market, some one would have to determine whether it was winter wheat or spring wheat, and many other complications, to say nothing about the honor and credit of the United States, would, I think, make it entirely impracticable.

No repeal was undertaken, and, as I said before, the farmer has prepared to plant and is now in some parts of the country, actually planting, if he has not already planted, his spring wheat. In my country it will soon commence. They have prepared for it. The ground is plowed, every arrangement has been made in the way of purchasing or keeping the seed, and in all their other farm arrangements for the spring of 1919 the matter has been kept carefully in mind.

I know of no other way in which our Government can honorably fulfill its pledge, a pledge made in the darkest days of the war, when wheat was as necessary as men to fight the battles, but for the Government to purchase the crop or provide means for its purchase, thus carrying out the compact. It is one of the resulting losses, one of the expenses, I might say, of the war. When this country undertook to marshal not only its millions of men to fight the battles of this war, but all its resources, all its energies, and all its economic forces, we did not hesitate to pay any price for munitions and instrumentalities with which to prosecute the war. We did not hesitate to safeguard allied nations against famine while fighting the battles of the war. I say now that the only honorable course is to meet this pledge in the most economical and efficient way possible, and I believe this measure accomplishes that object.

I can not say how much the loss will be to the American people. To be sure, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] said, we have only to buy the surplus, and if we buy the crop and it is the policy of this country to sell that wheat to the people of this country at the same price, or substantially the same price, it is to be sold in Europe, we may sustain great loss. It is not probable that it will amount to a billion dollars; but, after all, can we afford to say to the American people that they shall pay a guaranteed war price for their bread and the peoples of Europe may buy it cheaper, or is it better for us to pay the loss as a war item and let the American people derive benefits the same as people of foreign countries?

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

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am not quite sure, in view of the last statement and the preceding one just submitted by the Senator, whether he advises that the Government shall sell the wheat and the flour which it takes over or which it may take over on the market at market prices or whether, by putting on a prohibitive tariff or a tariff or embargo of some character, and thus keeping out any competition, it will attempt to raise the wheat price higher in order that it may be made whole, thus, of course, compelling the domestic consumer to pay more than the world market price for wheat and flour.

Mr. KELLOGG. My judgment is that the honest and most beneficial thing to do would be to sell the wheat crop and the flour produced from it to the American people at the fair world market prices so that they as well as Europe may have the benefit of those prices. That is my judgment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Minnesota takes very safe and sound ground in the statement just made. I now ask the Senator whether he agrees with the position taken by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 would be sufficient for the purpose of covering the loss that the Government may sustain, and that that fund would be sufficient to carry out any legitimate responsibility resting upon the Government under the promise which has been made, and which the Senator has discussed?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, three or four or five hundred million dollars in all human probability would not begin to be enough to handle the crop, whether our loss is \$300,000,000 or \$500,000,000. I will state the reason to the Senator. Even this year, with a market for all the wheat we could ship abroad and as rapidly as we could ship it, it required from \$350,000,000 to \$500,000,000 to handle the crop.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator explain where Mr. Barnes and the committee that had control of this matter obtained funds with which to handle the crop?

Mr. KELLOGG. I stated that the Grain Corporation, under the law and order of the President, was authorized to borrow the balance of its capital. The Government advanced temporarily out of other funds, I am told, \$125,000,000 I think it was, which has already been returned. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] will correct me if I am wrong. They have borrowed the balance from the banks throughout the country. At times, I understand, those amounts ran from \$150,000,000 to \$250,000,000.

The fact is that as rapidly as the grain reached the terminal elevators in all the markets of the West the elevator companies simply took a warehouse receipt, turned it over to the Grain Corporation, and received their money. In no other way could the elevator companies, the Grain Corporation, and the mills have handled it, because they had no market in which to sell it. They were only permitted to sell to the mills at the Government price. At one time I know the Government had in store in the elevators of this country 234,000,000 bushels of wheat, and I think the Senator from North Dakota will bear me out in saying that that was some time in November. That amount of wheat at the market price represented nearly \$500,000,000. The fact is that even last year, with the ready demand in foreign countries, the grain could not be shipped as rapidly as it was received by the Grain Corporation, and, of course, if we should have a billion bushel crop next year and a market only for 300,000,000 bushels, the Government would require greater storage facilities to handle the surplus, which possibly may extend into next year.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Minnesota is correct in his statement. Congress appropriated only \$150,000,000, to be used as a revolving fund, and whatever money was used above that was borrowed by the Grain Corporation. I do not know why any Senator should assume that we are appropriating a billion dollars here to be paid to anybody. It is an authorization, and the President would be allowed to draw upon this fund to the amount of a billion dollars. If it is not required, of course it will not be used; but Mr. Barnes—and I am glad to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I indorse what he has stated with reference to Mr. Barnes—has handled this matter efficiently and well. I have followed it with some interest, I will say to the Senator. Mr. Barnes has testified that we ought to have a billion dollars; that, in his judgment, we should not have any less. It was at first proposed that we should have a billion and a quarter dollars, but that was cut down to a billion dollars; not with any idea or view that this was going to be a loss to the Government—but I shall explain that later on, as I do not wish to take the Senator's time.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from North Dakota has made such a statement. There are in this country thousands of elevator companies, as I stated, and several thousand farmers' elevator companies, line elevator companies, terminal companies, storage companies, and so forth, all over the wheat country. In fact, they are found all the way from New York to San Francisco. They have very large private capital and the capacity for borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars if necessary, but unless the Government has a fund upon which the Grain Corporation may draw so as to insure purchasers that they may at any time turn it over to the Grain Corporation that private capital will not invest in grain.

I know that many of the experts who have talked to me about it—and I presume they have presented the same facts to the committee—said that this was in the nature of an insurance fund, so that private capital would step in and handle the grain and sell it to the mills, knowing that when they had a surplus they could turn it over to the Grain Corporation and get their money at any time. No company, no individual, would dare purchase a bushel of wheat at a guaranteed price, either last year or this year, unless the Grain Corporation, under authority of the Government, insured the purchase. I do not believe the entire billion dollars will be required to handle the crop, but I think it is necessary to appropriate that amount as a guaranty fund to insure the safe handling of next year's crop.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to inquire whether, in view of the statement just made, opportunities are afforded under this bill for speculation? The Senator has just alluded to the fact that this billion dollars would be treated as a sort of insurance fund, and would induce grain elevators, terminals, and private persons to go into the market and purchase grain and then dispose of it to others.

Mr. KELLOGG. I can answer positively that the Grain Corporation has power to issue, and does issue, licenses to every mill, every grain dealer, and every elevator company, and fixes the price at which the elevator companies shall sell to the mills, and the price the mill companies shall charge, so that there is no opportunity whatever for speculation; but it will permit the elevator companies to sell to the mills at the price fixed by the Government, so as to avoid investment by the Government in grain and withdrawal of funds while it is being turned over. They permit elevator companies to sell direct to the mills at the guaranteed price.

Mr. McCUMBER. What is the profit, then, that is given, and how is the profit paid to the elevator companies?

Mr. KELLOGG. That is determined by the Grain Corporation. They absolutely regulate the price.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well. Then let me ask the Senator this question: If that is true, why not let the grain pass along finally to the miller just as rapidly as the miller needs to use it; and why is not the miller's cash invested in that as he needs it?

Mr. KELLOGG. It is.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, if the milling capacity of the country is kept going all the time, it is paying out for that wheat not through the Government, but paying out cash to the mills for that wheat from month to month, from week to week, and from day to day, then finally do we not get down to the proposition that all the Government needs to look out for, if this fund is operated economically and properly, is to take care of any surplus that may be put into the market above what the millers need to grind?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Therefore, all we have got to do is to take care of the surplus. The Senator would not claim that that would amount to very many hundreds of millions of bushels at any one time?

Mr. KELLOGG. It is not at all improbable that the Grain Corporation, representing the Government, may have to buy and to store more than 500,000,000 bushels at one time. Of course everyone knows that can not be accomplished with three or four or five hundred million dollars.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me one further question, as I understand the Senator's position it is that in order to stabilize the market, to prevent speculation, to give the Government the power to handle this as it may see fit, it must assume a continuation of the war powers and go into the States, give out licenses, and take charge of these purely domestic matters?

Mr. KELLOGG. There is no other way to handle it. If the Senator will read the testimony of every witness before the Agricultural Committee, he will see that it is impossible to throw open the grain exchanges during the time this grain would be handled, to be manipulated by everyone who desired to enter the exchange.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that the Congress of the United States now, when the war is over, has the power to project itself into the States, to conduct a licensing system, and to prescribe the pains and the penalties for infraction of ordinances and laws that may be passed?

Mr. KELLOGG. I have not the slightest doubt of it. This guaranty was made pursuant to a war power. Peace has not been concluded. The guaranty operates for 1919, and the Government has the power beyond question to carry it out.

Mr. KING. But the operations extend to 1920.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is only to the end of the 1919 crop year,

Wholesale price of wheat per bushel, 1912-1917.

Date.	New York.		Baltimore.		Chicago.		Detroit.		St. Louis.		Minneapolis.		San Francisco.	
	No. 2 red winter.		No. 2 red.		No. 1 northern spring.		No. 2 red.		No. 2 red winter.		No. 1 northern.		White (per 100 lbs.).	
	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.	Low.	High.
1912.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
January-June	98½	127	95½	116½	107	122	95½	120	92½	125½	103½	118½	150	190
July-December	103½	118½	94½	106	85	116	101½	112	94	115½	80½	112½	149	165
1913.														
January-June	107	114½	105½	109½	87½	96	102½	116½	93	115	82½	89½	155	182½
July-December	94	107	89½	96½	85	95½	87½	102½	83	97½	80½	93½	155	172½
1914.														
January-June	87½	111½	83	103	89	100	86½	99½	75½	99½	84½	98½	151½	165
July-December	86½	136½	82½	127	88½	133	80	127½	76	127½	85½	129½	152	200
1915.														
January-June	126	178	111	168½	123	167	114½	165	110	164	114½	165½	165	240
July-December	108½	144½	100½	127½	99	153½	106	132	106	129	89	155	140	185
1916.														
January	138½	156½	123	141½	119½	139½	122	137	122	143	118½	138½	150	190
February	130½	154	116	137½	112	138	111½	135½	116	142	108½	136½	160	185
March	130½	139	112½	119½	109½	123	110½	118½	112	122	108½	120½	160	175
April	129½	143	114½	123	115½	128	117	124	116	130½	117½	126½	160	170
May	124½	136	104	119½	116	126	108½	123½	106	125	113½	128½	160	170
June	113½	132½	100½	105½	116	118	103	113½	106	114	106½	119½	160	170
January-June	113½	150½	100½	141½	106½	139½	103	137	106	143	106½	138½	150	190
July	123½	143	102½	126	110	131½	104	129½	109	136½	107½	132½	160	185
August	144	179	125½	157	126½	164½	130	154½	129	165	127½	165½	190	210
September	168½	184½	148½	157	150	171½	144½	156	147	172	152	167½	185	225
October	185½	209½	150½	192½	164	202	157½	188	158	195	169½	193½	185	275
November	188	215	174	193½	165	200	171	189½	177	196	177	200	240	290
December	183	206	159	183	155½	190	171	187½	168	187	159½	188½	250	290
July-December	123½	215	102½	193½	110	202	104	189½	100	196	107½	200	160	290
1917.														
January	207	226	184½	203	178½	205	178½	196½	183	206	175	199	250	285
February	197	220½	168½	197	162½	199	171	194½	171	202	166½	193	250	285
March	216	238	194½	213½	183½	213	192	210	194	220	184½	211	250	300
April	223½	292	215½	303	205½	295½	213	300	221½	310	203	296	275	450
May	279½	320	274½	342	258	340	267	340	265	342	247	339	450	500
June			220	283	249	310	245	295	222	298	222	315		
January-June	197	320	168½	342	162½	340	171	340	171	342	166½	339	250	500
July			200	240	217	300	225	255	210	273	228½	295	330	360
August			212	234	221	300	215	250	214	257½	215	303	340	390
September	229	231	222	226	220	200	219	220	215	227	215	221	340	365
October	229	229	222	224	220	220	217	219	215	215	215	215	350	350
November	229	229	222	224	220	220	217	219	215	215	215	215	350	350
December	229	229	222	224	220	220	217	219	215	215	215	215	350	350
July-December	229	231	209	240	217	300	215	255	210	273	215	305	330	390

Wheat production and exports, United States, year ending July 1.

Year.	Production.	Exports domestic wheat.	Per cent.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	
1912	621,338,000	79,689,404	12.83
1913	731,267,000	142,870,597	19.57
1914	783,380,000	145,590,849	19.07
1915	891,017,000	332,464,976	37.31
1916	1,025,801,000	243,117,026	23.70
1917	631,655,000	203,573,928	31.99
1918	917,100,000	132,411,997	14.40

Wheat production in principal countries: average 1909-10 to 1913-14 and annual 1914-1917. (Thousands of bushels.)

	Average 1909-10 to 1913-14.	1914 and 1914-15.	1915 and 1915-16.	1916 and 1916-17.	1917 and 1917-18 (preliminary estimates).
Western allied European countries:					
France	317,635	282,683	222,775	204,908	144,149
Italy	183,335	169,582	170,541	176,530	139,969
United Kingdom	59,638	62,431	73,913	60,630	63,824
Total	560,608	514,702	467,229	442,068	347,972
Russia:					
European	624,615	573,376	749,862	525,418	
Asiatic, 9 Governments	82,371		98,740		
Total	706,986		848,602		
English and French colonies and dependencies:					
Canada	204,708	161,281	426,748	262,781	231,730
Australia	90,499	24,894	179,627	145,475	122,880
India	351,762	312,028	376,726	318,002	379,303
Egypt	34,814	32,830	39,146	35,543	30,000
Algeria	34,968	19,165	34,653	29,151	28,979
Tunis	6,224	2,205	11,023	7,165	7,000
Total	723,005	552,403	1,067,923	797,117	799,892

Wheat production in principal countries, etc.—Continued.

	Average 1909-10 to 1913-14.	1914 and 1914-15.	1915 and 1915-16.	1916 and 1916-17.	1917 and 1917-18 (preliminary estimates).
The United States and South American exporting countries:					
United States	686,692	891,017	1,025,801	639,886	650,828
Argentina	147,062	169,166	172,650	70,224	237,913
Chile	20,062	19,000	21,145	(21,145)	(21,145)
Uruguay	6,518	3,597	9,867	5,390	10,000
Total	860,331	1,082,780	1,229,463	736,645	919,888
Neutral European countries:					
Spain	130,446	116,087	139,298	152,329	141,008
Switzerland	3,314	3,278	3,957	3,821	4,556
Netherlands	4,898	5,688	5,681	4,710	3,452
Denmark	5,342	5,787	7,984	6,044	(6,004)
Norway	305	298	283	316	243
Sweden	8,117	8,473	9,171	8,979	7,495
Total	152,422	139,581	166,374	176,190	162,799
Total above, excluding Russia	2,296,369	2,289,466	2,933,989	2,146,884	2,241,944
Central powers and their allies:					
Germany	152,117	145,945	141,675		
Hungary (Kingdom)	156,523	105,237	151,495		
Austria	60,840				
Bulgaria	42,439	25,981	46,212		
Total	411,919				
Territory occupied wholly or in part by the central powers:					
Romania	87,791	46,237	89,786	78,521	
Serbia	14,775				
Belgium	14,886				
Luxemburg	614	525	514	433	390
Total	118,076				

FIXING GUARANTEED PRICES FOR WHEAT.

A proclamation by the President of the United States of America.

Whereas under and by virtue of an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved by the President on the 10th day of August, 1917, it is provided among other things as follows:

"SEC. 14. That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided for in this section, he is authorized from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain standards act approved August 11, 1916. The President shall from time to time establish and promulgate such regulations as he shall deem wise in connection with such guaranteed prices, and in particular governing conditions of delivery and payment; and differences in price for the several standard grades in the principal primary markets of the United States adopting No. 1 northern spring or its equivalent at the principal interior primary markets as the basis. Thereupon the Government of the United States hereby guarantees every producer of wheat produced within the United States that, upon compliance by him with the regulations prescribed, he shall receive for any wheat produced in reliance upon this guaranty within the period, not exceeding 18 months, prescribed in the notice, a price not less than the guaranteed price therefor as fixed pursuant to this section. In such regulations the President shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which any such producer shall be entitled to the benefits of such guaranty."

Now therefore I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, by virtue of the powers conferred upon me by said act of Congress, and especially by section 14 thereof, do hereby find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guarantee provided for in said section; and, in order to make effective the guarantee by Congress for the crop of 1919 and to assure such producers a reasonable profit, I do hereby determine and fix, and give public notice of reasonable guaranteed prices for No. 1 northern spring wheat and its equivalent at the respective principal primary markets as follows, to wit:

New York, N. Y., \$2.39½ per bushel.
Philadelphia, Pa., \$2.39 per bushel.
Baltimore, Md., \$2.38½ per bushel.
Newport News, Va., \$2.38½ per bushel.
Duluth, Minn., \$2.22½ per bushel.
Minneapolis, Minn., \$2.21½ per bushel.
Chicago, Ill., \$2.26 per bushel.
St. Louis, Mo., \$2.24 per bushel.
Kansas City, Mo., \$2.18 per bushel.
Omaha, Nebr., \$2.18 per bushel.
New Orleans, La., \$2.28 per bushel.
Galveston, Tex., \$2.28 per bushel.
Tacoma, Wash., \$2.20 per bushel.
Seattle, Wash., \$2.20 per bushel.
Portland, Oreg., \$2.20 per bushel.
Astoria, Oreg., \$2.20 per bushel.
San Francisco, Cal., \$2.20 per bushel.
Los Angeles, Cal., \$2.20 per bushel.
Salt Lake City, Utah, \$2 per bushel.
Great Falls, Mont., \$2 per bushel.
Pocatello, Idaho, \$2 per bushel.
Spokane, Wash., \$2 per bushel;

and that the guaranteed price for the other grades established under the United States grain standards act approved August 11, 1916, based on said price for No. 1 northern spring wheat at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned, will assure the producers of wheat produced within the United States a reasonable profit, the guaranteed prices in the principal primary markets above mentioned being fixed by adopting No. 1 northern spring wheat or its equivalents at the principal interior markets as the basis.

For the purposes of such guaranty only, I hereby fix the guaranteed prices at the respective principal primary markets above mentioned for the following grades of wheat, to wit: No. 1 northern spring, No. 1 hard winter, No. 1 red winter, No. 1 Durum, No. 1 hard white. The guaranteed price at the respective principal primary markets aforesaid of all other grades of wheat established under the United States grain standards act approved August 11, 1916, shall be based on the above guaranteed prices and bear just relation thereto.

The sums thus determined and fixed are guaranteed by the Government of the United States at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned, to every producer of wheat of any grade so established under the United States grain standards act, upon the condition that said wheat is harvested in the United States during the year 1919, and offered for sale before the 1st day of June, 1920, to such agent or employee of the United States, or other person as may be hereafter designated, at any one of the above-mentioned cities, which are hereby declared to be the principal primary markets of the United States, and provided that such producer complies with all regulations which may be hereafter promulgated in regard to said guaranty by the President of the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done in the District of Columbia, this 2d day of September, in the year of Our Lord 1918, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

WOODROW WILSON.

[SEAL.]
By the President:
ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State.

VALIDATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a conference report, and move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator to what subject the report relates?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. To the validation of war contracts.
Mr. GORE. Does the Senator think it will require very long discussion?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think so.
Mr. GORE. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, although I am not sure whether it is the unfinished business, for that matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator does not need to do that.

Mr. GORE. Very well.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report presented by the Senator from Oregon will not displace the unfinished business, unless the Senate adjourns before its consideration is concluded.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the request; I did not understand.
The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.
The Secretary read the report 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. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to adjust, pay, or discharge any agreement, express or implied, upon a fair and equitable basis that has been entered into, in good faith during the present emergency and prior to November 12, 1918, by any officer or agent acting under his authority, direction, or instruction, or that of the President, with any person, firm, or corporation for the acquisition of lands, or the use thereof, or for damages resulting from notice by the Government of its intention to acquire or use said lands, or for the production, manufacture, sale, acquisition or control of equipment, materials or supplies, or for services, or for facilities, or other purposes connected with the prosecution of the war, when such agreement has been performed in whole or in part, or expenditures have been made or obligations incurred upon the faith of the same by any such person, firm, or corporation prior to November 12, 1918, and such agreement has not been executed in the manner prescribed by law: *Provided*, That in no case shall any award either by the Secretary of War or the Court of Claims include prospective or possible profits on any part of the contract beyond the goods and supplies delivered to and accepted by the United States and a reasonable remuneration for expenditures and obligations or liabilities necessarily incurred in performing or preparing to perform said contract or order: *Provided further*, That this act shall not authorize payment to be made of any claim not presented before June 30, 1919: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall report to Congress at the beginning of its next session following June 30, 1919, a detailed statement showing the nature, terms, and conditions of every such agreement and the payment or adjustment thereof: *And provided further*, That no settlement of any claim arising under any such agreement shall bar the United States Government through any of its duly authorized agencies, or any committee of Congress hereafter duly appointed, from the right of review of such settlement nor the right of recovery of any money paid by the Government to any party under any settlement entered into or payment made under the provisions of this act, if the Government has been defrauded, and the right of recovery in all such cases shall exist against the executors, administrators, heirs, successors, and assigns of any party or parties: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to relieve any officer or agent of the United States from criminal prosecution under the provisions of any statute of the United States for any fraud or criminal conduct: *And provided further*, That this act shall in no way relieve or excuse any officer or his agent from such criminal prosecution because of any irregularity or illegality in the manner of the execution of such agreement: *And provided further*, That in all proceedings hereunder witnesses may be compelled to attend, appear, and testify, and produce books, papers and letters, or other documents; and the claim

that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving the same shall not excuse such witness from testifying, but such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person in the trial of any criminal proceeding.

"Sec. 2. That the Court of Claims is hereby given jurisdiction on petition of any individual, firm, company or corporation referred to in section 1 hereof to find and award fair and just compensation in the cases specified in said section in the event that such individual, firm, company or corporation shall not be willing to accept the adjustment, payment or compensation offered by the Secretary of War as hereinbefore provided, or in the event that the Secretary of War shall fail or refuse to offer a satisfactory adjustment, payment or compensation as provided for in said section.

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War, through such agency as he may designate or establish, is empowered, upon such terms as he or it may determine to be in the interest of the United States, to make equitable and fair adjustments and agreements, upon the termination or in settlement or readjustment of agreements or arrangements entered into with any foreign government or governments or nationals thereof prior to November 12, 1918, for the furnishing to the American Expeditionary Forces or otherwise for war purposes of supplies, materials, facilities, services or the use of property, or for the furnishing of any thereof by the United States to any foreign government or governments, whether or not such agreements or arrangements have been entered into in accordance with applicable statutory provisions; and the other provisions of this act shall not be applicable to such adjustments.

"Sec. 4. That whenever, under the provisions of this act, the Secretary of War shall make an award to any prime contractor with respect to any portion of his contract which he shall have sublet to any other person, firm, or corporation who has in good faith made expenditures, incurred obligations, rendered service, or furnished material, equipment, or supplies to such prime contractor, with the knowledge and approval of any agent of the Secretary of War duly authorized thereunto, before payment of said award the Secretary of War shall require such prime contractor to present satisfactory evidence of having paid said subcontractor or of the consent of said subcontractor to look for his compensation to said prime contractor only; and in the case of the failure of said prime contractor to present such evidence or such consent, the Secretary of War shall pay directly to said subcontractor the amount found to be due under said award; and in case of the insolvency of any prime contractor the subcontractor of said prime contractor shall have a lien upon the funds arising from said award prior and superior to the lien of any general creditor of said prime contractor.

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to adjust, liquidate, and pay such net losses as have been suffered by any person, firm, or corporation by reason of producing or preparing to produce either manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten in compliance with the request or demand of the Department of the Interior, the War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, the Shipping Board, or the Emergency Fleet Corporation to supply the urgent needs of the Nation in the prosecution of the war; said minerals being enumerated in the act of Congress approved October 5, 1918, entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply.'

"The said Secretary shall make such adjustments and payments in each case as he shall determine to be just and equitable; that the decision of said Secretary shall be conclusive and final, subject to the limitation hereinafter provided; that all payments and expenses incurred by said Secretary, including personal services, traveling and subsistence expenses, supplies, postage, printing, and all other expenses incident to the proper prosecution of this work, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem essential and proper, shall be paid from the funds appropriated by the said act of October 5, 1918, and that said funds and appropriations shall continue to be available for said purpose until such time as the said Secretary shall have fully exercised the authority herein granted and performed and completed the duties hereby provided and imposed: *Provided, however*, That the payments and disbursements made under the provisions of this section for and in connection with the payments and settlements of the claims herein described and the said expenses of administration shall in no event exceed the sum of \$8,500,000: *And provided further*, That said Secretary shall consider, approve, and dispose of only such claims as shall be made hereunder and filed

with the Department of the Interior within three months from and after the approval of this act: *And provided further*, That no claim shall be allowed or paid by said Secretary unless it shall appear to the satisfaction of the said Secretary that the expenditures so made or obligations so incurred by the claimant were made in good faith for or upon property which contained either manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten in sufficient quantities to be of commercial importance: *And provided further*, That no claims shall be paid unless it shall appear to the satisfaction of said Secretary that moneys were invested or obligations were incurred subsequent to April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, in a legitimate attempt to produce either manganese, chrome, pyrites, or tungsten for the needs of the Nation for the prosecution of the war, and that no profits of any kind shall be included in the allowance of any of said claims, and that no investment for merely speculative purposes shall be recognized in any manner by said Secretary: *And provided further*, That the settlement of any claim arising under the provisions of this section shall not bar the United States Government, through any of its duly authorized agencies or any committee of Congress hereafter duly appointed, from the right of review of such settlement nor the right to recover any money paid by the Government to any party under and by virtue of the provisions of this section, if the Government has been defrauded, and the right of recovery in all such cases shall extend to the executors, administrators, heirs, and assigns of any party.

"That a report of all operations under this section, including receipts and disbursements, shall be made to Congress on or before the first Monday in December of each year.

"That nothing in this section shall be construed to confer jurisdiction upon any court to entertain a suit against the United States: *Provided further*, That in determining the net losses of any claimant the Secretary of the Interior shall, among other things, take into consideration and charge to the claimant the then market value of any ores or minerals on hand belonging to the claimant, and also the salvage or usable value of any machinery or other appliances which may be claimed was purchased to equip said mine for the purpose of complying with the request or demand of the agencies of the Government above mentioned in the manner aforesaid."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
D. U. FLETCHER,
C. S. THOMAS,
F. E. WARREN,
P. C. KNOX,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. H. DENT, JR.,
W. J. FIELDS,
JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the conference report, because it does not include matter that was passed by the House and which, substantially in the same form, was passed by the Senate. The matter to which I refer was left out of the conference report. I call the attention of the Chair first to Rule XXVII, which provides:

Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses.

I call the attention of the Chair to the wording of the rule, which says that the conferees shall not "strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses."

I read from page 3 of the bill as passed by the House:

And provided further, That the names of such contractors and the amounts of such partial or final settlements shall be filed with the Clerk of the House, for the information of Congress, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the Official Bulletin or as a public document 10 days before confirmation and payment is authorized upon such contracts.

On page 14 of the bill which passed the Senate on that subject is found the following:

And provided further, That the names of such contractors and the amounts of such partial or final settlements shall be filed with the Clerk of the House, for the information of Congress, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that up to that point both bills are the same—
or as a public document within 10 days after such confirmation.

Mr. President, the gist of my contention is that matter has been left out which was agreed upon by both Houses, and, under the terms of the rule, that makes the report subject to a point of order. I refer to the provision that the names of the contractors and the amounts of such partial or final settlements should be filed with the Clerk of the House for the information of Congress and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is true that in the Senate a slight change was made in the remainder of that clause; that is, reference to the Official Bulletin was left out, and instead of the publication being required before confirmation it was required under the Senate bill to be made 10 days after confirmation; in other words, there is a difference as to time and as to publication in the Official Bulletin; but it was agreed by both Houses that there should be a publication of these data. This provision ought not to have been left out of the conference report, in my judgment, and I make the point of order that the conference report should be recommitted under the terms of the Rule XXVII, found on page 35 of the rules.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. JONES of Washington addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield first to one and then to the other of the Senators. I yield first to the Senator from Utah and then to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to ask the Senator if the time fixed was the same in the House bill as in the Senate bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. It was 10 days before confirmation in the House and 10 days after such confirmation in the Senate. In other words, there was just a difference in time of applying that matter which had been agreed upon by both Houses.

Mr. SMOOT. Then what is the Senator complaining of in substance?

Mr. McKELLAR. The substance is identical. The question of time is immaterial, as it seemed to me at the time and as I believe now.

Mr. FLETCHER. And the mode of publication is identical.

Mr. McKELLAR. As to the mode of publication, the only difference is that it was left out of the Official Bulletin, and the Official Bulletin may or may not be in existence at the time the publication is made. I do not think that is material. I do not think either one of the two changes—the Official Bulletin or the time of publication—is material, but that the essential matter was the publication of this information, and it was agreed upon by both Houses.

Mr. SMOOT. And left out in the conference report?

Mr. McKELLAR. That was left out entirely. The Senator from Utah is a parliamentarian, and I should like to ask his opinion about the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair rule first, and then any Senator can take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, or the Senator from Utah can express his opinion on the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair has heretofore gone to great lengths in sustaining the rule of the Senate with reference to the insertion of new matter and the omission of matter agreed to by the two Houses. In an early opinion after this rule was adopted, the point of order was sustained where there was a section in the original bill of the House and a section in the original bill of the Senate which were identically the same. That ruling went further than the precedents of the House of Representatives have been, from the days of Speaker Colfax down. Those rulings are uniformly to the effect that where the House passes a bill and the Senate strikes out all after the enacting clause and passes another bill, when it goes to conference the matter is practically in the hands of the conferees to report such a bill, germane to the subject of the conference, as the conferees may think proper, and then it is for the two Houses to say whether or not they will adopt the conference report. As heretofore stated, however, the Chair, being extremely desirous of sustaining this rule of the Senate, did sustain a point of order under circumstances of a bill enacted by the House, all after the enacting clause stricken out, and a new bill inserted in the Senate, where in both bills there was a section identical in language.

Now, let us see where we are.

This is a proviso contained in each bill. It is not identical in the two bills at all, beyond the fact that each required the names of the contractors and the amounts of partial or final settlements to be filed with the House for the information of Congress. There it ends, so far as the terms are identical in the two bills. After that, in the House bill it is to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the Official Bulletin or as a public document 10 days before confirmation and payment is authorized upon such contract. The Chair is inclined to think that the important thing in the bill was the requirement that it be printed somewhere 10 days before confirmation and pay-

ment. In the Senate bill it is to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or as a public document within 10 days after such confirmation.

The Chair thinks there was just about 20 days in controversy before the conferees, and that they had a right to strike the proviso out. The Chair overrules the point of order. If Senators desire either provision retained, they can vote to reject the conference report for that reason.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon knows the situation out in our western country with reference to the production of spruce. I have not had time and opportunity to examine this conference report. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not, under the terms of the conference report which is now presented, the contractors with the Spruce Production Co. would have relief under it on their contracts?

The Senator will remember that the language of the Senate bill was "any agency of the Government," and so forth. I have not heard whether or not that language is retained in the conference report.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will call the Senator's attention to the language of the first section:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to adjust, pay, or discharge any agreement, express or implied, upon a fair and equitable basis that has been entered into in good faith during the present emergency and prior to November 12, 1918, by any officer or agent acting under his authority, direction, or instruction, or that of the President.

I will say to the Senator that this question was in my mind at the time. It seems to me that the Spruce Production Corporation is an agency of the Government acting under the authority of the President. If it is not, this bill will not cover it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is an agency; but would it be considered an agent? The Senate bill contained the word "agency" as well as "agent." Now that language is apparently stricken out.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. After getting into conference we had a good deal of controversy and a good deal of trouble, as the Senator knows, to reach any agreement at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I know that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The matter has been back and forth between the two Houses for a week or more; and in order to reach any agreement at all we practically took the House bill as a basis for reaching an agreement. If that language has been left out, it has been left out because it was not in the House bill. I will say to the Senator, however, that we did insert language in conference in order to meet the situation which the Senator suggests, not only where these contracts were made by any officer or agent acting under the Secretary of War, but where they were made by anyone acting under the authority or direction of the President. I thought that was broad enough to cover it. It may not be. I am perfectly frank to say so.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. KNOX. The point that is made by the Senator from Washington, it seems to me, is rather a technical one. I recall very distinctly that the sole and only purpose for which this corporation was formed was to act as an agent or an agency for the Government, and I have not the slightest doubt myself that the language which has just been read by the Senator from Oregon covers the situation completely.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am very glad, indeed, to have the opinion of the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the matter. I am inclined to think that it covers it, too, but I should like to be sure of it if it is at all possible, because, as the Senator knows, this Spruce Production Corporation was organized for the sole purpose of aiding the War Department and the Government in securing timber and materials for airplane work, and the contracts that these people made with the Spruce Production Corporation were, in fact, made for the Government, for the War Department.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will permit me just a moment. If the Senator will compare this section 1 with the section as originally passed by the House, he will find that we extended it further than contracts, express or implied, made by the Secretary of War and his agents. We extended it by the addition of giving the same right to contracts made by agents of those acting for or under the direction of the President. I think it is broad enough.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think this Spruce Production Corporation was acting more directly under the Secretary of War than under the President. I think it was headed by some

of the War Department officers. At any rate, these people who furnished materials and made their contracts made them with officers of the Army, and they seemed to think that they were dealing directly with the War Department. I think this corporation was more nearly an agent of the War Department than of the President; but it certainly was an agent of one or the other, it seems to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, were they getting out materials for aircraft production?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; for the manufacture of airplanes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should think they were operating under the Signal Corps branch of the Army, and they were either acting under orders of the Secretary of War or under orders of the President. The President had authority there, in connection, I think, with the material for production of airplanes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They made their contracts with the Spruce Production Corporation. The Spruce Production Corporation, I have no doubt, was acting under the Signal Corps. I think its officers were largely officers of the Signal Corps, and so it seems to me that it is covered by this language, but I wanted to have the RECORD show the opinion of the Senators in charge of the matter.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the amendment, but to protest against the ruling of the former occupant of the chair. I will say, as the Senator who proposed the amendment to the rules, that it was the intention of the amendment to prohibit conferees from doing what, according to the statement of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], was done in this case. I did not appeal from the decision of the Chair because I know the importance of this legislation and how anxious the chairman is to get the matter disposed of to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to enter my protest, so that the RECORD will not show that the ruling was agreed to by common consent. I do not expect to take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The reason why paragraph 2 of Rule XXVII was amended was because conferees included new legislation of the most vital character, legislation that was not acted upon by either House, and the practice grew to such proportions that the Senate decided that the only way to protect themselves was to amend the rules; and the rule, as above stated, was amended. If that action of the Senate can be set aside by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting entirely new legislation, as will be the case if the ruling just made is allowed to stand, if this ruling is a correct interpretation of the rule, we will have to amend the rules again.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as the matter left out is concerned, in the Senator's judgment, does not this ruling abrogate the rule itself to that extent?

Mr. SMOOT. That is my opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, has the title been amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I gave notice of some brief remarks this afternoon on the subject of the league of nations.

Which shall it be, Mr. President—war, and continued preparations for war, or a league of nations? Those are the alternatives.

Heretofore the world, through all the centuries down to the present time, has been afflicted and afflicted with the curse of war. The larger part of governmental appropriations, here and elsewhere, has been for the burdens of war. Through all the centuries this has continued. Every generation has sent its men to the slaughter. One eloquent critic of this proposed league of nations has read into the RECORD recently a list of 50 wars that have devastated the Old World during the last century. America has not been free from the curse. Besides our own Revolutionary War, our Civil War, and our Indian wars, we have had the War with Mexico, the War with Spain, the War with Germany and Austria-Hungary, and we have felt, even though using every effort to keep out of war, its awful effects. Our experiences in the war from which we are just now emerging have convinced us that we are a part of the world; that whenever the world is convulsed with war we are going to suffer from it, and probably participate in it. We,

too, therefore, find ourselves face to face with the question, Shall it be war, and preparations for war, or shall it be a league of nations?

Senators who criticize the league of nations seem to ignore the alternative. Let us face it. What if we have no league of nations?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I must, I regret to say, decline to yield on account of lack of time.

What if the peace to be signed becomes like other peaces that have been signed—merely a truce while nations make ready for another war? That inevitably means a resumption of war preparations on an increased scale.

Before this war the United States and the four great nations associated with the United States in forming this league of peace were expending about \$600,000,000 a year in military preparations and about \$600,000,000 a year in naval preparations. It is easy to see, if the league of nations fails and international chaos follows, that the world will sag back into the despair and desperation of a constant prospect of war. Every nation will become an armed camp, and military preparations and naval preparations will go on upon an unheard-of scale. The burdens of the people in that case will be enormously increased over what they have been in the past. There may not be a war for years; but the preparations for war will threaten bankruptcy, and they will certainly bend the backs of the taxpayers as they never have been bent before.

I am speaking now only of preparations for war, Mr. President; but what of actual war?

First, we have the cost in money, the least important and the least terrible penalty we pay for war. The war just concluded is estimated to have cost the seven nations which bore its burden something like one hundred and forty thousand million dollars. The taxpayers of those nations will stagger under that burden for generations yet unborn if no relief is afforded in the cost of war preparations. The late war cost 6,000,000 lives and millions more of cripples. It has destroyed hundreds of towns. It has widowed millions of wives. It has brought in its train the inevitable consequences of war—pestilence and famine. One of the war diseases alone has cost this country over 300,000 lives of the civilian population. It has let loose and inflamed the passions and lusts of men and crushed and humiliated millions of women. Massacre, torture, and assassinations have accompanied it. Law and order have been overthrown. Bolshevism and anarchy have been propagated. The confidence of men in government has been shaken. It will never be restored until governments devise some way to end war.

Mr. President, I have observed that so far in this discussion most of the opponents of the league of nations are those who would oppose any league of nations. They enormously magnify the possible evils and dangers of a league and convey the impression that the United States is giving up everything and gaining nothing by this great compact of honor and justice and peace between the nations of the earth.

Two of my eloquent colleagues attacked it as a form of internationalism. They object to internationalism. They are too late. Internationalism has come, and we must choose what form the internationalism shall take. We must choose between the internationalism of justice and honor and peace and mutual support between the civilized nations of the earth and the internationalism of the socialist, the anarchist, the Bolshevik.

Humanity will not long tolerate a condition of recurring war over questions between governments that can be settled by peaceful methods along the lines of justice and reason. The mass of men will not allow themselves to be forever led to the slaughter uselessly and unnecessarily. The taxpayers will not submit indefinitely to spoliation by enormous taxes to make unending preparation for unceasing wars.

Senators who oppose the league of nations have apparently ignored the enormous evil from which the world suffers. They have apparently ignored the rising tide of protest not only among the people of the United States but among the people of the whole civilized world against war. If we fail to adopt an internationalism of governments that will unite to end the wars we shall be face to face with the internationalism of the individual socialist. We can not ignore the fact that the Russian millions are now thoroughly committed to the communistic government. We can not deny the fact that France and Italy, the one a republic and the other a limited monarchy, are largely under the control of socialistic ideas and socialistic leaders. No other leader could get control in the state of public opinion. We can not ignore the fact that Germany is being rapidly and radically reorganized into a socialistic nation of 75,000,000 souls,

We are impressed by the growth of socialism in Great Britain and the acceptance of socialistic ideas by British leaders.

War and preparation for war, the burdens of war, the horrors of war are largely responsible for this development in every nation of Europe. It spreads over national boundaries as easily as trade and commerce and much more irresistibly. If war and the preparation for war are to continue the chief business and the chief expense of National Government we may yet expect a development of socialism and Bolshevism in the United States. Nor will it be confined to orations on soap boxes in the public streets of our great cities, but it will appear here in Congress, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, just as it has appeared in the parliaments of the Old World. It will affect legislation in this country as it has in other countries. It will seize political power in this country as it has in other countries.

I therefore repeat, we must choose between the internationalism of the league of nations bound together in a society for mutual protection, with honor and justice and liberty and self-government as the standard, and the internationalism of the Socialist.

But, Mr. President, let me discuss briefly the purpose of the league. I admit that we have not fully analyzed it in the short time we have had to make the acquaintance of the constitution as proposed. It is at the present time only a proposition, being a unanimous committee report to the congress of nations.

The purpose of the league of nations set forth in the articles is to maintain international peace. To this end its members agree that they will in no case resort to war with each other until they have submitted to arbitration the dispute between them, or submitted to an inquiry by the executive council, and not even then will any member resort to war until the arbitration has concluded or the inquiry of the executive council has been finished, and not even then until three months thereafter. There is thus provided by this ingenious machinery, whenever a dispute arises between any of the nations in the league, a cooling-off time of from nine months to one year, a time sufficient in all human probability to end the danger of war between the contestants.

The nations further agree, moreover, that they will not even then, after the lapse of three months, resort to war against a member of the league which complies with the award of the arbitrators or the recommendation of the executive council if it is unanimous. There we have another block to war. There is an almost insuperable obstacle in the way of war, a solemn covenant between the nations which have entered into the league.

These agreements render war between members of the league as nearly impossible as human ingenuity can devise. To my mind it is unthinkable that any nation admitted to the league will violate this solemn covenant. I think we have passed the age when a national covenant will be considered as a scrap of paper.

If, however, any member of the league should violate this covenant and should resort to war against any other member, without arbitration or in accordance with the council, that act shall be considered an act of war against all the members of the league. Thereupon all the powers of the league are employed to bring it within control.

All trade relations are to be dissolved between every member of the league and the outlaw nation. All intercourse between the faithless nation and the other nations is to be cut off. It becomes subjected to the most intense form of economic, commercial, and financial pressure, which is to be followed by military and naval combination against the offending nation. Such penalties are certainly large enough to deter any nation even if the moral obligation of its covenant were not sufficient.

Moreover, Mr. President, the members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the political independence and territorial integrity of each member. That is a guaranty against war as strong as it can be made. Any member of the league knows that if it undertakes a war of conquest it has the whole league to deal with and not merely the nation against which it may direct itself. Had Germany known even that Great Britain was coming into the late war Germany would not have started this great war, and certainly if Germany had known when she proceeded to back up Austria in her demand against Serbia that all the other nations were coming in which finally did come in against her, Germany would certainly not have started the war, and everybody knows it.

Another very important covenant which is signed by all the nations who will become members of the league is the promise to reduce national armament to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and to make no concealment from each other of their armament-making resources and industries. This

agreement also includes the promise to prevent as far as possible the manufacture of munitions and implements of war by private enterprise.

Here the makers of the league of nations have put their fingers on the remedy for the evil—the reduction of armament and the regulation or the elimination of the private manufacture for profit of armament to be sold to nations not able to make their own.

In order that this reduction of armament and the limitation of manufacture of munitions by private companies may be fairly and justly and intelligently carried out, the executive council of nine nations considers the question and submits it for the adoption of each country. Mark that! It has been charged here that the league of nations proposes to dictate to every country what sized armament it shall have, but the fact is that the league of nations, through its executive council of nine members, five of whom are the nations associated in this war, considers, discusses, and recommends to the nations who are members of the league what reduction of armament shall be made. That limitation does not go into effect until it is adopted by the Governments of those countries.

I want to make that clear, because it has been stated here upon the floor of the Senate several times that if we went into this compact we submitted ourselves to the dictation of foreigners as to what sized armaments we were to have. The truth is it would be a matter of mutual agreement between the nations through the agency of the league what limitation of armament each member nation shall submit to.

Undoubtedly, Mr. President, if this solemn covenant can be carried out in good faith for this reduction of armament, this control of the private manufacture of armament by the league, it will have an enormous effect not only in reducing the dangers of war but in reducing also the burdens of government to every country in the world. It will save to the United States hundreds of millions of dollars a year, probably thousands of millions of dollars within our lifetime.

Now, Mr. President, I want to consider some of the details of the proposed constitution. The most striking fact about this league constitution, and one which should appeal particularly to the United States, is the very ingenious, highly effective device under which its control and direction are largely intrusted to the executive council, an executive council of nine nations, five of them permanent, four of them to be elected by the body of the membership. The five permanent members of this executive council, five out of the nine, are the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. The other four will be elected from time to time as the 30 or 40 nations in the league may decide. This executive council not only has all the powers that the league has but it has a number of distinct and separate powers which are vested in it permanently.

The five permanent members whom I have named will naturally and inevitably largely shape and control the policy of the league, but the other nations, the smaller nations of the world, the nations that have been neutral in this war, will be interested in the election of the four other members who will support and to some extent influence possibly from time to time the action of the five permanent members. We do not know yet which those nations will be, but the chances are that they will change from time to time by some system of rotation. However, the five permanent members of the league, of which we are one, will be the backbone of the executive council, just as the executive council is the backbone of the league.

The executive council is to be the active governing body of the league. It must meet at least once a year and may meet much oftener. It may deal with any matter within the sphere of the league or affecting the peace of the world. Many of its powers are specified and are separate from and independent of the body of the league membership. One of these is its supervision over the limitation of armament of nations. It does not arbitrarily fix this limit, but it considers the question and proposes the limit to the various nations for their adoption. When thus adopted the limit shall not be changed without the consent of the executive council. It is also charged with the duty of advising the nations how the evil of private manufacture of arms and munitions can be limited and overcome. It is vested also with authority to advise as to the means by which the league shall help and protect any of its members when threatened with war. It also has power to make special inquiry into a dispute between members when submitted and to make recommendation of settlement within six months. It also has power to propose steps to enforce any award made by a court of arbitration to which nations may have submitted their case. It also has power to establish a court of international justice to hear cases voluntarily submitted to it by the nations. It has the power to fix the military and naval forces which each nation shall contribute

in case it becomes necessary for the league to resort to force to protect a covenant of the league if broken by members. It has power to fix the conditions upon which disputes may be inquired into when they arise between a member of the league and an outside nation or between two nations not members of the league, and upon holding the inquiry to recommend such action as may be deemed best to the nations concerned. It has power, if nations outside of the league refuse to accept this inquiry, to take such action and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and end the dispute.

From the specification of these powers it will be seen that the executive council of nine nations constitutes a powerful executive, legislative, and judicial body to speak for the league and to act for the league. In those cases, however, where disputes are inquired into between members of the league the decision must be by unanimous vote to be effective, and if the decision is not unanimous it is advisory only.

To my mind the executive council is an ingenious, just, and effective method of placing in the control of the five great nations which have successfully fought this war the permanent direction of the league, modified, however, by such influence and support as the four nations which will be chosen from time to time as the other members of the executive council may exert.

Mr. President, let me now consider some of the opposition that we have heard upon the floor of the Senate to the league of nations. When I hear Senators describe the danger which they see in entering the league, when I hear one Senator condemn one article and another a different article, and another propose a change here and another a change there, I begin to wonder whether all this great labor of the leading nations of the world, represented by their ablest men, having all possible counsel, has really created a thing which is so weak and miserable, so dangerous and so fatal to the welfare of the members that are going into it. One would think that this league, with the loftiest purposes, designed by the ablest men, inspired by the most noble spirit, was nothing but a fabric of faults, a creation of mistakes. I am reminded of the experience of the man, a perfectly healthy man, who had been reading a lot of patent-medicine advertisements and consulting several quack doctors. After he had read of all the symptoms told of in the advertisements and listened to the recital of the symptoms of disease which the quack doctor had fastened upon him, he concluded that he had every known disease in the world except housemaid's knee. So when I hear these gentlemen ready to prescribe for the league of nations, one on one thing and one on another, one tearing this out and another tearing that out, it seems to me that in considering this noble creation of these great men, representing the leading countries of the world, the political critics view the league to be in position of a man who has been listening to quack doctors and reading patent-medicine advertisements of ills that are only imaginary.

Suppose we should take these suggestions and cut the league constitution to suit each critic. The constitution of the league would be very much in the position of the boy's trousers that we have heard of in the old story. A pretty good pair of trousers had been purchased for him and brought home. He had them on. It was thought they were a little too long. So he asked his mother if she would cut them off for him a little. She said she was too busy. Then he applied to his aunt, and she was too busy. Then he applied to his sister, and she was too busy. Finally the boy went to bed, tired of trying to get the little change that seemed to be necessary. After he had gone to bed, however, during the night one member of the family after another began to have conscientious scruples. So the mother got up, and she cut something off from the bottom of the trousers. A little later the sister came to the conclusion that she should comply and make the change in the trousers, and she cut off a little. After a while the aunt got the same idea, and before morning she cut off a little from the lad's trousers. When he finally got up in the morning he had not much but a pair of bathing trunks to put on. So if the Senators attempt to take this great document, the product of these great men, representing these great nations, and proceed here to engraft each his own ideas upon it and to make these emendations of it, it will be wrecked. We must give some credit to the nations and the men who have been laboring to bring this great work to fruition.

Mr. President, we have been told in a single speech on the floor of the Senate that the control of the league would be in the hands of European monarchs and Asiatic despots; that it might be controlled by the British Empire, or, if the British Empire should lose control, the Germanic nations might get control, or that, if they did not get control, the Bolsheviks might get control. In fact, in that single speech every possible method of control was suggested except the very obvious one that the

league and the executive council of the league are going to be in control of the great democracies of the world, five of them being named as permanent members of the executive council and controlling it.

I say "democracies." France is as much a democracy as is the United States. They are both republics. Great Britain is as much a democracy as is the United States, and her Government responds to the will of the people more readily, possibly, even than does our own. Italy, a constitutional monarchy in name, is in fact a democracy. Japan, while at the head of her government she has the Mikado, is rapidly being transformed, as we all know, into a government in which the will of the people is carried out. The Japanese love and revere their Mikado, but they compel him to change his ministry as rapidly as they change their public opinion.

Why, Mr. President, how absurd to say that the kings and monarchs of Asia and Europe will control the league! We all know that the King of England and the King of Italy have no more political power than the painted kings in a deck of cards. The President of the United States has a hundred times more power than has any king in the world. I saw in the newspapers sometime ago an account of a conversation between the President of the United States and the King of Spain. It was reported that the President of the United States inquired of the King of Spain why he did not do something with relation to the affairs of Spain that was thought desirable, and the King of Spain replied, "Oh, Mr. President, you forget I am not a president; I am only a king."

The league ruled by the monarchs and despots of the world! It is ridiculous nonsense; it is preposterous. The despots of the world have gone, and gone forever. The world is democratic, and it is ruled by the democratic nations of the world.

Mr. President, I have already indicated that the affairs of the league are to be administered by the executive council of nine nations; that of these nine nations five are permanent members, and no one of them is controlled by a monarch or a despot. What of any four nations that might be elected to fill out the four other places on the executive council? Can you conceive of any monarch or despot represented on the league of nations in the executive council? Would it be so if it were Norway or Sweden or Denmark or Holland or Switzerland or Belgium or Spain or Portugal or Poland or Jugo-Slavia, or any of the 20 republics of the Western Hemisphere? Why, Mr. President, this league of nations can not by any possible conception of the imagination be considered as passing into the control of monarchs and despots.

We have been told also that when a nation enters this league it yields to the arbitrament of the league its national life. What nonsense when, under one of the covenants of the league, all the nations that join in it solemnly pledge themselves to preserve and protect the political independence of each member, including its territorial integrity.

Then, we have been told that we would be compelled to contribute to a force that might be used by the league against us, whereas the only provision for contributing a force is in case one of the nations becomes an outlaw, and then the other nations contribute to bring it within control of civilization again. There is no standing army; there is no league navy; each nation maintains its nationality. That bugaboo that Senators attacked before the constitution was made public has disappeared forever. Senators have attacked something that did not exist, and they still continue conjuring up the scarecrow.

Then, we have been told that if we joined the league we would place ourselves at the mercy of Mexico, which might despoil our citizens, commit outrages on our borders, and enjoy the benefits of the guaranty of the league as to its political independence and territorial integrity. Yet the fact is that under the terms of the league Mexico is ineligible to admission to membership in the league. Mexico can not perform, and does not perform, her international obligations, and no such nation can gain admission.

We have been told that if we enter this league we will abandon the Monroe doctrine; that is, we will abandon our right to attack any nation which may seek to gain a foothold on the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe doctrine was enunciated when each nation had to look out for itself, and we took that step to look out for ourselves; but the purpose of the league of nations includes the very purpose of the Monroe doctrine; that is, to prevent aggression of nations upon each other, whether upon the continent where they exist or upon any other continent. Anything that has the character of an attack upon any American Republic or even an unfriendly act against the United States would call for action by the league. Instead of being compelled to defend the Western Hemisphere alone, we would, if necessary, have the sympathy and help of every member of the league.

We have been told that this is one of those entangling alliances against which Washington warned us. I deny it. There is just as much difference between an entangling alliance and the league of nations as there is between a horse-chestnut and a chestnut horse. When Washington gave his warning the world was full of entangling alliances; nations were endeavoring to secure power by alliances with other nations. Why? To fight wars. They were not doing it to maintain peace; they were doing it to fight wars. That age has passed away; the league of nations is to wipe out all entangling alliances and bring about an honorable union among the nations of the world to end war and preserve peace. When Washington sat down by the light of candles and with his quill pen laboriously wrote out that warning to the American people he saw the world as it was then. If Washington were here to-day, he would see the world as it is now; and in the blaze of electric lights he would punch a button, summon a stenographer, and dictate to the people of the United States an urgent recommendation that they join this league for the purpose of maintaining with other honorable nations of the world perpetual peace on earth.

This reverence for things said a hundred or more years ago under old circumstances is no mark of respect for those who stated them; it presumes that they would not advance. Washington was not that kind of a man. China to-day, living in the past, worshipping the dead things that dead men have said centuries ago, shows the folly of carrying to an extreme that unprogressive doctrine.

We have been told here in the Senate that if we entered this league of nations Japan would compel the United States to arbitrate the immigration question, and, if she succeeded, compel this country to admit her nationals. What nonsense! There are two answers to this proposition. The first is that if Japan could compel arbitration by the executive council, she nevertheless could not hope to win a verdict favorable to her contention. She is the only nation of her race represented among the eight Caucasian members of the executive council. She could not hope to get the vote of Great Britain, who sits on the executive council with her, when Great Britain is so tremendously interested in the immigration question as affecting Canada and her other dominions, Australia being even a stronger illustration.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I asked not to be interrupted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will permit me, a little later on I shall not object to being interrupted.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wished to ask the Senator a question bearing directly on the point he is discussing. The Senator has interrupted nearly every other speaker on the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Make it short, and I will yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. It will be quite short. As I understand the Senator, the reason the proposal to admit Japanese into this country would not succeed is because Japan could not get a sufficient number of votes in the league—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am stating a number of reasons.

Mr. KELLOGG. And not because it is not one of the questions which can be submitted.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is one of the questions which can not be submitted. I am coming to that, if the Senator will wait.

Mr. KELLOGG. I merely wish to ask the Senator whether, under sections 12, 15, and 16, there are any limitations upon the questions which must be submitted either to the arbitral tribunal or to the executive council?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This is not a question of putting limitations in the document. If we attempt to put limitations in the document, it would be made as long as the moral law. There are no powers conferred on the league of nations except those that are required under the terms of the document itself. It relates only to international questions and international disputes, and not to domestic questions. It has not any more to do with the immigration question than it has with the question of marriage and divorce in the United States. There is not any doubt about that; it is thoroughly agreed among all of those who have discussed this matter in Paris that such is the fact.

I know that Japan endeavored in the council at Paris to secure a declaration of equality of races and against any discrimination against races; but Japan failed. All that Japan gets out of this league of nations is the highly honorable and much-prized membership in the executive council and the same protection other members get. All the efforts she made to establish the recognition of race equality were vigorously rejected and by a unanimous vote.

But even if Japan had succeeded, even if Japan might bring this matter under the terms of the league, yet nevertheless there is another insuperable barrier against Japan. Supposing the impossible were possible, and that Great Britain would permit Japan to bring that matter into negotiation and force Japanese into the United States and into Canada and into Australia—an impossible supposition, but suppose she should—yet Japan is bound by a treaty with the United States against that very thing. Japan is bound by a solemn treaty with the United States that is still in force, and that will be placed on file with the league, to recognize our exclusion laws. I will say for Japan that with the most scrupulous care she has constantly lived up to the contract. The bugaboo of Japanese immigration is one of those false fronts that are brought in here to array prejudice against the league of nations.

We have been told that if we should agree to the league proposal for the limitation of armaments we would interfere with the power of Congress and impair the sovereignty of the country. Nothing is more ridiculous. A hundred years ago the United States and Great Britain entered into a contract, which was ratified by the Senate of the United States, limiting naval armaments on the Great Lakes between Canada and the United States. Did that limit the sovereignty of the United States? Why, we have almost forgotten that it existed; but the United States and Canada have scrupulously lived up to that contract. In principle there is no difference between such an agreement between the United States and Great Britain and the proposed agreement of armament limitation between the United States and all of the nations in the league. The only difference is this, and it is in favor of the league: In the league case, while the executive council can propose the limitations to each nation, provided it does it by a unanimous vote, it does not go into effect until adopted by each government. In the United States it would not go into effect until the Congress of the United States declared it adopted. Anyone who examines this document carefully will see the utter folly of the claim that the league can dictate to the United States what its armament shall be.

Shall we not concede anything to good faith? Shall we not consider that these nations whose representatives have sat down at the peace table to draw this great document of mutual concessions and mutual defense, based on honor and on justice, have a good purpose, and that they are not trying to draw each other into a dark alley for the purpose of assassination? Must we forever be suspicious of the motives and the purposes of those who have gone into this league?

We have been told that we would destroy our Americanism and our nationalism if we entered this league; and the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in a brilliant peroration here the other day, brought before our eyes the personality of Theodore Roosevelt as the very embodiment of Americanism, which we should cherish and which we should live up to. Has the Senator forgotten that Theodore Roosevelt himself ardently advocated a reduction of armaments by agreement between the nations? Has he forgotten that Theodore Roosevelt advocated a league of nations? Has he forgotten that Theodore Roosevelt even went so far as to declare that force should be placed behind a league of nations to maintain the peace of the world? Who can doubt that if Theodore Roosevelt were President of the United States to-day he would be bending every energy, as Woodrow Wilson is bending every energy, to establish a league of nations to preserve the peace of the world?

Theodore Roosevelt, the embodiment of Americanism and nationalism. Then why charge that Woodrow Wilson is trying to destroy nationalism and Americanism? He is advocating the same thing that was advocated by Theodore Roosevelt, only he has succeeded in organizing the world to bring it into effect.

Mr. President, we have been told by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], in a very forceful speech, that it would have been a disaster to the world in times past if a combination of nations had existed to guarantee their independence and their territorial integrity. He says he is thinking of the time when Charles and Philip of Spain held the world in their grasp and of the days when Napoleon swept over Europe with his conquering hosts, and he says that if a league of nations had been devised in those days and had gone into effect to maintain the political independence and territorial integrity of those conquerors and those kingdoms it would have choked liberty to death.

Mr. President, that is the trouble with Senators who oppose the league of nations. They are thinking of the days that are gone, and gone forever. The conquering empires of the world have been wiped out. The fall of Russia and Germany and Austria-Hungary removed from the world the last representa-

tives of the conquering spirit and of autocratic power. The world is now democratic. Senators should cease to turn their eyes to the past and turn them to the present and see what we have before us. The world of democracy has come into its own. Yes; that is the mistake; too many are turning their eyes to the past and forgetting that we have come into a new world.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator?

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. If what the Senator from Nebraska has said is true, if the spirit of aggression and injustice is a thing of the past, what need have we of a league of nations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We have the same need that we have in a civilized community to hold in check those who will only remain in check under organization. We have here a great civilized city, but it would not do to permit law and order to remain to chance. We organize the city to maintain law and order, and we are going to organize these democracies of the world to preserve law and order in the world; and we can do it now for the first time in the history of the world. We need take in no despots. We need take into consideration no conquering empires. That day has gone, and we have come out into a new world; and Senators should realize it. Let them grasp the fact that the spirit of the age is to end conquest; that the spirit of the age is that the people shall rule; that the spirit of the age is that governments shall be content to serve their own people and not despoil others. Let them see the new world as it is, and the new spirit which inspires it. Let them appreciate the fact that humanity is not willing to sacrifice itself further; that men and women demand of their governments that as the fruit of this terrible war an agreement shall be entered into for the preservation of world peace in the future.

If the Senator will turn his face from the past and toward the future, he will behold a new heaven and a new earth—not a millennium, perhaps, but a world in which the affairs of nations are to be administered in justice and reason and humanity; a world in which the chief affair of government shall be peace and development and progress; a world in which man shall attain his highest destiny and greatest happiness. This was impossible in the days of tyrants and autocrats and conquerors, but it is possible in the new age of liberty, statesmanship, and philanthropy.

PRICE GUARANTIES TO PRODUCERS OF WHEAT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 15796) to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by inserting after the word "price," on line 13, page 3, following the committee amendment at that point, the following:

Such as the usual market conditions, under the unrestricted operation of the law of supply and demand, would warrant, without regard to the enactment and enforcement of this law.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it is said that law is the perfection of human reason; and jurists and lawyers and courts, from the time when the race began to have its conduct outlined or restricted or controlled by law, have all agreed that when the reason for the law ceases the law itself should cease.

I have heard a spacious argument here to-day about why the United States Government should pay the guaranteed price on wheat—a price guaranteed when war was raging and when there was necessity, perhaps, for a guarantee being made. The claim is made that the Government is in honor bound to pay the \$2.26 not only for all the wheat that was planted last year, without regard to whether it was planted before or after the armistice was signed, but for all the wheat that is yet to be planted. The Government is in honor bound, it is said, to pay that. Why?

The reason for the law was that we needed to encourage the production of wheat because the war was on. It was permitted, under those conditions, that all the people in these United States who are bound to eat bread in order to live should be charged a higher price for the necessities of life than usually was warranted. Why? Because the war was on; because wheat must be produced; because growers must be encouraged.

But it was said by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] that nobody expected, at the time the guarantee was made, that the war would cease on November 11. The war has ceased since November 11, and not all of the fall crop was even planted at that time.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. What I said was that when the guarantee was made by the President on the 2d of September nobody expected that the war would end so soon, and this guarantee was made by the President pursuant to act of Congress.

Mr. KIRBY. There is no disposition on my part to haggle about the understanding or misunderstanding of an expression. The Senator says that when the guarantee was made by the President the war was on, and nobody knew when it was going to close. That may be conceded to be true; but the war is not on now. It has not been on since November 11 of last year, and at that time one-half of the fall crop even of wheat had not been planted.

Now, why should the laborer and clerk and professional and business man, and all who toll in these United States, be required to pay for bread at the rate of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat that is not yet planted? Where is there any reason for the Government saying that we will pay for all the spring wheat that can be planted, and give you \$2.26 a bushel? Everybody, wheat growers and all, recognize what? They recognize that without this guaranty or without this law to authorize the manipulation and the restriction of sale and to limit the imports the usual price of wheat would be about \$1 a bushel. Then why should the United States of America be expected to pay the wheat grower \$1.26 a bushel clear profit on a necessity of life that all must use, when the war is over, when the grower knew it was over before three-quarters of the crop was planted, and all of his crops will be harvested under after-war conditions?

We were going to allow him this price for wheat because we needed the wheat and because the conditions were difficult under which wheat was to be planted and produced, but those conditions have passed away. Why is the United States in honor bound to pay for wheat that has not yet been planted, to men who have never even planted wheat before, \$2.26 a bushel, at the expense of all of the consumers in the United States? Under the changed conditions each man must minimize his own damages. Do you suppose that one bushel less of wheat was planted last fall than would have been planted if no guaranty had been made? Do you suppose that one bushel less of wheat would be produced now if it was known this guaranty would not be performed? No; not one bushel less of spring wheat would be planted.

Now, we hear talk about the United States being in honor bound to pay it. Why? The Government owes some duties to the people of the United States, and we owe some duty to the Government of the United States, we who are Senators here looking after the public welfare and the Government interest. Why should we tax four-fifths or seven-eighths or six-tenths, anyhow, of the people of the United States, \$1.26 a bushel for wheat and breadstuff more than it is conceded it is worth in order that the farmer who produced the wheat may be paid a bonus of \$1.26 a bushel?

Now, the purpose of this amendment is stated right there. It is still proposed that we shall pay \$2.26 a bushel for wheat that is not yet planted, because we wanted to encourage wheat growers before the war ended, because we wanted to relieve conditions during the war, when the war has been over since last November. Now, I say we ought to so amend this measure as that the consumers will not be mulcted in this extortionate cost for breadstuffs, and that the Government itself shall stand between the consumer and the farmer, who is expecting \$1.26 a bushel more than the wheat is worth because the Government, forsooth, in times of stress found it necessary to say that it would pay \$2.26 a bushel. The purpose of the amendment is that the Government shall permit the wheat and breadstuff to be sold in these United States according to the unrestricted operation of the law of supply and demand as though this law had not been passed. Then if wheat goes, as it ordinarily would, to \$1 a bushel, the people who buy wheat, the people who consume bread, will have the benefit of that, as they ought to have when the war is over and under conditions as they now exist. There is no reason why the farmer should have more consideration, because he plants three-quarters of his crop of wheat under afterwar conditions and it is all harvested under afterwar conditions. I do not believe that the Government

should be authorized by this bill to manipulate and control the market by restrictions here and regulations there and tariffs and taxes and embargoes yonder. I do not believe it should be allowed to do that in order that it may make itself whole for \$1.26 bonus that it is going to give back to the farmer. If there must be \$1.26 bonus paid back to the farmer for this wheat that he has not yet planted, and none of it has been grown or harvested, then let it be a straight proposition to be paid out of the Treasury. Let the people pay their taxes into the Treasury.

Let the farmer come down next fall and say, "Here, I produced so much wheat. My wheat has gone to \$1 a bushel. All the people of the United States got the benefit of it, and without regard to whether I lost any money or not you promised before the war was over that you would pay me \$2.26 a bushel. I want the other \$1.26 out of the Public Treasury." That is what it amounts to, neither more nor less. I say when you put it down on that proposition, where it ought to be, the people of the United States are not going to take kindly to that sort of practice.

But the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] said, "Think how much money our farmers lost two years ago or a year and a half ago when wheat was selling at \$3.05 and \$3.21 to \$3.50. Your farmers did not lose any money that year. No, the Government of the United States found it necessary to pass a law curbing the rapacity of dealers in wheat and foodstuffs in order that they might not rob all the people. That is what was done. It did not cost you \$2.26. You got a fair profit and more than that on all the wheat that was produced.

The war is supposed to be over. If we are going to pay until September, 1920, a war-time price for wheat and bread, the country is indeed in a bad condition.

Let us contrast with this the condition of the farmer in the cotton States. The year before we went into the war the wheat price went soaring and all the wheat farmers got about 80 cents to \$1 a bushel more than they had been getting for their wheat. The cotton farmer in the South, where the cotton cost him about 18 cents a pound that year to raise, got 5 cents a pound for cotton. Why? Because the Government would not take any steps to stabilize the price of his cotton. Although he produced it and carried it at a loss, he did not complain about it. Now, what has been the condition since that time? The wheat farmer was guaranteed \$2.26 a bushel for his wheat and he got his money.

At the same time all the statisticians agree when wheat sells at \$2.26 a bushel cotton ought reasonably and normally to sell at 35 cents a pound. Cotton went to 35 cents a pound under those conditions, and then what happened? The War Industries Board concluded it was necessary to make some sort of a regulation in order to restrict the export of cotton, and the cotton price started down. They talked about regulating the price. It went farther and farther down. It broke the market again. After that they said there is no necessity for regulating the price of cotton; and it has gone farther and farther down, until from 35 cents a pound, where it was on a level with wheat at \$2.26 a bushel, it has gone down to 21 and 22 cents a pound, and you can not now sell any of it. Why? Because of the restrictions and embargoes on cotton in this country. The French have such a condition and system about the sale of cotton that you can not ship a bale of cotton to France or land it there at all unless you sell it through the French commission and it is carried by the French Government.

That is the condition about the cotton crop, and you have not heard those people say a great deal about it yet. They have been injured. They have been suffering greatly because of war conditions. Shall they have the further exaction placed upon them of growing cotton hereafter when they must pay \$2.26 a bushel for wheat and breadstuffs and when their market is restricted and practically destroyed by present war conditions that have not passed so far as they are concerned?

That is a matter which ought to be considered here, it seems to me, and on that account I have this to say: If this bill must be passed, if the Government of the United States must step up to the wheat farmer who produces all his crops now under after-war conditions, who has not planted three-quarters of his crop yet, or had not at the time the armistice was signed, let us make it a pure matter of bonus, let us say it shall not affect the usual market conditions, and that the wheat price shall seek the usual level, that it shall follow the unrestricted application of the law of supply and demand, and let the bonus be paid out of the Treasury, where all the people pay their taxes, and if the farmer can come down and say, "I produced so much crop here last year, I have been damaged so much because it cost me more than a dollar and a quarter a bushel to raise it," let him be remunerated or let the whole amount be paid if neces-

sary, but let it be paid as a bonus; let it not be levied upon the man who must eat bread in order to live.

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

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Has the Senator read the proclamation of the President of the United States with regard to this guaranty?

Mr. KIRBY. It does not make any difference about the proclamation of the President. It was made under conditions that are not applicable now.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator deny that the President of the United States has declared that the price for the crop of 1919 shall have a certain price fixed for it?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not deny that at all, but what I am stating is that there is no reason to perform any guaranty that must be carried out under changed conditions. Why should you have given the wheat farmer \$2.26 a bushel for wheat if it only cost him 98 cents a bushel to raise it when the war is over? If his wheat was half of it planted after the war was over and harvested under after-war conditions, there is no reason on God Almighty's earth why it should be done.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will yield further, I will say for one, as one Member of this body and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture who has given it some attention, that I would rather see the whole bill defeated than to have the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas adopted.

Mr. KIRBY. Why? Would not the wheat man get his \$2.26 a bushel?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator must admit that the amendment simply means repudiation. Does he not admit that?

Mr. KIRBY. It does not; but there ought to be a repudiation, if you would call it so. Why should you pay for wheat \$2.26 a bushel when it can be raised for 80 cents a bushel after the war is over?

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator permit me to answer that?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Why should the Senator from Arkansas vote to take more than \$1 a bushel from the farmer at the beginning of the war, I ask the Senator?

Mr. KIRBY. I say that the farmer or the man who manipulated the market in wheat was robbing the people of the United States of America when he charged \$18 a barrel here for flour because he could get it, not because the wheat cost that much, but because the conditions warranted him taking the public by the throat and holding it up and getting the money. I do not know that the wheat farmer did it, but it was done.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that the farmers were absolutely unable to say anything about the price of wheat, does he not?

Mr. KIRBY. He sells his wheat upon the market, like everybody else sells his product; and it is supposed to be ruled by market conditions, by the fair operation of the law of supply and demand. That is the condition we have here. This amendment I propose will not affect the farmer getting his \$2.26 a bushel, but there will be paid by the Government out of the taxes as a bonus \$1.26 a bushel on a promise made a few days before the war closed, and three-quarters of the wheat which will be paid for was raised after the armistice was signed, and half of it is not yet planted. This only provides that the Government shall not enter into manipulation of the market; that the Government shall not make restrictions and place embargoes on the sale of wheat, to the injury of all of the people who consume bread, in order that it can pay the farmers, without loss to itself, an arbitrary price of \$2.26 per bushel, which is entirely out of harmony with the actual facts and conditions under which the wheat was produced.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, instead of adopting the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas the idea would be to defeat the bill. There is no use to go ahead here and say be it enacted that one thing shall occur and put on a proviso and say it shall not occur. I think it would be very unfortunate to adopt an amendment of that sort.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I dislike very much to delay the proceedings of the Senate again upon this particular question. I had not intended to say a single word, but the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, for whom, as he knows, I have the highest regard, I think is eminently unfair. During the war Mr. Hoover, who then represented the administration, appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and stated certain things, and the facts are these: He stated, among other things, that there was a world shortage of wheat. We all know that at that time we were engaged in a most terrible war. He called attention to the fact that it was of the highest importance that we should increase or stimulate production to the utmost possibility, and, as he told us, according to his judgment and the judgment of the administration the minimum price

should be fixed upon wheat in order to insure the producers that they would be compensated for any extra expenses which might be involved.

The Committee on Agriculture accepted the statement of Mr. Hoover, although from the beginning there was a most serious opposition to it. I think I state a fact when I say that not a single member of the Committee on Agriculture was in favor of price fixing. At that time, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has stated this afternoon, the price of wheat in certain markets in the grain districts was \$3.42.

I want to say to my good friend from Arkansas that the farmers had absolutely nothing to do with that market price. The farmer could not if he wanted to have fixed the price on any of his products. He has never been able to do so; and, with the treatment that men who have been elected to serve in legislative bodies give him, it is quite certain that he never will have anything to say as to the price of his products.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas and to the Senate that by that very legislation which this body and the other House passed, and which became a law, the farmer was deprived of more than \$1 a bushel. That applies to the spring-wheat crop of 1917 and all the crop of 1918.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Does not the Senator think that it would be better for the Government to pay the farmer \$1 a bushel than to guarantee him \$2.26 a bushel on wheat that he has not planted yet, when half the men who will plant this spring never planted wheat before?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that all those questions have been seriously considered. The committee heard representatives from nearly every board of trade and chamber of commerce in the United States on that very question. While the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] called attention to certain things, there is one thing which I believe he overlooked, and that is the danger of fraud being perpetrated upon the Government of the United States and upon the people of the United States if we again throw open these exchanges when the Government is responsible for this fixed price of wheat. That is one of the main reasons, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas, why the committee thought that it was best to let the Government handle the entire crop, to buy and to sell it.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the Senator has no greater objection to the exchanges than I have. I think they ought to be abolished. I am not talking about the exchanges.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator that the Government of the United States would have to guard every elevator and every warehouse in the country if his proposition should prevail. It would cost this country hundreds of millions of dollars to do what the Senator is attempting to do if these grain exchanges are thrown open again. Suppose the Senator from Arkansas intends to pay the producer the guaranteed price, how is he going to do it under his amendment?

It was proposed to the committee that the market price should be paid to the farmer and a certificate given him for the balance. Let me remind the Senate that the great danger is not that the farmer is going to perpetrate a fraud, but when all this grain is placed in the warehouses and in the thousands of elevators all over the country—human nature is human nature—let us suppose that some of these elevators have 50,000 bushels of wheat on hand and they report and show certificates for double or three times that amount, how is the Government to keep a record of what these elevators, warehouses, and mills have on hand unless they superintend the entire business? Let us assume—and it is a very reasonable assumption, because selfishness and greed have not yet been eliminated from the human nature—if these elevators and storehouses should have a loss by fire and could show that they have issued certificates for thousands of bushels of grain, for which they have never paid a cent, the Government would have to pay this fictitious loss. The Government would have to pay it, and the loss to the Government, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas, would be so much greater than the loss which the Government will sustain in making this guarantee good, and doing it openly.

If you want to repudiate this obligation, have courage enough to say that you do not want to pass this bill. If you believe in repudiation and dishonor, for God's sake have the courage of your convictions and say that you want to repudiate this law and repudiate this proclamation which the Chief Executive of this Nation has promulgated under authority of law.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator from North Dakota suppose that the President would make a regulation now providing for the payment of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat that is not yet planted? If not, why not? Because the war is over now. Why should the regulation, which was made immediately before the war ended, apply to a crop that has not yet been planted?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator has asked me if the President of the United States would make a regulation affecting the price of spring wheat. I will say to the Senator that I believe the President would, for I assume the President is an honest man; and there would be just as much dishonor in the repudiation of the spring wheat crop as there would be in the repudiation of the winter wheat crop.

I want to call the Senator's attention to the proclamation of the President. I am afraid that the Senator has not had time to read the proclamation of the President of the United States; or, if he has read it, he may have forgotten it, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] suggests. May I ask that the Secretary read the President's proclamation, which I send to the desk?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PRESIDENT EXPLAINS PLANS TO INSURE FAIR WHEAT PRICE FOR CROPS GROWN IN 1919—BASIS OF GOVERNMENT GUARANTY—COMMISSION TO BE APPOINTED NEXT SPRING TO REPORT ON ALL FACTORS NOW OR THAT MAY THEN EXIST TO GUIDE HIM IN DECISIONS.

MEMORANDUM.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1918.

In issuing to-day the Government's guaranty of the same price for the 1919 wheat crop that was guaranteed for the 1918 crops I wish it to be understood that in the spring of 1919 I will appoint a disinterested commission, who will secure for me the facts by that time disclosed as to the increased cost of farm labor and supplies, using the three-year prewar average prices of wheat, of labor, and of supply costs as a basis, and that from this information I shall determine whether there should be an increase in price above the present level, and, if so, what advance, in order to maintain for the farmer a good return. Should it then appear that an increase is deserved over the present guaranty, however, it will be applied only to those who have by next harvest already marketed their 1918 wheat.

It is the desire and intention of all departments of the administration to give to the wheat grower a fair and stimulative return in order that the present acreage in wheat may be maintained.

I find a great conflict of opinion among various sections of the country as to the price that should be named as a minimum guaranty. It must be obvious to all, however, that the factors which will make for increased or decreased cost of production of next year's harvest can not be determined until the near approach to the harvest.

In giving a guaranteed price for wheat one year in advance (the only industry guaranteed by the Government) there is involved a considerable national risk. If there should be peace or increased shipping available before the middle of 1920, Europe will naturally supply itself from the large stores of much cheaper wheat now in the Southern Hemisphere; and therefore the Government is undertaking a risk which might in such an event result in a national loss of as much as \$500,000,000 through an unsalable surplus; or, in any event, in maintaining a high level of price to our own people for a long period subsequent to freedom in the world's markets.

Despite this, the desirability of assuring a supply to the world of prime breadstuffs by insuring the farmer against the fluctuations in prices that would result from the uncertainties of the present situation and from the speculation those uncertainties entail seems to me to make the continuation of the guaranty for another year desirable. On the other hand, it is clear that before increasing this liability by large sums with the risks set forth above, and before increasing the burden of the consumer, the matter should be subjected to searching inquiry at the appropriate time—the time when the pertinent facts will be known.

I feel confident that with this preliminary fixed guaranty, and with the assurance that justice will in any event be done to the grower, he will continue the fine patriotic effort by which he has served the country hitherto; that the Government will have acted prudently; and that the consumer will be satisfied that his interests are not unduly sacrificed, but just and exhaustive consideration given to every element of the matter at the proper time.

WOODROW WILSON.

PROCLAMATION GUARANTEEING PRICE FOR THE WHEAT CROP GROWN IN 1919 IS ISSUED BY PRESIDENT WILSON.

[By the President of the United States of America.]

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas under and by virtue of an act of Congress entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved by the President on the 10th day of August, 1917, it is provided, among other things, as follows:

"SEC. 14. That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat and that it is essential that the producers of wheat, produced within the United States, shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided for in this section, he is authorized, from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain standards act approved August 11, 1916. The President shall from time to time establish and promulgate such regulations as he shall deem wise in connection with such guaranteed prices, and in particular governing conditions of delivery and payment; and differences in price for the several standard grades in the principal primary markets of the United States adopting No. 1 northern spring

or its equivalent at the principal interior primary markets as the basis. Thereupon the Government of the United States hereby guarantees every producer of wheat produced within the United States that, upon compliance by him with the regulations prescribed, he shall receive for any wheat produced in reliance upon this guaranty within the period, not exceeding 18 months, prescribed in the notice, a price not less than the guaranteed price therefor as fixed pursuant to this section. In such regulations the President shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which any such producer shall be entitled to the benefits of such guaranty.

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, by virtue of the powers conferred upon me by said act of Congress, and especially by section 14 thereof, do hereby find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guaranty provided for in said section, and in order to make effective the guaranty by Congress for the crop of 1919 and to assure such producers a reasonable profit I do hereby determine and fix and give public notice of reasonable guaranteed prices for No. 1 northern spring wheat and its equivalents at the respective principal primary markets as follows, to wit:

New York, N. Y., \$2.39½ per bushel.
Philadelphia, Pa., \$2.39 per bushel.
Baltimore, Md., \$2.38½ per bushel.
Newport News, Va., \$2.38½ per bushel.
Duluth, Minn., \$2.22½ per bushel.
Minneapolis, Minn., \$2.21½ per bushel.
Chicago, Ill., \$2.26 per bushel.
St. Louis, Mo., \$2.24 per bushel.
Kansas City, Mo., \$2.18 per bushel.
Omaha, Nebr., \$2.18 per bushel.
New Orleans, La., \$2.28 per bushel.
Galveston, Tex., \$2.28 per bushel.
Tacoma, Wash., \$2.20 per bushel.
Seattle, Wash., \$2.20 per bushel.
Portland, Oreg., \$2.20 per bushel.
Astoria, Oreg., \$2.20 per bushel.
San Francisco, Cal., \$2.20 per bushel.
Los Angeles, Cal., \$2.20 per bushel.
Salt Lake City, Utah, \$2 per bushel.
Great Falls, Mont., \$2 per bushel.
Pocatello, Idaho, \$2 per bushel.
Spokane, Wash., \$2 per bushel.

And that the guaranteed price for the other grades established under the United States grain standards act, approved August 11, 1918, based on said price for No. 1 northern spring wheat at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned, will assure the producers of wheat produced within the United States a reasonable profit; the guaranteed prices in the principal primary markets above mentioned being fixed by adopting No. 1 northern spring wheat or its equivalents at the principal interior markets as the basis.

For the purposes of such guaranty only I hereby fix the guaranteed prices at the respective principal primary markets above mentioned for the following grades of wheat, to wit, No. 1 northern spring, No. 1 hard winter, No. 1 red winter, No. 1 Durum, No. 1 hard white. The guaranteed prices at the respective principal primary markets aforesaid of all other grades of wheat established under the United States grain standards act approved August 11, 1918, shall be based on the above-guaranteed prices and bear just relation thereto.

The sums thus determined and fixed are guaranteed by the Government of the United States at the respective principal primary markets of the United States above mentioned to every producer of wheat of any grade so established under the United States grain standards act, upon the condition that said wheat is harvested in the United States during the year 1919 and offered for sale before the 1st day of June, 1920, to such agent or employee of the United States, or other person, as may be hereafter designated, at any one of the above-mentioned cities, which are hereby declared to be the principal primary markets of the United States, and provided that such producer complies with all regulations which may be hereafter promulgated in regard to said guaranty by the President of the United States.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done in the District of Columbia this 2d day of September, in the year of our Lord 1918, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

During the reading of the proclamation,

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota how much more of this proclamation is to be read, and would not the Senator be willing to have it printed in the RECORD? We have had our day, and out of four legislative days of the session remaining one day has been taken on this bill. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota sympathizes with me in my urgent desire to secure the passage of the measure. If it is not passed at an early date, I shall feel obliged to ask that it be laid aside temporarily and let some other legislation have the right of way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading is all over except the reading of the name, which will be read.

The SECRETARY (reading):

Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. GORE. I shall not filibuster against the pronouncement of that name.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I fully realize what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has stated, but I desired this proclamation read for the benefit of the Members of the Senate to show that there is a binding contract between the Government of the United States and the farmers of the United States. I shall take only a very few moments longer, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas.

Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that at the time the Government of the United States fixed the price of wheat the Government of Italy—and Italy produces a great deal of wheat, for it produced in 1918, 176,000,000 bushels—made the price of \$3.60 for 1918 for hard wheat and \$3.18 for soft wheat. It made a price of wheat for 1919 of \$4.44 for hard wheat and \$3.96 for soft wheat. France, which produces a great deal of wheat, made the price for 1918, \$3.96, and reduced it only to \$3.84 for 1919. Great Britain was the only European country, which made a low price for wheat, but Great Britain guaranteed the price up to and including the year 1922, I will say to the Senator, of \$1.64 per bushel.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota should state that that is a minimum price and not the absolute price.

Mr. GRONNA. That is a minimum price. I thank the Senator.

Holland guaranteed the price of wheat to her farmers for 1918 of \$2.76 and for 1919 of \$3.30 per bushel. Switzerland guaranteed a price for wheat to her farmers of \$3.36 for the 1918 crop and \$3.18 for the 1919 crop. Norway guaranteed for the 1918 crop \$4.38 and for the 1919 crop \$4.09. Of course Norway does not produce a great deal of wheat, although she produces a considerable quantity.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will allow me to finish this list, then I will yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Right on that point, has the Senator any information that those Governments expect to allow these guaranties to stand now, inasmuch as the war is over?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Dakota has the information that these countries are going to live up to their contracts. I will say that this information has been furnished me by the food department, and the communication bears the stamp of that department.

Mr. President, Brazil established a guaranteed price for wheat of \$2.16. It is shown that the only government in Europe which made a lower price than that fixed by the United States was the Government of Great Britain; and I repeat, that every one of those governments is living up to the contract it made.

If we have only a normal crop in the United States, I believe—and I have so stated many a time on this floor—that this Government will not lose a dollar on the 1919 crop; it will lose no more on the 1919 crop than it did on the 1918 crop; and the Senator from Arkansas knows, if he has made an investigation, that the Government made a profit on the wheat crop of 1918, instead of sustaining a loss. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. President, if we are going to begin repudiation, let us not begin on the farmer alone, but let us repudiate all contracts. There are in the United States to-day, to my knowledge, thousands and thousands of contracts which have not even been entered into formally and in connection with which no written agreement can be found. Do you want to repudiate those contracts? I, for one, do not. I am willing to pay my share of the taxes to see that this great country of ours sustains its honor and pays its honest debts. I care not whether it affects the people of the North, or the West, or the South, or the East, we can not afford to begin repudiation; we can not afford to cast a stigma upon the honor of this country, which so unselfishly sent thousands and millions of its noble young sons across the sea to fight for our flag and for the cause of civilization, as has been so loudly proclaimed on this floor. We can not have it said, now that these boys have been successful in their efforts and are triumphantly returning home, that we should begin a policy of repudiation.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that the amendment which I propose does not affect the price of \$2.26 to the wheat raiser.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that, although I know he is one of the ablest lawyers on the floor of the Senate, I differ with him. It would affect the price, and I would rather see the bill defeated, I will say to the Senator, than to see his amendment accepted.

Mr. President, I had intended to explain this bill at some length, but inasmuch as the chairman of the committee is anxious to secure a vote on it, I shall not further delay the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's closing observation, and I am sure the Senate will appreciate my desire to secure a vote. When we met this morning there were only four legislative days remaining, and an enormous amount

of legislation remained to be passed, including billions of dollars to be enacted in the form of appropriation bills, much of it controverted legislation that ought to be discussed. This measure is not controverted; there will not be five votes cast against it. This proposed legislation is to fulfill a contract, and it ought to have been passed in 20 minutes. I shall feel obliged to lay it aside temporarily unless at least the friends of the bill forbear to discuss it. I move to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. KIRBY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, in section 2, page 2, line 14, before the word "use," to strike out "create and"; and on the same line, after the word "any," to insert "existing," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 2. That in carrying out the provisions of this act the President is authorized to make such regulations and issue such orders as may be necessary, to enter into any voluntary arrangements or agreements, to use any existing agency or agencies, to accept the services of any person without compensation, to cooperate with any agency or person, to utilize any department or agency of the Government, including the Food Administration Grain Corporation, and to coordinate their activities so as to avoid any preventable loss or duplication of effort or funds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 11, after the word "necessary," to insert "to carry out the purposes of this act and to enable the people of the United States to purchase wheat products at a reasonable price," so as to read:

Sec. 3. That whenever the President shall find it essential, in order to carry out the guaranties aforesaid or to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder, he is authorized to buy, or contract for the purchase of, wheat of said crops of 1918 and 1919 at the places designated for the delivery of the same by the President's proclamations or such other places as he may designate, for cash at the said guaranteed prices, and he is authorized thereafter to buy or contract for the purchase of, for cash, or sell, consign, or contract for the sale of, for cash or on credit, wheat of the said crops of 1918 and 1919 and flour produced therefrom at the said guaranteed prices or at such other prices and on such terms or conditions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act and to enable the people of the United States to purchase wheat products at a reasonable price.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the purpose of the provision which follows the amendment just agreed to, and which I will read to him. I refer to the provision on page 3, lines 20 to 25, defining the powers of the President conferred by this bill. It says:

Including the protection or indemnification—

The words "or indemnification" are offered as an amendment by the committee—

of millers, wholesalers, jobbers, bakers, and retail merchants who purchase in carload lots against actual loss by them on account of abnormal fluctuations in the price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. If I may complete my question before the Senator answers it, I do not see any connection between the function outlined in that provision and the guaranteeing of the price of wheat as heretofore fixed by the President. It is entirely a different subject, entering into a field that was scarcely covered by the vast powers and extraordinary functions conferred upon the administration during the war before the armistice was signed. Under this provision the President would have the power, and it would be his duty to exercise the power when it is conferred under the responsibilities of his position, to protect and indemnify millers, wholesalers, jobbers, bakers, and retail merchants against loss in their business transactions. What is the purpose of that provision?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the object of that provision is to meet this situation: The crop of 1918 is still being marketed; it is being marketed on the basis of \$2.26 per bushel. Millers have a great deal of that wheat now on hand, and bakers are estimated to have on hand \$50,000,000 worth of flour, manufactured from this wheat. The millers have been obliged to buy this wheat at the market price of \$2.26.

Bakers have been obliged to buy their flour on the basis of \$2.26 per bushel for wheat. Now, it may come to pass, when the new crop comes in, that while paying the farmer \$2.26, the guaranteed price, as a matter of course, the President may decide to permit the people to purchase flour on the basis of \$1.50 wheat, by way of illustration—whatever may be the market price prevailing in the world. The millers' will, of course, have on hand a good deal of wheat which they had to

buy at \$2.26. The bakers will have on hand flour which they had to buy on the basis of wheat at \$2.26. It was felt to be a mere matter of justice that when wheat and flour come down by the action of the Government the millers and bakers ought not to be obliged to take the loss where they had to buy it under Government control.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator says "by the action of the Government"; but the bill does not say that.

Mr. GORE. The Senator understands that all wheat is now being marketed under Government control on the basis of \$2.26 a bushel.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that; but the Senator says that the purpose of this provision is to protect them from loss suffered by the action of the Government.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The bill contains no such limitation at all, nor any limitation. It says:

Against actual loss by them on account of abnormal fluctuations in the price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops—

Any loss.

Mr. GORE. There ought not to be, and probably would not be, any abnormal fluctuation. I take it there will be very little.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why would there not be? There have been abnormal fluctuations, every year that I have ever paid any attention to the price of wheat, in the price of wheat and in the price of almost every other product.

Mr. GORE. There has been no fluctuation at all under Government control.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; but you say that you are going to protect them against fluctuations below the Government price.

Mr. GORE. No; the Senator did not understand me. The Government will have to pay the farmers \$2.26 per bushel for wheat marketed in June and July. Millers will have on hand wheat harvested in 1918 which they had to buy at \$2.26. Now, suppose the Government decides that while it must pay the farmers \$2.26 for wheat marketed in June and July of this year, yet the people shall be allowed to buy flour manufactured from such wheat on the basis, say, of \$1.50 per bushel for wheat. That would leave millers and bakers with wheat and flour on hand which the Government compelled them to buy on the basis of \$2.26; and unless they were indemnified against loss they would, of course, have to sell it in competition with the flour manufactured from wheat sold arbitrarily at \$1.50, the Government taking the loss resulting from the difference. Now, the millers ought not to be obliged to take that loss. The Government ought to take that loss.

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

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. Suppose that the Government pursues the course which the Senator from Minnesota a short time ago suggested was the wise and proper course—namely, while guaranteeing the price of wheat at \$2.26, to let the law of supply and demand take its course, and as a result the market price of wheat was, say, \$1.50 a bushel, the Government being compelled to pay the difference between \$1.50 a bushel and \$2.26. Under those circumstances, as I understand the Senator, a number of millers and bakers who now have a considerable supply of flour on hand would lose money.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. That is to say, they would have on hand a product that cost them more than the product would cost in the market after the Government allowed the law of supply and demand to take its course.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. I can not see, with the understanding I now have of this bill, under what principle of morals the Government of the United States ought to indemnify the millers and the bakers and those who have that flour on hand.

Mr. GORE. Why, Mr. President, this is the reason: This country had to be fed. Wheat had to be converted into flour. The millers had to do that. They had to buy it at \$2.26 a bushel. They had no choice. Now, it seems to me that it would be an act of the worst imaginable bad faith for the Government to reduce the price of wheat and oblige its citizens who had purchased at a price fixed by the Government to take the loss as compared with that artificially high price when the Government permitted the price to go down.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, the Government does not lower the price. It merely permits the law of supply and demand to take its course. If the law of supply and demand brought wheat to \$1.50 per bushel, those who had loaded up—if I may be permitted a vulgarism—with wheat at a higher price would have to take the loss, just the same as there are hundreds of retail merchants in the United States to-day who were compelled to buy, in order to meet the demands of their

local trade and their customers, millions and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of goods at high prices, war prices, goods produced under the war-price standard. Now, with the termination of the war prices have gone down, and their competitors who do not have a large amount of goods on hand may go into the markets and buy the same character of goods and the same quality of goods at a price perhaps 50 per cent less. Does the Senator think the Government ought to come in and indemnify those men because of the losses which they have sustained?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think the Government ought to indemnify every citizen of the United States against any loss that the Government compels him to take. I lay down that principle as universal. Let me cite, now, a concrete case, a hypothetical case, that may happen.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. We will say that on July 1 a miller had 100,000 bushels of wheat on hand, that he bought in the regular course of his trade. He bought it on the basis of \$2.26 a bushel, because he could not buy it at any other price without violating the law and subjecting himself to prosecution. On the 1st day of July the Government reduces the price of wheat to \$1.50 per bushel. Shall the miller take the loss of \$75,000 on account of the action of his Government? My understanding is that governments are instituted to protect men against injury and injustice, and not to perpetrate those acts upon them. I think it would be the grossest act of injustice to compel a man to sell an article for less than he paid for it when the Government fixed the price at which he could buy it, and when the purchase, manufacture, and sale was indispensable to the existence of the country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator how far this reimbursement is carried. Is it carried from the miller to the retailer, to the grocer, and to the baker?

Mr. GORE. I think so, where they have purchased in carload lots; yes, sir.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a suggestion?

Mr. GORE. I yield; yes, sir.

Mr. KELLOGG. It takes, as I recollect, about 10,000,000 bushels of wheat to keep the mills supplied constantly. Now, if they are compelled to buy at \$2.26, and by reason of the Government taking off the inhibition about a free market the price goes down to \$1.50, the result will be that the millers are not going to keep up the supply of the country. They will not buy the wheat.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that instead of complaining about the Government you ought to praise the Government, because the Senator from Minnesota said, when he was occupying the floor a little while ago, that if the Government had not fixed the price at \$2.26 wheat would have gone to \$4 or \$5 a bushel; so that if these bakers and millers had bought the flour or the wheat at \$5 a bushel, as was suggested, the indemnification would be very much more than now, when they bought it at \$2.26.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator knows, if he knows anything about the matter, that where there is a free market the miller who buys a million bushels of wheat in order to manufacture it into flour sells a million bushels of wheat on the same day, or sells the flour on the same day that he buys the wheat.

Mr. GORE. And is allowed to hedge against it. He hedges against the loss.

Mr. KELLOGG. Absolutely; although he is prohibited from doing so under this law.

Mr. GORE. If the market had been left open, they would have hedged and protected themselves against loss. They were denied that privilege. The markets were closed. Shall the Government oblige innocent men to take these enormous losses?

I simply wish to add one thing to what I have said to illustrate my general position: I was not in favor of the Government getting into this situation at all. We find ourselves, I will say particularly to the Senator from Washington, pretty much in the situation of a man surrounded by a circle of fire, with inflammable material increasing the nearer it approaches to him. In that situation I would advise the man to get out, and to take the thinnest place in the flame, if he could determine which it was; but he ought to get out from the fire before it gets worse.

That is the situation in which the Government is in this matter. It has created an artificial situation. When we change

the artificial situation we have got to get out, and we have got to take our losses as we go.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 3, line 21.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there has been no vote upon this amendment for indemnification.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that the only reason that was inserted in addition to "protection" was because that word was supposed to relate to anticipated losses, while "indemnification" applies to cases where they had already purchased it and had it on hand when the change in the situation came. I think the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I just want to call attention to the proposition that the provision which has just been discussed by its terms requires the Government to protect every dealer in wheat from any loss—the most unprecedented thing that has ever been suggested in any legislation in the history of Congress.

While I am commenting upon this bill, I should like to ask another question of the Senator from Oklahoma as to the purpose of section 4 of the bill, which gives the President complete control over all grain exchanges and all dealers in grain, and authorizes him to issue licenses to regulate their practices and transactions and operations. The Senator certainly does not contend that that vast authority is necessary in order to enable the Government to fulfill the obligation which it has assumed—that it should pay \$2.26 a bushel for the 1919 crop of wheat. Why do you continue to keep this great branch of the industry of the country under Government control?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that is a continuation of existing law. A section is contained in the food-control act vesting that authority. I do not know that it is very material now, because if the Government purchases grain and licenses those who handle it from the beginning to the end of its processes, there will be very little opportunity for dealing in it on the boards of trade.

I took up this question rather biased in favor of the Government taking its hands off the situation, as far as practicable, at once, and establishing a free and open market and permitting the trade to handle the situation; but the more I investigated it the more strongly I was driven to the conclusion that it was not practicable, and I conferred with a good many members of the trade. I may say that I conferred with representatives of the Chicago Board of Trade. I think they finally reached the conclusion that the situation was so artificial, not only in this country but in other countries, that the trade would not be equal to handling this crop.

I do not think that is really very material. We have a provision farther on, as the Senator will observe, making it the duty of the President to establish a free and open market as soon as practicable. That was as far as we felt justified in going.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GORE. I yield; yes.

Mr. NELSON. I want to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma this idea: That if you do not include boards of trade and grain exchanges the speculation that prevailed before the Government entered into this wheat guaranty would prevail, just as last year in the case of the previous crop, if the boards of exchange and grain exchanges had been open and there had been no guaranty wheat would have been from \$3 to \$4 a bushel. Now, if the Government guarantees the price of it, we do not want these grain exchanges to step in and interfere with the operations of the Government. If you throw the door open to the grain exchanges, they will hamper the Government in its operations in carrying out this guaranty.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that might or might not happen; of course, I can not tell; but other countries have fixed a price on wheat. They will undoubtedly attempt to manage the sale of wheat this year so as to minimize their losses. Therefore there will not be a world market in wheat. It will not be flowing in an open market, here or elsewhere, and it was feared that an attempt to permit the trade to handle it would result in a sagging of the market here which would increase the Government's losses.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. CALDER. Has the Senator inquired carefully into the suggestion of the New York Produce Exchange as to the best method of handling this question?

Mr. GORE. I will say that I have considered a like proposition which was submitted by other exchanges. I ought in can-

dor to add that I was predisposed to favor those propositions which looked to the early establishment of a free and open market; but I was finally driven, and reluctantly driven, to the conclusion that the conditions are so artificial, and there are so many arbitrary forces in the situation, that it can not be done; and I think a large percentage of the trade reached the same conclusion. I was convinced, and many of them after hearing the arguments told me that they were convinced, that responsibility would be fixed upon the trade for occurrences for which they were not responsible, and which they did not have the power to avert; and I think many of them are satisfied to have this artificial situation continued for a year.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, a further inquiry, if the Senator please. I entered the Chamber just a moment ago and heard the Senator speaking on the subject, but failed to get the full gist of his statement. Is there a provision in this bill by which the people who buy flour, and who consume the bread made from flour, can get it any cheaper?

Mr. GORE. There is a provision in the bill which permits the President to see to it that the consumers of the United States are able to purchase bread at a reasonable price. I assume that that will be construed to mean upon the basis of the world price, so far as the world price can be arrived at. Of course, there really will not be a world market nor a world price, but a reasonable price can be arrived at by considering the price of the wheat which is flowing freely in the world markets and the prevailing prices on corn, rye, and barley in the United States. There is a pretty well-defined ratio between those grains.

Mr. CALDER. So the Government purchases the wheat and then takes the loss in the sale of the wheat to the miller?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; that can be done under this bill. I assume it will be done.

Mr. CALDER. All the time having in mind the world market price of wheat?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CALDER. The commissioner in charge of the wheat problem will have to meet the world price to sell it?

Mr. GORE. As far as that can be arrived at.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. The amendment I proposed would have done what the Senator from New York asked about. There is nothing in the bill now which requires that it shall be done. Is it any less desirable that the Government shall manipulate the market to make \$1 wheat sell for \$2.26 to the consumer than that the exchange shall do it?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I may say that apart from that consideration, a very practical consideration which enters into my mind is substantially that the proposition was submitted to the House, and it was defeated by an overwhelming majority. It is my understanding that an effort will be made by the managers of this bill in the House to concur in the amendment without referring the bill to conference. I think that is extremely desirable. A good many things will have to subordinate themselves to the desire to pass this legislation before final adjournment. The Senator realizes, of course, that in the closing days of a Congress we sometimes do things that we would not do if we had more time.

Mr. PENROSE. I would like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I notice all through the bill that certain extraordinary autocratic powers are imposed on the President, and that he is directed to investigate the operations of numbers of transactions and perform certain duties. It seems to me we all know that that is a delusion and a deception. Does the Senator believe that the President will ever know a thing about the duties and responsibilities imposed on him specifically under the bill?

Mr. GORE. I think not.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator does not think he will ever know anything about it?

Mr. GORE. No; I do not.

Mr. PENROSE. In other words, he will delegate these vast powers to some petty autocrat sitting in a department.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator pleases to use that term.

Mr. PENROSE. That is really the outcome as I take it.

Mr. GORE. The duties will be devolved upon subalterns.

Mr. PENROSE. Then it seems to me the bill ought to be amended throughout, and instead of giving the public the thought that the President is going to perform these extraordinary duties, just come out and say that a clerk in a bureau

may be directed by the President to carry them out, and let us know where we are. I can live under a benevolent despotism, Mr. President, where I know the despot and can get to see him, but I sympathize with the opposition of the people in Europe to an autocracy. I have had two years' experience of petty bureaucratic autocrats invested with delegated authority, delegated originally by Congress to the President.

Mr. GORE. There is a weird sort of charm about some kinds of ignorance. It sometimes is bliss.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that; but there is no weird charm but a brutal reality when citizens come to Washington and are insulted and turned aside with scorn by these petty bureaucratic autocrats invested with these extraordinary powers by delegation from the President, who will never know anything about how these duties are discharged except in the most casual, superficial, supervisory way.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator deny those who are vested with "a little brief authority" their inalienable right to "cut fantastic tricks before high heaven"?

Mr. PENROSE. No; I would not. During the war, when citizens of Pennsylvania and from other parts of the country would come in to see me with the air black with profanity at the way they were treated by some petty autocrat or the utter inability they discovered to get any information even as to their status, I was willing to put up with it, although I thought the whole system wrong, even under war conditions. But now, when we are out of war, I think at least we should return to constitutional methods.

Mr. GORE. Did the Senator hear the speech of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this afternoon?

Mr. PENROSE. It is impossible for me to hear all the speeches in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. The Senator does not know then that democracy and good will are now universally prevalent and that everybody is going to promise to be good.

Mr. PENROSE. I have no doubt that is true, particularly in relation to Ireland, but I unfortunately missed that part of the Senator's speech. I will read it carefully. But what consolation is it to the unfortunate citizen who gets into the clutches of these bureaucrats and whose property is threatened with ruin to be assured that humanity will rule abroad, and that an international conscience perchance prompts the petty autocrat of the moment? There is no consolation in it that I can see.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think the Senator and myself are not in so wide a diversion on that point. I thought the Constitution was the bulwark of personal rights and property rights in war as well as in peace.

Mr. PENROSE. I thought so once, but no longer.

Mr. GORE. I thought breaches made in the Constitution in times of war would afterwards be cited by Bolsheviks as precedents to follow in times of peace. Of course the Senator realizes my situation. I look upon the bill now pending as I would look upon a major operation if I had to undergo one. I would not like it and I would not proceed to the table under the knife with any special pleasure, but under an overpowering and inevitable necessity I would go. We are in a predicament, as the Senator knows, and have got to get out of it one way or another.

Mr. PENROSE. I think we are in a predicament on account of the economic follies which attended the prosecution of the war in America, and I suppose I will have to vote for the bill.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that I will use my influence with the administration to have the acts of these autocrats to which he alludes referred to the league of nations.

Mr. PENROSE. That is very kind in the Senator. Will he go to Paris to carry out that program?

Mr. GORE. I do not control the issuance of passports.

Mr. PENROSE. I was only going to suggest in great sincerity that all through the bill the language be amended so as to read that whenever the President shall delegate the power to a clerk or other qualified citizen of the United States he shall then go on and be permitted to discharge these duties.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator can divest that amendment of any suggestion that would indicate any impeachment of the infallibility of those in authority I might support it.

Mr. PENROSE. Would the Senator be willing to support such an amendment? It might expedite the passage of the bill.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me to carry a veiled intimation against the infallibility of those who have been administering this law.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the Senator object to that, because I openly challenge their infallibility or their capacity?

Mr. GORE. I will have to refer that to the executive council.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I shall not pursue the inquiry any further. Perhaps when the league of peace is per-

pected the question of wheat will be a matter of world-wide regulation and the wheat raised in Turkey will be on a par with that raised in North Dakota.

Mr. GORE. I am afraid the Senator lacks faith in the new light.

Mr. PENROSE. I am full of weaknesses and frailties, I know; but I hope that wheat will be one of the things that is taken care of in the international league of nations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I suppose eventually this bill will pass.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. The remarks of the Senator from Illinois are always interesting, and in order that he may have a fitting audience I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sherman
Calder	Kellogg	New	Simmons
Curtis	Kendrick	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Fernald	Kenyon	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	King	Overman	Smoot
France	Kirby	Pittman	Spencer
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Poindexter	Sterling
Gay	Lenroot	Pollock	Sutherland
Gore	Lewis	Pomerene	Swanson
Gronna	Lodge	Randsell	Thompson
Harding	McKellar	Reed	Trammell
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sheppard	Welcott

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] are detained on official business.

Mr. SWANSON. My colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GORE. I should like to give notice now that I intend to try to hold a quorum to pass this bill to-night. I shall exhaust all the methods known to parliamentary usage to obtain it. I do not say that in the way of a threat, but Senators realize that we must legislate. I feel obligated to get the bill out of the way and not trespass on the time and patience of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hope the Senate will sit until 10 o'clock to-night, and it is the purpose of a number of us to do all in our power to keep the Senate here until that hour.

Mr. LEWIS. Not to hold it after 10?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not to hold it after 10.

Mr. SWANSON. I can not agree to that. It depends on how business is progressing. I do not understand that there is any agreement to adjourn at 10.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we hold the Senate until 10, we will be doing so much better than we have been doing that I feel encouraged by the suggestion. I shall not resist remaining longer, but I certainly shall insist that we stay here and work until 10 o'clock.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the Senate should stay and dispose of this measure. If the Senate will stay and see that this legislation is disposed of—

Mr. PENROSE. Is the Senator willing to adjourn after the disposition of this measure?

Mr. SWANSON. I will not say that. There is an executive session desired.

Mr. PENROSE. There seem to be two major generals on the other side. Whom is the minority to select?

Mr. SWANSON. We do not select major generals on this side. Every Senator here has his own individual will and judgment. It is only my individual wish to stay here.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to have the opinion of the Democratic whip.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not know why there is such an apprehension on either side of the Chamber when I take the floor.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield.

THOMAS G. ALLEN.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like at this time to call up the bill (H. R. 4610) to compensate Thomas G. Allen for injuries received while employed in the General Land Office of the United States and making an appropriation therefor. It is a

bill that was referred to the Committee on Claims after having been passed by the House of Representatives, allowing \$500 to Mr. Allen, of the Interior Department.

Mr. PENROSE. If I can be assured that the bill will not lead to prolonged debate, so as to delay the pending measure, I shall not object.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I can assure the Senator that if it does—

Mr. SHERMAN. That will be the condition.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall not press its consideration.

Mr. PENROSE. All right.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas G. Allen, the sum of \$500 in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries received while employed in the United States General Land Office, Washington, D. C., December 27, 1915.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. On December 27, 1915, Mr. Allen was engaged in working in the Interior Department and in the line of his duty in an official capacity was seriously injured. Some of the filing cases fell upon him after he had been instructed to get certain documents. The claim was approved in the House committee for \$1,000, but only passed for \$500. It was passed December 19, and I was appointed a subcommittee of one by the Committee on Claims to investigate this claim. I made a very thorough investigation of it. It is just. In my opinion Mr. Allen should receive \$1,000, but I have not changed the amount fixed by the House.

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

JOURNAL OF GRAND ARMY ENCAMPMENT.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will.

Mr. SMOOT. The House passed House concurrent resolution 69 for the printing of 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic. I report the concurrent resolution from the Committee on Printing and ask for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-third National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1919, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

GUARANTEED PRICE OF WHEAT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15796) to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder.

Mr. SHERMAN addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I shall object to the consideration of any bill that interferes with the passage of the pending measure. We have already agreed to-morrow that the entire calendar shall be called, and this bill ought not to be interfered with by any unanimous-consent agreement now. I shall object to any further unanimous-consent agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have a most splendid editorial from the Christian Science Monitor upon the subject of the league of nations. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It may be offered to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to hear it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my own time—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Mississippi has not got the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Illinois has the floor, but I have no doubt he will yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no doubt of it, either. I ask the Senator from Illinois to yield to me.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi, if the Chair please.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yields the floor to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; I do not yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not actuated by the idea of taking up the time of the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not yield the floor; and if the floor is to go, I withdraw my consent to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This editorial is entitled "Aude Sapere." At any time while I am reading this if any Senator will move or will suggest that I quit reading it and have it inserted in the RECORD, I will do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS proceeded to read the editorial.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be permitted to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I join in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I shall proceed to read.

Mr. WILLIAMS resumed the reading of the editorial, and having read some time, said:

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the remainder of the article in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The editorial entire is as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Feb. 24, 1919.]

AUDE SAPERE.

To-day Mr. Wilson lands in Boston Harbor. He lands there as the first President who has ever left the shores of America. And he lands there bringing with him the first draft of the great document he went to Europe to attempt to induce the peoples of the Eastern Hemisphere to sign. For years the President of the United States has been a student of history. He knows intimately the story of the struggle of the human race for liberty and equality. And it is safe to say that there is no page of the story he knows better than that which tells of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the United States. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," declares that famous instrument, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Looking round the world, in the autumn of 1918, the President must have been struck by the apparently unfathomable gulf which still stretched between the nations and this ideal. Here and there a nation had won freedom at a great price. But even these nations were being compelled to build ships and to recruit huge armies to prevent the tide of autocracy from flowing across their meadows or through the streets of their towns.

The President of the United States sat down as it were in the quiet of the White House, with the vast oceans heaving their rollers eastward to Europe and eastward to China and Japan, to think out his plan. With all the records of the war at his disposal, with a peculiar opportunity for reading and analyzing the thoughts, the passions, and the ideals which were sweeping through the consciousness of the world and the minds of its statesmen, he built up, little by little, the theory of the league of nations. Of course it was a theory and nothing but a theory then. Of course it is to a great extent a theory now. But it was at least a theory which to have conceived, even if it were destined to be shattered, was better than not to have conceived anything of such a nature at all.

When Mr. Wilson gave his gift to the world he must have smiled a little to himself. Already he must have heard in the Government offices and in the clubs, in the chancelleries, and in the war offices the Homeric laughter of Mars and Jupiter, and the acid criticism of all of those whose training had left them with little or no confidence in the power of good. But Mr. Wilson was a statesman, accustomed not only to encountering criticism and opposition, but to grappling with every strain of public opinion. He determined, therefore, to convince the world that he was right, that the hand of the Lord was not shortened so that it could not redeem. To do this, however, he felt that he must attend the peace conference in person. That he must be prepared to expound and explain his views to the statesmen of other countries. In short, that the issue before the nations was one fraught with such tremendous consequences for humanity that the opportunity for redemption from the old fallacies and the old fetters must not be lost.

What, then, Mr. Wilson saw as he looked around the world was surely something like this: The peoples of the earth had been engaged in the conflict of Armageddon. Principle, as was inevitable, had conquered. That is to say, those nations which had adhered most closely to truth had won the day. The danger, however, was this, that the victors might, for very want of better direction, waste the victory by enacting a peace of revenge. The excuse for such a peace was unfortunately, perhaps, tenfold that of any ordinary war. Yet such a peace could only have laid the train for another war. In such circumstances what was Mr. Wilson to do? He saw the danger of the situation if

it were left to drift. He saw the innumerable difficulties of any attempt to stop the drift. And he must have seen also the limitations of his own scheme for saving the situation. Something, however, it was obvious had got to be done if the situation was to be saved. Now, audacity, Danton has told us, is the way out of every difficulty. Mr. Wilson's scheme of a league of nations was, in the circumstances in which it was launched, Dantesque in its audacity. But, curiously enough, it was also the most Fabian conceivable. To have united Danton with Fabius was surely a triumph of diplomacy.

What Mr. Wilson undoubtedly had in mind in evolving the league of nations was the idea expressed by Lord Grey in the phrase that if the sacrifices of the war could not be utilized to prevent future wars it would be a calamity to the race. The type of mind of the President and Lord Grey is, in many ways, identical. The President, thinking over the same ground as Lord Grey, in the privacy of his own home resolved independently his league of nations. That was one thing. But to induce the nations to accept it was altogether another. He sailed for Europe. In Europe he found the very condition of opposition he had foreseen. But he found also a certain number of brilliant thinkers and the great majority of the people on his side. He was fortunate in winning early the warm friendship and support of King George and of Mr. Lloyd George, and with their help much of the latent questioning of his scheme was overcome.

So Mr. Wilson comes back to America with the league of nations in his dispatch box. The nations of the world have bowed to the idealism of the President and, with the mental reservations typical of their national characters, have agreed at least to attempt the great renunciation. What do they all hope from it? Something probably in exact proportion to their own trust in the power of good. And this, no doubt, is precisely what each will eventually receive from it. Anyway, a start has been made in a new era—the era of Armageddon. And the start has been made because the President of the United States has not flinched from the old proverb, "Aude sapere"—dare to be wise.

GUARANTIES TO PRODUCERS OF WHEAT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15796) to enable the President to carry out the price guaranties made to producers of wheat of the crops of 1918 and 1919 and to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, it is now time to pay the fiddler. We are engaged in that happy process to the extent of a thousand million dollars. When anybody undertakes to interfere with the market, he must either be prepared to undergo that process or retire from the proceedings early. A great many of my constituents have undertaken to handle all the production in a year of a certain kind of cereal, and they have inevitably either made a fortune or come to grief.

This was a vast undertaking by the Government to corner the wheat market. It had it to do, or it would necessarily have let the market take care of itself; it would have been the ordinary result. Prices of every species of merchandise used in the war—and it included about all of it—were either to be Government controlled or market controlled.

If the Government undertook to control it, it could either buy all that was offered on the open market and sell it the best it could in the event of the war's ending and the prices falling, or it could guarantee a fixed price. The Government adopted the latter process by an act of Congress, under which, by an Executive order, according to power delegated, a price of \$2.26 per bushel was fixed on this year's crop of wheat. The Government either had that to do or without its action the commodity would have gone to the market price measured by the demand.

The market price on many other things reached a very high figure. Wheat would have gone to between \$3 and \$4 a bushel, just as it did during the Civil War, if the Government had not considered the question of fixing the price and buying whatever was offered in the market or whatever was needed for Government purposes as well as for our allies. If it had not made a guaranteed price the producer of wheat would have been discouraged; if the price had been allowed to reach the market level, whatever it might have been, the farmer would not have produced the full quantity of wheat needed for both public and private uses. So, to avoid that difficulty, to encourage the producer, the farmer was induced by a minimum price to put out a large acreage. Last year the price was fixed at something less than this year—\$2.20, as I remember—while this year the price was fixed at \$2.26 at the primary inland market.

When this was done, it encouraged a very large acreage of wheat. If it had not been done, naturally that acreage would have been put into something else and the result would have been a diminished supply of wheat on the market.

No one could foretell when the war would end, so the Government gave the guaranty for 1919. Unfortunately as to this guaranty, but fortunately as to everything else, the war ended for practical purposes on the 11th of November, 1918. This naturally led to a fall in the price. If the Government had kept its hands off the wheat market, the farmer would have produced wheat under the stimulus of the market price; that price would have reached figures which would have induced him to have put into wheat every acre he could—probably a much larger acreage than that under the Government guaran-

teed price. That condition might not have continued for so long a time; it might not have lasted long enough to cover both 1918 and 1919; but while the high market price prevailed it would have caused a large acreage of wheat. The Government, however, after it had fixed the price and the war ended, faced a falling market.

I am satisfied with the provisions of this bill, taking it in its entirety, although there are some provisions in it I would not write if I were writing a bill to cover the subject; but none of us on a measure of this magnitude can have his ideas met entirely.

When the price began to fall in other markets we had to make some provision for the wheat crop in connection with the market price. In some markets wheat can be had very much cheaper than it can in this country. I understand that the importation of wheat is discouraged, if not actually prohibited, in our country. Wheat in Australia now sells for something less than a dollar a bushel. In that country there is a limited population and they produce a very large surplus. The whole population of Australasia is not equal to that of the State of Pennsylvania—in fact, it is a million less—and their wheat production can only be cared for by an export trade. They have sent some of it to other countries. Some of it reaches England and the ports of other European countries, but it is not allowed to come into our market.

The price of wheat flour and wheat products generally has not fallen, and it is not likely to fall until the Government begins to sell wheat at a lower price than that now prevailing in the market. Sometime the Government can do this. After it has bought all the wheat that is offered, it can turn around and sell it, and can fix the price of the sale. The Grain Corporation, with its office in New York, is a great distributing agency. It is an agency of the Government. If the Government will sell at a lower price, flour and wheat products will be available to the consumer at a lower price than they are now. I do not know whether or not the Government authorities intend to do that. The administration can keep wheat at \$2.26 a bushel until the 1st day of July next, or until the entire wheat crop of 1919 is harvested, thrashed, and turned into merchantable form.

If it wishes to keep up the price of flour products to the consumer for that length of time, it can do so, and it will not lose a dollar in this transaction; but the Government faces a loss on the \$2.26 guaranty, or its equivalent, only when it sells at a lower price than the guaranteed figures on just so much as it sells below that figure. It will use this fund on the theory that there will be 900,000,000 bushels of wheat next year, or, taking the winter wheat, that is a potential crop now and adding that to the spring-wheat sowing, and adding it all together, the crop of 1918, and estimating it at from 900,000,000 to 1,000,000,000 bushels, a guaranteed price on that of \$2.26, if the Government sells it at \$2.26, will cost the Treasury nothing; the taxpayer will be out of pocket nothing; but the American consumer will, during all that time of an artificially maintained price, pay the difference. The Government must decide whether it wants to do that or not. When it is generally known that the \$2.26 figure, or its equivalent, is the Government-maintained figure, and every bag of flour and all the wheat products of the country are sold on that basis, just how long the Government will be able to maintain its serenity, in the face of criticism, and save the Treasury from a loss nobody knows. It will have that to do, or we will have to face paying the bill. Just so much as the Government sells its wheat under the \$2.26, or its equivalent figure, that much the taxpayer or the Treasury stands to lose—there is no escape from it—or the consumer must pay it. In all the prices in which the Government did not interfere, in which markets sought their legitimate levels, based upon the demand for the article—as with rice, with cotton, with peanuts, with cotton products, with everything raised in every area, North or South, that was not interfered with by the Government and the general market outside the Government bought for its own use for war purposes—on all those matters prices sought their legitimate level. The consumer paid the bill in that case.

Some criticism has been made here on the floor of the Senate because the Government did not fix the price of cotton. We remember, a few years ago, when cotton was down to some 6 or 8 cents a pound. Under the pressure of war requirements it rose to many times that figure, an increase of four or five hundred per cent. Some criticism was made here at times—and I probably was guilty of it myself occasionally, as a matter of argument, at least—because there was no Government price-fixing on this article. When the Government did not fix the price on cotton the consumer of every cotton product paid the bill. Every person who bought cotton fabrics, who bought cot-

ton for any purpose in any form, either for clothing or any other purpose, paid his share of that bill. Now, if it comes to a matter of abstract justice, there is no more reason why the consumer of flour products should not pay his proportional part of the bill than there was why the user of cotton products, during these years of high prices, should not pay his share of the bill on those articles.

If the Government had laid its hand on cotton and fixed its price, it would have had to do one of two things. Either it would have diminished the consumption of cotton, and it thereby would have done an injustice to the producer, or it would have had to do what it did with wheat; it would have guaranteed the price of every bale of cotton produced in the United States in order to keep up the production, the inducement being the only way in which you can make a voluntary production possible.

That was not done, and you and I and the rest of us have paid our part of that contribution. The high price of cotton products has been the natural result of the high price level on the market. As a matter of abstract justice, although the first process is distributed among millions of people, there is no difference between them. Everybody has paid from a few cents to many dollars of this cost. When, however, the Government has guaranteed a price and it finds itself with from 900,000,000 to 1,000,000,000 bushels of guaranteed wheat likely to flow into the bins of the Grain Corporation, or that it becomes liable for upon its guarantee, then the question is presented in a very practical way; so that the Government must stand the loss or it must turn around and sell at the artificial guaranteed price. If it sells at that price, no miller can mill wheat and sell the flour to the consumer, or the by-products outside of the flour, at a low price. The baker can not sell bread at a low price. The miller can not sell bran and middlings, shorts, or anything else at a low price. The natural consequence will be that the price of wheat products will be maintained.

If that is true, the Government will lose nothing. The revolving fund of a thousand million dollars provided in this bill will continue in use as a balance for the purchase of grain until the time has expired in 1920, covering the period for the liquidation of all this transaction; and then, if the Government keeps up the artificial price of \$2.26, or its equivalent, it will have that entire sum to turn back into the Treasury and there will be no loss; but I do not think that will be done. I do not believe anybody here who votes for this bill expects it to be done. The public will understand that if the present price of flour is maintained, if bran and shorts and all the by-products of wheat maintain their present prices, the consumer will begin to complain.

The consumer will understand that the Government is responsible for the high price. It can not be the grain exchange this time. No board of trade in Chicago, no grain exchange in New York, none of the exchanges in Minneapolis or Kansas City will be responsible for the present price. The people will know where to put the responsibility.

That is why the Government will not stand the pressure. Even this bureaucrat, of whom my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] spoke very feelingly awhile ago—and I sympathize with him a great deal—even this gentleman, with his metallic cheek and his nerve of drawn steel and his utter insensibility to criticism, would not be able to stand the storm of indignation that would sweep down on him if he undertook to keep the price of wheat products up for all this period, say to 1920, or until the 1919 crop was disposed of. That is what it means, because we will live on the crop of 1919 over into 1920; and I think for one time in the history of Washington there will be some gentlemen at the heads of bureaus whose ears will tingle and who will have no maiden's blush on their cheeks when they hear it. They will not stand up against it. So it means a lowering. That is what I meant when I said, at the beginning here, that the time for paying the musician had arrived—a thousand million dollars of it.

I remember when wheat sold at 60 cents a bushel. Not very many years ago it sold for \$1 and less; it sold down to 94 cents. There is no money in wheat under \$1. Every wheat producer who keeps books, and who knows what his land is worth, and his agricultural implements, and his team—or his tractor, nowadays—his help, the depreciation of his machinery, who conducts his business like any other business man conducts it, knows that wheat can not be produced unless he goes up into Canada, across the line, where there is cheaper land, for less than \$1 a bushel and make anything out of it.

Wheat will come down from \$2.26. Say it will come down to \$1.26 or \$1.25, and that is as low as we could expect it, say, within the next year, by the time the 1919 crop has been harvested and disposed of. When that is done, by taking the estimates here we can tell how this bill was drawn, and that the

Senator from Oklahoma and his colleagues on the committee were approximately correct, as nearly correct as it is possible to be in a transaction of this kind.

In the United States, for instance, it is estimated that in 1919, with the increased acreage, we may have nearly one thousand million bushels of wheat. The crop of 1918 was over 900,000,000 bushels—917,000,000 bushels. If it should run up to one thousand million bushels, and all of it should be claimed from the Government at the guaranteed price, and the price should drop to \$1.25 or \$1.26 a bushel, it means a loss to the Government of \$1 a bushel, and with one thousand million bushels it would absorb the amount of the revolving fund provided in this bill. If the decrease is less than the \$1, it will diminish the loss by that much, so the appropriation provided in the bill is within the limits of safety. If the decrease is less than \$1, we will have something left to turn back of this fund. If not, we have got to pocket the loss and go on.

We can reconcile ourselves to that, because, whatever the loss may be—whether the entire amount of this appropriation or only a part of it—that loss is a part of the cost of the war. It is as much a part of the expenses of this war as the powder that has been burned, the uniforms worn out, the hospitals that have been built and that we will not need, or these concrete buildings that are around on the Plaza, that will stay here in order that the visitor may know that there are old ruins in America as well as in Europe. [Laughter.]

We are running a hotel, a series of hotels, a series of boarding houses. The boarding-house prune and oatmeal are found in the greatest abundance in these concrete buildings across here that are now occupied. They will be there a long time, and they are a part of the cost of the war. What I said here one time, a year or two ago, will apply there. The hardest thing this Government will have to do will be to get rid of these unsightly objects. The Plaza is doomed to be the habitation of Government eyesores, it seems, indefinitely. We tried to get the old buildings down, and about the time we got them down these others went up. But it is a part of the bill we have to pay; and we will pay the bill for the guaranteed wheat price in just the same way.

Some criticism has been made occasionally of the principle of the Government appropriating this money and providing the machinery to liquidate the transaction. I think it ought to be done just as economically as possible. I do not think the Government ought to throw up its hands and quit. I believe we ought to get out with as little expense as can be well contrived, and that is what this bill is undertaking to do. There will be some pay roll connected with it, and it is provided that the administrative expenses shall be not exceeding \$3,000,000. I do not think that is out of proportion for a transaction of this kind, comprising a matter of a thousand million dollars and keeping account of wheat production running into that number of bushels, it is not out of the way.

The Government has undertaken to do a good many things. It has practically put all the grain exchanges of the country out of business. The commission men who have acted as agents between the buyer and the seller, all those men who own the property from the time it left the producer until it reached the consumer, have either been working on a very close margin, a small per cent fixed by the Government, or have gone out of business altogether. I never thought a grain exchange was a burden upon the business. I thought that that agent was a middle man who could not well be supplanted.

I know in some places for a good many years it has been sought to eliminate the grain exchange, but just as surely as the grain exchange is eliminated something else takes its place. There is no difference between an elevator run by a grange in North Dakota and one run by anybody else, except it is supposed that the one run by the grange or by the Government or by a combination of farmers will be run at a less profit than a private company which is maintained entirely for gain.

Time is the great test of those things. The bill goes on the idea somewhat, there is a hint in it, here and there in some sections, that a grain exchange is an object to be legislated against. It is provided that they can not carry on their occupation without taking out a license, and being subject to various penalties for violating what are called "evil practices" in the bill. The evil practices are enumerated and lie largely, not in any matter of statutory definition, but all are matters of rules to be made by the department. So undoubtedly when the rules are made they will keep a grain exchange or a member of it from making any money.

Whatever may be the result though, by the time the Government gets through, it will have had to frame up and put into operation something to take the place of it. The Grain Corpora-

tion is nothing but a big grain exchange. It is run by the Government. The stock is owned by the Government. It is headed by a very expert wheat man, Mr. Barnes, but when they get through with it somebody will have paid the bill. The Grain Corporation is run by men just like any other business enterprise. They must live and their salaries are paid. The office, the rent, the stationery, the clerical help, all the usual expenses belonging to a grain exchange are found in the Grain Corporation owned by the Government. Those expenses will not be charged up in all probability to the expenses of the war beginning in 1917 or before that time. It will be said that it was conducted at a very low price. The Government never charges up against its transactions any of these expenses and so they make a very good showing a large part of the time.

The United States has the largest wheat production to its credit of any other country in the world. In 1918 it produced 917,000,000 bushels. British India came in as the second area of production with 379,000,000 bushels, in round figures. Then came Argentina with 219,000,000 bushels. The various wheat-producing countries follow in their order, with Australia next with 121,000,000 bushels. I shall ask permission to insert all these figures at the end of my remarks, because I should like to have these productions in 1918 shown in order to compare the productions of other countries with that of the United States. Ordinarily our exports in normal times run from 100,000,000 to 120,000,000 bushels per annum. Under war conditions, beginning with, say 1915 or 1916, our exports ran to over 300,000,000 bushels. If the same figures would be maintained out of the 900,000,000 or 1,000,000,000 bushels in 1919, we would export one-third of it. That will not be maintained, however, under peace conditions. England will draw some of her wheat supplies from other sources. Some will reach her markets from Australia and some from Argentina. British India will resume her shipments, and of the 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 bushels produced in British India, a large part of it will seek the market of England. The foreign demand for our shipment will be lessened. Even if we kept up to the full export of 1917 and 1918 we could not expect to get the prices prevailing during the war in 1919 for our exports.

Wheat products are cheaper in London than they are in Washington. They are cheaper in every South American city; they are cheaper in any settled peaceful market at present, outside of Russia, than they are here. We are paying high prices. We are still living on a war basis. We will continue on wheat products to live on a war basis until the Government reduces the price of the \$2.26 wheat. When it does that the taxpayer will make up the difference.

So it resolves itself into a contest between the consumer of wheat products and the man who pays the taxes into the Treasury that supplies this \$1,000,000,000. How long that will continue I do not know. It depends a great deal upon public sentiment as to just how soon the public will discover where the responsibility lies.

Prices are not falling in this country very materially just now. They are not greatly falling in Washington. They will be kept up here for some time. Prices will remain at a fairly high figure for most manufactured articles for some time.

I do not wish to see wages fall, and still a large part of the high prices of merchandise is attributable to the labor cost of whatever the article may be. It is bound to remain that way until the prices change. The labor unions tell us there will be no reduction in wages. I do not wish to see the wages unduly reduced. Whether they can keep to the full war figure or not I very much doubt. I am opposed to any reduction in wages except as the reduction keeps pace with the reduced cost of things that the wage earner must buy. If there is any reduction, the fall ought to be made proportionately so that at the time there is a reduction in wages there will at least be a corresponding reduction in rent, in clothing, and in all manner of food products that go into his kitchen, so that in the end he will not be any worse off with whatever reduction is made than he is with the high prices that prevail all along the line at the present time.

The main thing, after all, is to readjust these prices so as to keep everything moving, so the pay rolls will still be alive, so there will be no idle men collected. Out in the soft-coal country there are many thousands of idle miners. It does not make any difference what the miner could get per day; if he has no work he earns nothing. High prices are continuing for him so as to use up at these figures whatever surplus he may have accumulated. So the first thing to consider is keeping the pay roll.

I would rather the high price of wheat would remain than that it should fall out of all proportion and that the pay roll

in the milling business would be diminished to the point where it hurts. Every time any industry stops it pinches the coal market. A mild winter calls for little fuel coal. The depreciation in values has led to the liquidation of war contracts and the sale of many merchantable products at lower prices. The result has been that a good many of the manufacturers have ceased operation. When the war contracts were drawn some of them had for a time to slow down or quit altogether. Their civil business was gone. They had no private orders. They began building up with war contracts. Some of them had to build their business from the ground. They had to go out and find their orders. While they are doing that some of their war contracts have been held up here under the bill validating informal contracts, that took its last step here to-day. Some \$2,000,000,000 owing to contractors or manufacturers has been withheld from the normal current of the trade. This has contributed to diminish the amount of steam coal used in the soft-coal business. All of it together has contributed to make a rather dull winter.

So when we are speaking of lower figures the main thing, after all, is to keep the occupation going and its doors open. I would rather the mills would continue to run on \$2.26 wheat and that the general public would have the cost distributed throughout the entire country than to have distress as the result of the closing down of business that would throw many of the men out of work.

I notice in section numbered 4 in the bill it is provided—

That whenever the President shall find that operations, practices, or transactions, at, on, in, or under the rules of any exchange, board of trade, or similar institution or place of business cause or are likely to cause unjust market manipulation, or unfair and misleading market quotations, or undue depression or fluctuation of the prices of, or injurious speculation in, wheat or wheat flour, hereafter in this section called evil practices, calculated or likely to enhance unduly the liabilities of the United States under the said guaranties, he is authorized to prescribe such regulations governing, or may either wholly or partly prohibit, operations, practices, and transactions in wheat or wheat flour at, on, in, or under the rules of any exchange, board of trade, or similar institution or place of business as he may find essential in order to prevent, correct, or remove such evil practices.

I wish here to call the attention of the governmental authorities very briefly to the difficulties under which a miller will labor with this section unless there is a very liberal interpretation placed upon it by the men who operate it.

Some of the milling companies in the Mississippi Valley, from Minneapolis on south, in the northern spring wheat or the winter wheat, mill under contract very large quantities of flour. It is a very common thing for 100,000 barrels to be covered in a single contract. This would require between 350,000 and 400,000 bushels of wheat. A miller comes in to-day. He is licensed under the Government and the department having charge of the sale of wheat. He wishes to fill an order of that magnitude. He buys from the Government 400,000 bushels of wheat at a guaranteed price of \$2.26. It is to fill the orders in some instances that will go out to his regular customers. If it is a single contract all to be delivered at once, there is no difficulty about it. He will mill it and in a very short time the whole quantity will be delivered to the purchaser. If, however, he is doing a custom business, he buys that quantity of wheat expecting to sell it in the next 30 or 60 days to the trade. He mills his flour out of it, and if the Government does not keep wheat at \$2.26 for him until he has disposed of the entire purchase, the miller is bound to lose on the contract. There is no way to guarantee him against the loss.

Under the old way in the open market with a grain exchange open, he could write what amounted to an insurance policy for himself which was absolutely certain. Every miller handling a considerable volume of business guarantees himself against loss. If he bought 400,000 bushels of wheat at a fixed price, he sold on the market through the broker 400,000 bushels of wheat. It made no difference whether the market went up or down; one balanced the other; and the process familiarly known to the trade as hedging was a perfectly legitimate transaction by which the miller was able to buy for himself on the market an insurance policy covering the risk. So if he came out of the transaction and liquidated on both trades he would even up on the transaction and have the legitimate profits coming from the milling, and those profits on the transaction would be his without loss on the fluctuations of the market. He is not allowed to do that to-day. If a man were to pursue that process here on a board of trade and sell short on the one hand and be long on the other, he would be fined in the sum of thousands of dollars for such a transaction. That is where the miller must have the care of the Government in milling his wheat, and until all of a given purchase has been turned over on the market to the consumer. If that is not done, milling will be a much riskier business than buying

or selling on a margin in a grain exchange when there are no governmental regulations.

I trust that Mr. Hoover or his aids or those in charge of the Grain Corporation will so handle section 4, and I am willing to trust them for it, that the millers of the country will be able to transact business without bankrupting themselves.

There were some abuses under the old way of buying and selling wheat on exchanges; I have no doubt of that. But for one abuse there were ten legitimate transactions.

This entire section is too much, if I were to fall into a critical mood with reference to it, written with the idea that every grain exchange and every broker is to be watched because he is a gambler. The most of the business transacted on the boards of trade and grain exchanges of the country, where there was no regulation on that subject, were not gambling transactions. I know many times the volume of wheat was sold in Chicago and Minneapolis. I know, too, that many times the manufacture of cotton cloth from the mill was sold. If all the cotton cloth from the mills were aggregated in a single year and then all the sales of cotton cloth were aggregated on the other hand, it would be found that many times the volume manufactured had been sold. It may be argued that there was speculation. That would not answer it. There might be some speculation, although ordinarily it does not follow, in that product. But the mills sell to the jobber and the jobber sells in many instances again to the dry goods jobber or sells to the retail merchant, so that there are from two to three times the actual volume of cotton cloth turned over which comes out of the mill before it reaches the user or the consumer; but that does not argue that there is any gambling. It only argues that somebody in handling the volume of cloth coming out of the mills turns it over that number of times before it reaches the user. A great deal of the volume of grain exchanges can be explained in the same way. The latter part of section 4 provides:

The President shall take reasonable steps to provide for and to permit the establishment of a free and open market for the purchase, sale, and handling of wheat and wheat products upon the expiration of this act.

This act, I believe, expires in 1920, as I have indicated. The President must take reasonable steps to remove the hand of the Government from the natural markets of the world. These regulations will be taken off; the Grain Corporation will liquidate its business; this revolving fund will be wound up; the Government will ascertain its loss; the loss will be deducted, to be drawn out of the Treasury; it will be charged up to profit and loss in the bill for conducting the war. I think that is the business way to do it. I think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the chairman have taken the right way out of this difficulty.

The only thing that I have doubt about is how long the Government will keep the prices of wheat products to the consumer high enough to get even or let them fall, so as to take some of the loss. We are bound to have a loss, and we had just as well take it at one time as another.

When the Government takes its hand off the exchanges, when the natural laws of markets reassert themselves, we shall then go back to the natural price fixed by supply and demand. I suppose the last four lines here in this section anticipate that period. It is proposed to recognize the right of the market to resume its normal operations.

Our export trade is provided for in section 5, which provides:

Provided, That as between the two articles mentioned preference shall be given to the exportation of flour, except when the public interest would, in the judgment of the President, be injuriously affected thereby.

At some time we shall have to take our entire Government regulation off exports. How long we can continue under present conditions is a considerable query. England has very materially interfered with our exports. There is a long list of prohibitions. It covers a very large variety of manufactured merchandise. She will take our flour exports until she can begin to buy flour cheaper some place else. Then, by the natural laws of the market, she will either cease buying or she will some morning quietly add to the prohibited exports from this country that of wheat and its products. She is taking care of herself. I do not blame her for that. I think if ever I had to abjure my allegiance, if I had that misfortune as an American citizen, I should prefer, if I had to expatriate myself, to swear allegiance to the English Government rather than to any other one under the sun. I would be guided in my choice largely because England takes care of her citizens and subjects as well as, if not better, around the world than any other country of which I know. I do not blame her for taking care of her own people on these prohibited exports of ours. She is only undertaking to return to the normal traditions of trade and manufacture. She is doing that to protect her own market and her own pay rolls.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] referred to other countries that have given guaranteed prices for wheat. Italy in 1919 fixed prices ranging up from \$3.96 to \$4.44; France fixed a price of \$3.84 and \$3.96 for last year; England, or the United Kingdom, fixed a price of \$1.64 in 1919 and the same figure in 1918. In Australia the price in 1919 is fixed at 95 cents a bushel. Holland has a price of \$3.30, as against \$2.76 in 1918. Switzerland has a price of \$3.18 in 1919, as against \$3.36 in 1918. Norway has a price of \$4.09 this year, as against \$4.38 last year. Roumania has a price of \$1.61, as against \$1.61 last year. Brazil has a price of \$2.16 for 1919. Canada fixed no price guaranty this year, but last year fixed a guaranty price of \$2.24. The United States has a guaranteed price of \$2.26. This price is a basic price. That does not mean the price is \$2.26 at every place.

The price in New York is \$2.39½; in Philadelphia, \$2.39; in Baltimore, \$2.38½; in Duluth, \$2.22½; in Minneapolis, \$2.22½; in Chicago, \$2.26; in St. Louis, \$2.24; in Kansas City, \$2.18; in Omaha, \$2.18; in New Orleans, \$2.28; and in Galveston, \$2.28. The price in Tacoma is \$2.20; in Seattle, \$2.20; in Portland, \$2.20; in Astoria, \$2.20; in San Francisco, \$2.20; and in Los Angeles, \$2.20; these are all Pacific coast points. At Salt Lake City, \$2; at Great Falls, Mont., \$2; and at Spokane, \$2.

Mr. President, as to the production of wheat for 1918, I should like to add, without reading, the tabulation, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Wheat—production, visible supply, and surplus.

Country.	Production, 1918.	Visible supply, Dec. 1, 1918.	Estimated surplus.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
United States.....	917,100,000	175,066,000	
Argentina.....	219,431,000	1,850,000	185,000,000
Chile.....	28,292,000		
Uruguay.....	12,860,000		
Italy.....	176,368,000		
Spain.....	127,984,000		
Switzerland.....	7,095,000		
British India ²	379,829,000		75,000,000
Japan.....	31,127,000		
Egypt.....	32,555,000		
Tunis.....	8,451,000		
Union of South Africa.....	8,833,000		
Australia.....	121,772,000	170,000,000	210,000,000
New Zealand.....	6,274,000		
United Kingdom.....	(³)	17,500,000	
Canada.....	(³)	55,388,000	100,000,000
Afloat.....		19,248,000	
Total.....	2,077,971,000	439,052,000	570,000,000

¹Including harvests of 1918-19. ²Includes native States. ³No data.

Wheat production, 1918.

[From United States Food Administration, Division of Statistics (Mr. Lane), branch 55, Jan. 15, 1919.]

Europe:	Bushels.
United Kingdom (England, Ireland, Wales, Scotland).....	84,000,000
France.....	184,000,000
Italy.....	176,000,000
Spain.....	128,000,000
Switzerland.....	8,000,000
Holland.....	3,000,000
Denmark.....	8,000,000
Norway.....	564,000
Sweden.....	10,000,000
	601,564,000

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not care to take up any more time on this matter. I only wish to say in conclusion that I regard this as an essentially honest act on the part of the Government. I think we ought to pass this bill. In passing this bill we keep the pledge. The proclamations which were issued by the President were issued in pursuance of an act of Congress. We well remember, on the floor of the Senate Chamber here, the controversy that arose in the passage of this guaranty. In pursuance of that power delegated to him by Congress, the President fixed this guaranty. Under that promise this very large acreage of wheat has been sowed. That guaranty holds good for the crop of 1919.

The Government ought to keep faith. If it wishes a response in time of trouble from its citizens again, it must keep faith. It ought to keep faith on this guaranty by the passage of this bill as much as it ought to keep faith in the payment of its 3½ and 4½ per cent bonds. It is a guaranty in any case for the payment of money, and it seems as though it is a matter of common

good faith to pass this bill in the form it is and let the Government get out with as small a loss as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Henderson	New	Sherman
Baird	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Simmons
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Kellogg	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Kenyon	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	King	Pollock	Spencer
France	Kirby	Pomerene	Sterling
Gay	Knox	Ransdell	Sutherland
Gerry	La Follette	Reed	Swanson
Gore	Lewis	Robinson	Williams
Gronna	McKellar	Saulsbury	Wolcott
Hale	Martin, Ky.	Shafer	
Harding	Moses	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, when I occupied the Senate floor earlier in the day I was assured by those who claimed to be friends of this measure that the Senate was ready to vote. Upon that assurance I, of course, was willing to conclude my remarks immediately, which I did. I feel, however, since the Senate has seen fit to continue the discussion that I should explain my position.

I do not want Senators to think that because I come from a spring-wheat State I want any measure passed which will not result beneficially to the people of the entire country. I wish to say that wheat and grain are not the only resources of the people of my State. I believe, sir, that in the course of a few years our farmers will engage in other industries which, in my judgment, will be vastly more profitable to them than the industry in which they are now engaged.

I have taken some time to make investigations relative to the abundant coal fields of the State of North Dakota. Perhaps the Senate will be surprised to learn that an estimate made by the Geological Survey shows that we have more than 15,000,000 acres of coal lands. It is estimated by the Geological Survey that North Dakota alone has more than 700,000,000 tons of coal. I admit that it is not of the highest grade, but inventions and discoveries have been made which will make it possible to utilize that coal and to improve upon it by manufacture so as to render it as valuable for fuel as the best anthracite coal, not even excepting the coal from the great State of Pennsylvania.

During this session the Congress was kind enough to pass my bill which provided for the investigation of the by-products of this class of coal, and \$100,000 was appropriated for that purpose. It may astound Senators when I say that we are told that it is possible to reduce the cost of this coal \$1.50 a ton by extracting and using the by-products. We know that lignite coal in my State contains a large amount of moisture, but we can overcome that. Inventions have been perfected which have made it possible for us to manufacture lignite coal into briquets and take out practically every bit of moisture. This coal is absolutely as good, I repeat, as any anthracite coal that is found in the great anthracite coal fields. So, I say to the Senate, that wheat is not the only commodity that we can produce.

I am not going to stand here and beg this body to fulfill its obligations which our President has made absolutely under authority of law.

I am going to take enough time to quote from the official statistics and official records of the commissioner of agriculture and labor of the State of North Dakota, which show some of our resources.

We had in that State in 1918, 70,149 farms, and some of those farms are large; we had in 1918, 6,377 miles of railroad, 336 newspapers, 835 post offices, 600 rural free-delivery mail routes, covering a distance of 75,000. The value of animals fattened and killed for home use in 1917 was \$5,828,628. We received for live stock, sold for market during that year, \$17,813,645; value of the creamery industry in North Dakota for last year amounted to more than \$25,000,000. We have more than 200 lignite coal mines in operation now.

So why should it be charged that it is the selfishness of the Senators from North Dakota who urge the passage of this bill? We have other industries, I want to say to you, but we have been and are patriotic enough to continue to produce the best and cheapest food known to mankind, although as a rule we are

doing it at a loss. We are asking now that you live up to your agreement; that you fulfill the contract with the farmers of the country, which you were so anxious to make when you took from them more than \$1 per bushel because you were anxious to give the people of the United States and the European nations the benefit of this reduction and furnish them with cheap flour and cheap bread.

But I want you to know that we have other industries. We expended last year for support of public schools nearly \$9,000,000, and we have more than 5,000 of them, with almost 8,000 teachers, and with a valuation of the school property of more than \$15,000,000. We have an endowment of land worth \$65,000,000, and when you know that we have a population of less than 700,000 and an assessed valuation of property of only a little more than \$400,000,000, but with an actual valuation of more than \$3,000,000,000, you will therefore pardon me for digressing and calling attention to the resources of my own State, a State where I have spent more than 40 years of my life, a State to whose people I owe much, a State whose people have made me what I am. But let me say to you that in return for what these people have done for me, I am not willing to surrender to the acclaim of selfish interests and repudiate a solemn obligation which vitally affects my people and which would do a great injustice to them. I am here to urge that the Congress carry out this obligation with the farmers of my State and with the farmers of the entire country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, is anybody opposing the idea of paying the contract price of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; there are a number here opposing it, Senators on the other side and Senators on this side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I confess that I did not know that, because as unjust as it is to the entire American people and as much as it may cost them to make the guaranty good, I can not understand how any man can stand up and oppose making a national guaranty good.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi and I am glad to know that he feels that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; although the Senator and I differed about this; I did not want to make the guaranty; I did not think it was right; I thought the price ought to be left to the market.

Mr. GRONNA. Well, the Senator and I do not differ as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we have done what we have done, and I submit to the Senator—

Mr. GRONNA. I did not differ with the Senator on that. I was in favor of not making a fixed price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that, because at the time the Senator hoped for a still higher price.

Mr. GRONNA. Well, I did not hope for it, but the price then spoke for itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator solemnly asserted at that time upon the floor of the Senate that the farmer could get a higher price.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In which I did not agree with him; but now the thing has been done and it is settled. Why should we spend time talking about it at the late end of the session, when we have a lot of business to do? I can assure the Senator that there is not the slightest danger of the Federal Government failing in its guaranty of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat.

Mr. GRONNA. I am very glad to have that assurance from the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, why not let us go on with something else?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that there are Senators on this side of the Chamber, and on the other side of the Chamber, who are strenuously opposing this guaranteed price. They maintain that, while they might go so far as to comply with the proclamation of the President and pay the guaranteed price for winter wheat, it should not be applied to spring wheat. I wish to make my position clear.

If we are going to have repudiation, let us have it all the way through, because when Congress first enacted this law the farmers in the States where winter wheat is raised received a price all the way from \$3 to \$3.42 for the 1917 crop while the spring-wheat farmers did not receive it. The spring-wheat farmers did not complain; we were in a tremendous war; and they were willing to do anything in order to win that war, and if the price of wheat had been fixed at \$1.50 a bushel they would have produced all they were able to produce. It was a question of patriotism; it was not a question of profit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not remember it in that way. I remember that a good many of the western Senators complained

about even that price and wanted it made \$2.50; but, however that may be, we can vote those opposing this matter down right now and get through with this bill and proceed to some other business.

Mr. GRONNA. If I have won the Senator from Mississippi to my assistance, I may be able to win over some of the recalcitrant Republicans on this side and the obstinate Democrats on the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They are in the minority, and a very small one at that.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope they are in the minority; but I simply wish to take a little of the time of the Senate to inform them that the winter-wheat farmers, at least, received the price fixed by the law of supply and demand, while that opportunity and that price were taken away from the spring-wheat farmers. I repeat, however, that they did not complain; they were willing to abide by anything that Congress did and by anything the President did.

But I do think that when the question is raised here now, that the winter-wheat farmers again shall receive that guaranteed price, but that the spring-wheat farmers, who have not yet had an opportunity to plant their wheat, shall receive the same shabby treatment from Congress that they received a year ago or two years ago, I think it is eminently unfair.

Let me say to you that when you discourage the production of spring wheat, you have taken away from the American miller the opportunity of making a grade of flour such as they are making to-day, such as they have made for years, which will sell in the markets of the world, and which will be given a preference in the markets of the world. Let me say to you—and I say it from the authority of men who know—that without this spring wheat you can not manufacture the high grade of flour that is being manufactured in the United States. You take spring wheat, with a high percentage of gluten, and it is always the custom to ship an inferior wheat from the South to be mixed with it. You must admit that you can not grow as good a quality of wheat in the winter-wheat belt as we grow in the spring-wheat belt. Any man who knows anything about wheat must admit that. Every miller in the United States will tell you so. Every chemist in the United States knows that I am stating facts. What determines the value of wheat is the amount of gluten in that wheat; and for the benefit of you people who are living in the South, and some of you gentlemen who are living in the North who do not seem to know any more about spring wheat than those who have never raised spring wheat, I want to give you some information about it.

Wheat contains three ingredients or constituent parts: First, its epidermal cells. That is what we call the bran and shorts. Secondly, the aleuron or gluten grains. The gluten may run from 9 to 15 per cent in spring wheat. You will hardly ever find it to exceed 10 per cent in your winter wheat; and that is where the farmer who is raising spring wheat is being robbed. The so-called heart of the wheat is the endosperm or the albumen filled with starch; and you might just as well take rice and mix it with wheat flour as to use nothing but the endosperm in flour. You can not make a good grade of flour nor a good quality of bread from it. But we have had not only Members of Congress combat this proposition, but the very department which should be the friend and the guardian of the farmer has been his worst enemy.

When, a year ago, we inserted in the bill a provision and made an appropriation of \$50,000, providing that the Department of Agriculture should install in that great department a small mill and a small bakery for the purpose of making tests, what do we find? We find, upon investigation, that one-half of all that \$50,000 has been expended for what? Not for the purpose of machinery, not for the purpose of carrying out this law, but for salaries and for overhead charges.

An estimate was made by the department for \$85,000 more this year, and the Committee on Agriculture of the House struck out the entire appropriation; and I find no fault with them. In my judgment, \$50,000 was sufficient to do the work to enable the Bureau of Markets to fix standards that would be just—just to the producer, just to the miller, and just to the consumer. It shows what is being done in the department that should administer the affairs of agriculture in the interest of production, in the interest of methods which would improve production, and methods which would improve marketing—and when I use the word "marketing" I will say to you that it has practically no limitation.

Do you suppose that the people of the great State of Michigan, in the manufacture of automobiles or in the manufacture of steel and iron, would go to work and manufacture a lot of automobiles and put them upon the market and ask people

what they were willing to pay for them? Do you suppose that the people of Utah would manufacture sugar by the millions of pounds, and leave it to the public as to what price they should pay? Do you suppose that the manufacturers of Pennsylvania would manufacture steel by the thousands of tons, and then be left to the mercy of the public what the price should be? Do you believe that the boot and shoe manufacturers of New England would manufacture boots and shoes by the hundreds of millions of pairs and be satisfied to let the public make the price? Yet that is what you want to do with the farmer. That is what you have done, and that is what you want to continue to do; and the Agricultural Department does not seem to realize the importance of this matter.

I have been chided because I myself farm. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senate that you are not depriving me of a living, no matter what price you fix on wheat.

I will promise you that personally I am trying to keep away from the poorhouse, whether I raise wheat or not.

I want to prove by the Government records that the statements made by some of the Senators here that it is on account of this law that the price of wheat is so high are not true. I want to prove, if Senators are willing to listen to me, that that is not the fact, and that commodities on the farm for which no price has been fixed have increased more in proportion than the price of wheat, more than it was increased even taking the price of wheat based upon prewar times.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] spoke this afternoon for more than an hour. He proved conclusively to the Senate that the price of wheat in the open market was a great deal more when we enacted this legislation than the price provided for in the law, but you were all led to believe, as I was led to believe, that that was the minimum price. When the question was brought up before the Committee on Agriculture we were told that we should not have a maximum price, because such a price might be too high or too low, but we were assured that while the law did not provide for a maximum price justice would be done to producers by fixing a minimum price. It was the argument by Mr. Hoover and others that we had to make a fair price that would pay the farmer a fair return for his labor, otherwise the country might go hungry and we would lose the war. That was at a time, Mr. President, when we had a crop shortage of some 375,000,000 bushels. In 1917 we produced only about as much wheat as we consumed—a sufficient amount for ourselves—639,000,000 bushels.

Europe wanted our wheat. I know of my own knowledge that neutral nations were here in the city of Washington. Some of the commissions were here from the month of August, 1917, until the month of June, 1918, begging to get the grain, begging this Government for wheat, but we said no. The little country of Norway was here, all the Scandinavian countries were here, and they were all neutrals. They offered any price for this grain. They said, "We do not care if you make it \$4 a bushel, our people are starving and we want this wheat; we want this food. If you can not give us the wheat, for God's sake, give us some kind of grain, give us barley or give us oats"; but we said no. I know what I am talking about when I say that we said no. That was the condition at that time, and still Senators stand upon this floor and say that the farmers wanted this law enacted. You misunderstood the situation, Senators. You have forgotten what occurred.

Do you know what the greatest expert in the United States has said with reference to the cost of producing wheat? I will put any Senator upon his honor and ask him, Do you want the farmers of this country to produce wheat at a loss, at less than it cost them to produce it? I hardly think any of you do. And yet Dr. Spillman, after an investigation of more than 20 years, made an official record, in which he made the statement that, based upon the labor cost of 1917, it cost, on an average, in the United States \$2.47 per bushel to produce the 1918 crop. Are you ready to deny that statement? I challenge anyone to deny that statement. Mr. Owen, of Minneapolis, one of the best-informed men in the United States, not only on the question of wheat but on the production of wheat and other grains, made a similar investigation at his own instance, and at a very large expense, and his calculation and investigation as to cost of producing wheat practically agreed with the figures of Dr. Spillman. He was only a few cents higher per bushel. The great University of the State of Minnesota made another investigation. Their figures, as I recollect, were more than \$2.60 per bushel.

I wish to say to you Senators that this is an important matter. Do you want to cut down the production of spring wheat? If you do, just repudiate the contract which you forced upon the American farmer against his will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Was the figure named by Dr. Spillman the average price throughout the country?

Mr. GRONNA. The average price throughout the entire United States; based upon an analysis of 20 years and taking the labor cost in 1917, he stated that it cost an average of \$2.47 per bushel. I should like to have the Secretary of Agriculture or Dr. Bland or anyone in the Bureau of Markets deny that statement.

Mr. President, I am not talking merely to hear myself talk. Those who know me best know that I do not care to do that. But I remember that some 40 years ago, when I was but a mere boy, men from New England States and men from nearly every other State in the Union came to the naked and bleak prairies of North Dakota at a time when there were no railroads there. There were innumerable caravans of ox teams and canvas-covered wagons. Young men who had recently been married took with them their wives, perhaps from good homes, and went upon those bleak prairies and trusted to God Almighty to help them establish for themselves and their little families the homes they so much desired. They had no means even to erect a house. They broke sod and built what we call "sod houses." Young women who had a college education went upon the prairies, and for years they battled with conditions—with drought, with hail, with all the things which we have to combat in the production of that crop. They were too poor even to get back home. Many of them settled upon the prairies which were not yet surveyed.

That was 40 years ago, and most of those farmers have only 160 acres. Many of them have comfortable homes now, it is true; but many of those homes are mortgaged. Yet we hear it said that this is a plutocratic industry; that these people, engaged in the industry of farming, are coming to Congress and asking for special privileges. Why do you not go out there and try farming, if it is such a great thing? Why do you not, you Senators, go out there and get a share of this great privilege, if you think it is so profitable? Those men, who were young men 40 years ago, are old men now. Many—and I might say most of them—raised large families. You will find the large majority of those men and their wives toiling and laboring to-day, with bended backs, from early morning until late at night, much longer than any of you, Senators, would be willing to labor. They have 160 acres of land, valuable as it may be, but it is not running into the millions, I assure you. So far as I am personally concerned, and so far as my interest lies in the great industry of agriculture, I am willing to sacrifice what little I have invested in farms if you will make conditions such as will benefit the great agricultural class.

You are talking about bolshevism. You are making it! You are talking about people not being patriotic. I call attention to the fact that these patriotic people, many of them who are too old to labor and should not be laboring, were found in the fields of the West from early morning until late at night, with bended back, trying to produce in order that we might have food for our boys. We sent more than 30,000 of the best men we had from our State alone. Somebody had to take their places. Nobody could fill their places but these old men and these old women, who labored by daylight and by moonlight to garner the crops in order that this great country of ours should win a victory. Are you going to challenge the patriotism of those families? Are you going to say that they were inspired by selfish motives because they increased their acreage? I could not convince you even if I showed you the books, I suppose; but if Dr. Spillman's statement is true, as I believe it to be, that, on an average, it cost \$2.47 a bushel for the product for which the farmers averaged \$2.05 a bushel since the enactment of this law. Where are the unjust profits of the farmer, I ask you?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is a very important matter and I have a lot of things I ought to say. I do not want to be discourteous, but I do not want to consume any more time than is absolutely necessary to inform the Senate about wheat, because it is evident to me that the Senate is probably ignorant about the production of wheat; but I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I know the Senator is thoroughly conversant with this subject. I am from a State that, while in part an agricultural State, does not produce as much wheat as I know does the State of the Senator, but, nevertheless, has some interest in the subject of agriculture. I have been written to several times in regard to this fixing of the price of wheat, and I am somewhat anxious to have the Senator's views upon the question of price fixing.

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be glad to tell the Senator, if I can.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a letter from one of the citizens of my State who says, in addressing me:

The proposed price of \$2.25 a bushel for unsown wheat is a plain waste of public money. Are you yourself willing to subscribe to the next victory loan with the knowledge that perhaps as much as one-fifth of your subscription will be used to pay the farmer a dollar more than the market price for wheat not yet planted?

Certainly a large proportion of the nonfarming class may be expected to prove unwilling to do so; and should the Government adhere to its proposed intention it is certain that this policy can not fail to endanger the success of the new loan which under any circumstances is likely to prove to be the most difficult task of this nature which the Government has yet undertaken.

Although it may appear to be dangerous from the political viewpoint to approve this measure, farmers are as patriotic and as self-respecting and as willing to make a sacrifice as any other group in the Nation, though the giving up of an unearned profit can hardly be considered a sacrifice. It is time to stop the useless expenditures of public moneys not only for the above purpose, but for all other unnecessary purposes.

Then I have another letter, reading as follows:

I have wondered many times whether the Government guaranty of the price of wheat has been cut off as to spring wheat. Of course, the engagement should stand as to the winter wheat, but it should be canceled, if in force, as to wheat not yet sown. Will you give me the facts, and, of course, jump in and save us from the spring-wheat loss, if such a thing is impending?

Both those letters were from constituents.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. From farmers?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; from farmers. I replied to those letters about as follows: I stated that at the time this guaranty was made the problem that the United States had was not only to produce enough wheat for our own consumption but to feed our allies and the soldiers on the western front, and in order that sufficient acreage might be planted, the Government gave a guaranty and that guaranty carried through the 1919 crop. Did it not, Senator?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; it did.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And included the spring-wheat crop, because if the war had continued it would have been necessary to have had the full production, including the spring wheat. So the farmers went ahead and made their engagements of seed and fertilizer and implements. In other words, they practically prepared last fall for the spring-wheat crop, naturally preparing the ground, buying fertilizer, buying the seed, in order that they might be ready to produce this spring the necessary supply to feed the soldiers on the western front should the war continue. I replied that I felt in honor that the obligation of the Government extended to the fall or winter wheat crop; but in view of the fact that we had practically contracted with these farmers for the spring wheat the good faith of the Government was at stake, and that it was our duty to carry out our contract and pay the price we engaged to pay when we agreed to take the 1919 crop at \$2.26.

I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if I am right in that assumption; if in my reply to these constituents of mine, all of whom are patriotic, all of whom are willing to pay the increased taxation, that the good faith of the Government is at stake; and whether in my reply to my constituents—and I have many more letters of a similar character—I have given them a correct answer? I should like, then, to ask another question, after the Senator has kindly answered this one.

Mr. GRONNA. I think I can furnish better testimony than my own answer to the question of the Senator from New Jersey, which will show conclusively that his answer to his people was correct.

I want to read just the concluding paragraph in the President's proclamation:

Now therefore I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, by virtue of the power conferred upon me by said act of Congress, and especially by section 14 thereof—

Referring to the food bill—

do hereby find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat, and that it is essential that the producers of wheat produced within the United States shall have the benefits of the guarantee provided for in said section in order to make effective the guarantee by the Congress for the crop—

Now, mark you—

for the crop of 1919, and to assure such producers a reasonable profit, I do hereby determine and fix and give public notice of reasonable guaranteed prices for No. 1 northern spring wheat and its equivalent at the respective principal primary markets, as follows.

Then he names a number of terminal markets, which I shall not name, but he begins with New York at \$2.39½ per bushel, and the basic price was \$2.26 at Chicago.

Mr. President, I think that fairly well answers the question of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. The President of the United States did the best he could, and we are

not criticizing the President for fixing a lower price than we had reason to believe we could get in the open market. He had to deal with labor; he had to deal with all of the consumers of the United States, and it was his best judgment that this was a reasonable price. I have never questioned that; my people have never questioned it. We accepted that price and were satisfied, whether we incurred a loss or made a profit. That has nothing to do with this question.

The President saw that it was necessary, in order to win the war, in order to stimulate production, to give an assurance to the producers that the price should not go below a certain specified or fixed sum. The President was right. He had the consumers in view, which he should have had, as well as the producers. I know that he spent a great deal of time upon this question, for I myself attended a meeting with the President, together with a number of others from different parts of the United States. He received us courteously; he treated us fairly. It was his judgment that the best prices he could afford to fix were the prices which he named in his proclamation. No man could find any fault with that.

The minimum price was fixed by statute for 1918 at \$2 per bushel. It was provided in the act that the President had authority to fix the price for 1919, which he did. Are you going to repudiate the patriotic act of the President of the United States? I am sure that he called upon the best experts in this country to ascertain what a fair and reasonable price would be. He did not promulgate this proclamation blindly; he certainly did not want to risk his reputation and fix an unduly high price at the expense of the consumer. The producers have accepted the price, and were satisfied whether there was a loss or a profit to them. If the President had fixed the price at \$2, they would not have complained, because we were in the midst of a terrible war, and it is my honest belief that no more patriotic men and women will be found in this country than the farmers.

I do not want to be misunderstood that anything which I have said is a criticism of the administration, for I do not so intend it. I would be unfair should I make such a criticism.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator from North Dakota suffer another interruption?

Mr. GRONNA. If it is not too long. I intend to conclude in a moment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, under the rules the Senator from North Dakota can not yield, it seems to me, without losing the floor.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. The absence of a quorum can not be suggested unless business has intervened since the last roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GRONNA. I think that is correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Chair quote the rule whereby a Senator can not be interrupted more than once?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not familiar with any such rule.

Mr. SWANSON. I will read the decision on that.

Mr. SMOOT. The last decision, I will say to the Senator, was that it was left entirely to the Senator occupying the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. I have talked a great deal longer than I had expected, but I intend to conclude in a very little while. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania has withdrawn his request. I do not yield for the purpose of calling for a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate to read the statements which I hold in my hand, but I have before me the Monthly Crop Reporter, which is published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, for February, 1919. I merely wish to call attention to the prices of a few articles, beginning with the price of hogs. The price of hogs on January 15, 1914, was \$7.45 per hundred pounds. On September 15, 1918, it was \$17.50 per hundred pounds. This advance holds good not only with reference to hogs but to beef cattle, to milk cows, to sheep, and to everything that is being produced; and certainly, Mr. President, there was no law which guaranteed a fixed price upon these and other commodities. So it is absolutely reasonable to suppose that the price of wheat would have advanced much higher than or, at any rate, to the

price at which it was when the price was fixed. That price in my locality was \$3.07 per bushel. I ask, Mr. President, to have printed as part of my remarks this table, without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Average of prices received by producers of the United States.

Prices of articles quoted below as of 1st of month are averages of reports of county crop reporters, weighted according to relative importance of county and State; 15th of month prices are averages of returns from a list of about 7,000 country buyers; State averages are weighted according to their relative importance to obtain the United States averages.]

Date.	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.	Barley.	Rye.	Buck-wheat.	Pota-toes.	Sweet potatoes.	Flax-seed.	Apples.	Hay.	Cotton.	Butter.	Eggs.	Chick-ens.
	Per bu.	Per bu.	Per bu.	Per bu.	Per bu.	Per ton.	Per lb.	Per lb.	Per doz.	Per lb.					
Feb. 1, 1910.....	105.0	65.2	45.0	59.3	76.1	72.0	56.2	76.8	192.9	108.8	11.34	14.0	27.9	28.9	11.1
Feb. 1, 1911.....	89.8	49.0	33.1	64.1	73.1	64.4	55.1	80.4	233.9	117.2	11.80	14.3	24.1	22.1	10.6
Feb. 1, 1912.....	90.4	64.6	47.5	91.2	84.4	73.6	94.4	90.2	190.8	95.8	14.39	9.0	29.0	29.1	10.3
Feb. 1, 1913.....	79.9	50.6	32.4	51.4	68.9	69.4	53.1	85.4	109.3	76.4	10.86	11.9	27.6	22.8	10.9
Feb. 1, 1914.....	81.6	68.3	39.3	52.4	61.7	75.6	69.7	84.3	127.8	116.8	11.67	11.9	27.4	28.4	11.7
Feb. 1, 1915.....	129.9	72.8	50.1	62.9	100.6	83.7	50.4	82.0	163.7	71.2	10.83	7.4	27.9	29.2	11.5
Feb. 1, 1916.....	113.9	66.7	44.6	61.7	88.3	80.7	88.0	71.2	210.9	88.0	10.55	11.5	27.6	26.8	11.9
Feb. 1, 1917.....	164.8	95.8	55.2	92.7	123.5	114.6	172.4	95.8	253.7	110.0	11.34	16.8	33.5	35.8	14.7
Feb. 1, 1918.....	201.2	138.8	78.7	131.9	174.8	161.9	122.9	123.1	326.7	140.1	18.88	29.7	43.7	48.4	18.8
Mar. 1, 1918.....	202.7	154.3	85.2	161.1	201.0	168.2	120.3	142.7	349.8	145.3	19.14	30.2	43.4	40.4	19.9
Apr. 1, 1918.....	202.6	153.6	88.9	170.2	235.1	170.1	92.6	151.6	379.7	151.3	18.68	31.8	40.7	31.2	19.8
May 1, 1918.....	203.6	155.7	86.0	158.5	221.1	176.0	80.1	135.0	373.3	154.8	17.97	28.5	39.9	31.0	19.8
June 1, 1918.....	202.5	152.5	78.1	135.4	187.6	191.0	75.5	148.8	363.6	158.2	17.13	27.4	38.6	29.8	20.0
July 1, 1918.....	203.2	153.7	76.3	113.6	170.0	200.8	94.9	134.3	349.3	150.4	16.07	28.6	38.2	30.7	21.2
Aug. 1, 1918.....	204.5	159.7	73.0	110.0	163.9	192.7	141.6	144.7	410.5	128.1	15.92	27.8	39.7	34.4	22.6
Sept. 1, 1918.....	205.6	165.7	70.3	100.9	159.3	189.2	148.8	156.2	381.2	123.7	17.42	32.2	41.4	36.4	22.8
Oct. 1, 1918.....	205.8	159.5	71.0	95.5	154.0	180.0	143.6	160.6	380.9	133.5	18.45	31.8	47.2	41.6	23.1
Nov. 1, 1918.....	206.0	140.3	68.2	94.9	152.6	173.0	127.2	146.0	333.8	138.6	19.27	29.3	49.7	47.2	22.4
Dec. 1, 1918.....	204.4	136.6	71.0	91.8	151.5	166.4	119.5	135.4	340.2	132.5	20.18	27.6	52.7	55.0	21.8
Jan. 1, 1919.....	204.8	144.7	70.8	91.3	150.7	162.9	116.1	142.1	327.7	147.7	19.92	28.7	54.9	57.2	21.7
Feb. 1, 1919.....	207.5	138.1	64.3	86.8	140.4	158.1	114.4	143.1	310.1	160.4	19.79	24.9	49.6	48.3	21.6

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should not have taken up this much time, only I felt that it was my duty to inform my friends on this side as well as my good friends on the other side of the Chamber as to the importance of this question. I thank the Senate for its patience.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to prefer a request. I will say, by way of preliminary, that the entire day has now been devoted to a discussion of this measure. So far as I have been able to see, there is no opposition to it. Only one speech has been made against it. In order to restrain its friends and prevent them from unintentionally delaying the measure too long, and thereby jeopardizing its final passage, I ask unanimous consent that hereafter speeches on the pending bill be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. PENROSE. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want to inform the Senator from Oklahoma that at least half a dozen Senators on this side of the Chamber have informed me that they were opposed to the bill and were going to vote against it, and I do not want the Record to show that there is no opposition to it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I hope the Record will show that there is no opposition to it.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope so, too.

Mr. GORE. If any Senator can muster up opposition he is at liberty to do so, but, so far as I am concerned, I hope that the Senator's speech has dissuaded Senators from persisting in their opposition.

Mr. GRONNA. Well, I think it has.

Mr. GORE. I think so; but I do not think there is any opposition to the bill, and I regret that the friends of the measure have taken this day in the discussion of a measure as to which there is no danger of its being defeated.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PENROSE. I think that this bill is one of the most questionable of the bills pending before Congress to the ordinary American citizen, without explanation; and I am one of those who feel that a miserable economic policy was adopted during the war in fixing prices.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator entirely about that, Mr. President.

Mr. PENROSE. Now, we are called upon to vote an appropriation for the enormous sum of \$1,000,000,000 to make good a mistake—

Mr. GORE. It is that.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator admits it is a mistake, and a very expensive mistake—

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. Requiring the appropriation of one-sixth of the total amount of all the revenues contemplated to be raised

under the recently enacted revenue law; and, indeed, in all seriousness, I think we are entitled to the fullest explanation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. PENROSE. I come, Mr. President, from a great industrial State, where the wage earners are not in sympathy with this measure. They look at it in some way as tending toward increasing the cost of living; and yet such is the depth of my sympathy that I intend to vote for it; but I want to be fortified with argument. I am in receipt of letters every day protesting against the bill and asking me to vote against it, and my reply is to send to my correspondents the speeches of the Senator from Oklahoma—

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. As fully explaining it. If those speeches had not been made, where would I be at? [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator will explain my explanations, if necessary.

Mr. PENROSE. Moreover, personally I am more persuaded and convinced with every speech that is made to support the measure, notwithstanding it is to make good a folly—an expensive folly—and I hope the Senator will not begrudge a little illumination upon this most expensive blunder. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. I am glad that the Senator is not only almost, but altogether, persuaded to vote for this bill. I think every Senator is.

Mr. PENROSE. I can only defend my course on the arguments presented by the Senator from Oklahoma. I have had his speeches printed at my own expense, and I am circulating them in Pennsylvania as the only vindication that I can obtain for my course in voting for this measure with the great mass of nine or ten million wage earners in factory and in mill.

Mr. GORE. I can only say to that compliment what Juliet said when marriage was proposed to her without her previous knowledge, "It is an honor that I dreamed not of."

Mr. PENROSE. Well, through my efforts the Senator's name has become very well known throughout that imperial Commonwealth.

Mr. GORE. I am indebted to the Senator for that addition to my reputation.

Mr. PENROSE. And were it not for my keen sympathy with North Dakota and Oklahoma and the other wheat areas, and did I consult the selfish dictates of section, as sometimes prevails in this body, I would vote against the measure; but, Mr. President, the prosperity of the western prairies is just as dear to my heart as is the prosperity of any Eastern State. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will realize my patriotism.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator's patriotism is beyond challenge; and I am certain that if he needs any additional fortification through my speeches they have been afforded by the very able and exhaustive—mark, I say "exhaustive"—speeches by the senior and junior Senators from North Dakota and the junior Senator from Minnesota. They will afford the Senator ramparts and bulwarks which can not be penetrated.

Mr. PENROSE. I need all the help that I can get [laughter], and I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not begrudge me any further help.

Mr. GORE. The only explanation in justification for this bill is that we promised to do it; we are simply "standing hitched." That does not really need any elaboration to a man like the Senator from Pennsylvania, who always stands hitched.

Mr. PENROSE. I nearly destroyed my political future by voting for \$2.50 wheat at the request of the Senator from Oklahoma. I did it cheerfully, however, and as a result of patriotic inspiration.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's future is much more securely entrenched and fortified than he has imagined. It will withstand many an assault of that character.

Mr. PENROSE. I feel that is true.

Mr. GORE. And if it does not, the farmers of the West will bless his memory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill and all amendments to it may be voted on at 2 o'clock next Monday afternoon.

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will have to be called on that request.

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have the roll call, then. I do not object, but let us have the usual roll call.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from North Dakota has indicated that he would object. Now, I ask unanimous consent to lay this measure aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to lay the pending bill aside. Is there any objection?

Mr. GRONNA. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, and upon that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, upon which he demands the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

Mr. OWEN. I second it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I object.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I did not understand the first request of the Senator from Oklahoma. I understood that his first request was to lay this bill aside, and for that reason I objected. I was engaged in conversation at the time with a fellow Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. Regular order!

Mr. GRONNA. I did not hear the first statement and withdraw my objection to the first request made by the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have the yeas and nays.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is, Is there a second to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. OWEN. I second the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are requested on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a motion to lay aside one measure and take up another bill is debatable at this stage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. GORE. It is not in order after the yeas and nays have been ordered, I suggest.

Mr. LODGE. That does not make any difference.

Mr. GORE. I think it does.

Mr. LODGE. The yeas and nays have not been ordered, as a matter of fact, but that makes no difference.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the call of the yeas and nays be proceeded with.

Mr. LODGE. They can not be proceeded with while there is debate.

Mr. GORE. The rule does not permit debate after the yeas and nays have been ordered. We very often indulge in debate afterwards, but it is out of order.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not out of order, if the Senator will pardon me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquired if the request for the yeas and nays has been seconded; it has not been seconded up to this time, and the motion is debatable.

Mr. LODGE. The motion is open to debate.

Mr. GORE. I thought the yeas and nays had been ordered.

Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate. Perhaps the motion to take up the Indian appropriation bill ought to be thoroughly discussed and illuminated. It is a question involving a great many mysteries, obscure propositions, and corollaries, and the Senate ought not to act precipitately upon so

serious and far-reaching a motion as that. I am certain that every Senator is anxious to dispatch business, and I hope now that the debate will proceed on the motion to take up the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, we have now taken about eight hours on this bill, the only point of importance in which is the promise of the United States to pay the guaranteed price. It has taken eight hours of the session, and it is obvious to the country, and it is perfectly obvious to every Member of this body, that it means nothing in the world except a filibuster to prevent business in this body.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Oklahoma is the chief offender. He made a speech that was interesting, but entirely unnecessary, concerning the league of nations, when pressing legislation was crowding the attention of Congress. I heard a number of Senators intimate a suspicion as to whether he was loyal to these great measures or was not secretly and surreptitiously engaged in a filibuster. [Laughter.] The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], made a speech to-day an able and brilliant effort, but entirely unnecessary.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. PENROSE. Those speeches consumed several hours; in fact, three-fourths of a day have been consumed by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oklahoma in unnecessary discussions about a matter on which I assume they will vote as it is given to them. It seems to me to require considerable effrontery to charge anyone with filibustering when those two Senators have taken up more time than any other two Members of the Senate in the last three days in needless, ill-placed, and unnecessary discussion, when we are within three days of final adjournment.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. I appreciate the humor of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. It is not humor, Mr. President.

Mr. OWEN. But, at the same time, the Senator can not really seriously deny that he has been the chief offender in this filibuster which is going on.

Mr. PENROSE. Oh, Mr. President, I have been confined for nearly five months in the various committees of the Senate, chiefly the Finance Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee, and have been very little on this floor, and have consumed very little time. While the Senator from Oklahoma has been junketing through Europe we have been endeavoring to carry the burdens of state and do the best we can to bring these great measures to a final disposition, and yet the first day he lands in the Senate he takes some half a day in an address upon an academic subject.

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

Mr. PENROSE. Now, in all seriousness, I think the Senator from Oklahoma should be a little consistent before he charges his colleagues with any hidden effort or desire to delay the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Oklahoma was entirely justified in quietly departing when he knew perfectly well that this filibuster was organized at the beginning of the session and would run right straight through and he could not accomplish anything by being here, so he went away.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. KELLOGG addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. PENROSE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if he wants to make a request for a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time to vote on this bill, there will be no objection interposed by me. I misunderstood the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. PENROSE. I do, for an inquiry.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to vote on this bill at the time stated by the chairman, on Monday at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object.

Mr. KELLOGG. This bill ought to be pushed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think I can make a suggestion.

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

Mr. PENROSE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we will agree to limit debate to 10 minutes from this time on, we will get a vote speedily on this bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to limit debate to 10 minutes on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Georgia for that purpose?

Mr. PENROSE. It is not necessary to yield, for I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. PENROSE. I object to the request to limit debate.

Mr. KELLOGG. Just on this bill.

Mr. PENROSE. There is a motion pending.

Mr. OVERMAN and other Senators. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that the Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I will not object to the unanimous-consent request; but I understand that under the rules a quorum must be called for before the agreement is made.

Mr. ASHURST. Not when an objection is made.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I understand—

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Pennsylvania, I think, will recall—because he is very punctual in his attendance here—that I have made five ineffectual attempts to get up the Indian appropriation bill. The Senator will remember that when the legislative bill was up I was assured that if I would be patient and wait until the legislative bill was passed the Indian appropriation bill would be next. The same assurance was given me on the Diplomatic and Consular bill, on the conference report on the Post Office bill, and on the fortifications bill; yet, for some strange reason, I am unable to get the Indian appropriation bill laid before the Senate. A moment ago I could not even get the yeas and nays. If I can not get the yeas and nays on a motion to take it up, of course, I could not hope to displace the pending bill.

I thought the friends of wheat, from those States where the wheat voters are, wanted this bill. I thought their voters were demanding this bill. Knowing that Senators would rush immediately to vote for any bill that the voters in those wheat States want, I was paralyzed with amazement to see the Senators from wheat States standing on the floor, hour after hour, talking and practically endangering the passage of this bill; and, for all I know, the suspicion is now being engendered that it is a buffer to prevent the passage of other legislation.

I hope that is not true. I repeat—and I have said it so many times that I am ashamed to say it again—that the Indian appropriation bill is not supremely important, but if it is not going to be passed I want to know it. I do not want to sit around here like a child making mud pies. I want to know if the bill is to pass; and if it is not to pass, the Indians can go. They have no votes. Wheat growers vote, of course, and I expect this billion dollars to go to them. They vote, but the Indian does not vote. He can chase jackrabbits and be neglected; but if he had a vote he could make himself manifest and make himself heard.

I think, too, that the Committee on Indian Affairs is entitled to consideration. Sixteen of the best Senators in the Chamber are members of that committee. Some of the most eminent Members of the Senate are members of that committee. Are you going to cast their work aside? Are you going to say that their work shall go for naught? It is the best bill that we have ever brought out. Moreover, on the 4th of March my official head goes into the basket. I shall no longer be chairman of the committee. I have a pride in this bill, very great pride; and then, Mr. President, I do not want the work of myself and my colleagues on the committee wasted.

I ask now that this billion-dollar wheat-growers' bill be passed, and let us forget it just as quickly as we can.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Why does not the Senator withdraw his motion?

Mr. ASHURST. I withdraw my motion, because it would not carry, anyhow. I withdraw my motion now, because it will not carry.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has kindly yielded to me in order that I may ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill and all pending amendments shall be limited to five minutes. I want to help the Senator from Arizona to pass the Indian bill. As he knows, I am a member of that committee—

Mr. ASHURST. I know the Senator is.

Mr. GRONNA. And I am anxious that that bill shall come up after this bill has been disposed of. I ask unanimous consent to limit debate on the bill and all amendments to five minutes.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I will not consent to that unanimous-consent agreement unless it is provided that no Senator shall speak more than five minutes, and that no Senator shall be recognized more than once for any purpose whatever until the bill is passed.

Mr. GRONNA. I will agree to that.

Mr. ASHURST. All right, if that is to be the agreement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not know that I would want to put myself in that situation.

Mr. ASHURST. All right, then; I object.

Mr. GORE. The Senator understands that when a Senator is in charge of a bill it is hardly proper for him to bind himself to speak only once upon it.

Mr. ASHURST. All right; I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I will withdraw my objection because I can not get any support.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, before I proceed to discuss this motion, if he is willing to fix a time on Monday at 2 o'clock to vote on this bill?

Mr. GORE. I will say frankly to the Senator that I think we had better vote on the motion made by the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am assured that if I withdraw that motion this bill will be shortly disposed of; and I therefore temporarily withdraw it, with the understanding that I will renew the motion if the bill is not disposed of soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. I wish to inquire what disposition was made of the amendment offered by the committee on page 3, line 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending question.

Mr. KING. Before it is disposed of I want to be heard.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to add a new section at the end of the bill. I suppose it is in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order at this time.

Mr. KIRBY. I understood that no agreement had been made to take up committee amendments first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may offer it later. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 21, after the words "including the protection," the committee proposes to insert the words "or indemnification."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I made an inquiry of the chairman in regard to this provision, and, as I understood the statement that was made by him and by other Senators who are in favor of this bill, the bill contemplates payment to all millers and all bakers and retail merchants for any losses which they may sustain by reason of a decline in the price of wheat or flour in the market, in consequence of which flour and wheat which they have shrink in value.

It seems to me that is a very unfair proposition. Men who have purchased merchandise in large quantities on the war basis are now confronted by a sharp decline in the prices of the same commodities.

It would seem to me that there is just as much obligation on the part of the Government to reimburse them for the losses which they sustained as to reimburse the miller or the baker or

those persons who purchased wheat on the market or flour on the market at market prices, and who now sustain a loss because there will be, or may be, a decline in the price of wheat and flour on the market.

I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. Will a motion to strike out the entire provision bearing upon this question be in order now, at a time when we are considering the Senate amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not be in order at this time.

Mr. KING. A further parliamentary inquiry. Would the adoption of the Senate amendment prohibit a motion to strike out the entire provision as amended at a later period?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. KING. Then I shall not submit a motion now or make further objection to action upon the Senate amendment; but at the proper time I shall move to strike out the entire provision bearing upon this question.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may we not dispose of committee amendments before we take up amendments to come at the end of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no agreement about considering the committee amendments first.

Mr. GORE. I will ask the Senator from Arkansas if he will not defer offering his amendment until we finish the committee amendments? That is the usual procedure. The request was not made to-day.

Mr. KIRBY. Very well; I will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 6, after line 5, to insert:

The President shall take reasonable steps to provide for and to permit the establishment of a free and open market for the purchase, sale, and handling of wheat and wheat products upon the expiration of this act.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I see that this is an amendment suggested by the Senate committee. It is not clear to me, and I am asking purely for information what the chairman had in view in tendering such an amendment.

Mr. GORE. The bill provides by its terms for its expiration on June 1, 1920. It also provides for closing boards of trade and grain exchanges throughout the country. If that time comes and no provision has been made for reopening the exchanges or for reopening the markets, of course chaos will prevail in the markets. It will take some time, of course, for the boards to get to running steady, and I thought we ought to devolve the duty on the President to take such steps as he can. It will be impossible to take any steps to restore normal conditions when the end comes.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me, the act expiring by limitation at a given time, nothing further could be done by the President or any of the executive officers that might operate under the provisions of this bill. In view of the fact that the bill does expire by limitation, there is nothing that the President could or ought to do. The machinery itself ceases to operate when the time for the expiration of the bill arrives.

Mr. GORE. It may be possible that nothing can be done and, of course, there would be nothing to do if there is nothing we can do, but I thought perhaps there would be steps we could take to bring about normal conditions. Of course, in the whole country a great many products are in an abnormal condition. We have got to get back to normal sooner or later. We ought to facilitate the transition to normal conditions as much as we can. It is more a declaration of policy than any fixed direction as to the duties to be performed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Are we not really providing for additional interference with what would be normal, and is it not better to leave the normal to take care of itself?

Mr. GORE. If that day comes and the markets are kept closed until that day Senators are wiser than I am if they can tell what will happen. We go over a precipice, where I do not

know, and I do not know what the effect will be. Wheat begins to move in my State and in Texas early in June, and I dislike to see it begin to move into a demoralized market. I do not know what the President can do, but I do know it is desirable to have a free and open market.

I may say that, as Senators know, the handling of the wheat crop is rather a delicate process and involves a great deal of credit, credit pyramiding upon credit. If the trade does not know that normal conditions are established they can not expect to provide themselves with credit.

As Senators know, if an operator in wheat has \$100,000 worth of capital of his own, he will buy \$100,000 worth of wheat and hedge against it. Then he will use the elevator receipts, and on those he will borrow \$90,000 more. He will buy \$90,000 worth of wheat with that, and he will hedge against it in the market, and upon the elevator receipts will borrow, say, \$80,000 worth, and this wheat has to be carried for 12 months from the time of harvesting in June and July until the time the last wheat is consumed in May or June of the next year.

It is a very delicate process, and I do not know whether it can spring up over night or not. If the President can do anything to repair the situation and to speed the restoration of normal conditions, he ought to do it. Of course, if there is nothing he can do, as the Senator from Utah suggests, there is nothing he will do. I need not say to the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Georgia that I am as much opposed to continued interference and meddling as any man can be, and yet we are at an abnormal height, and we ought to come down by the lock-and-dam system instead of rushing down a cataract and jumping over the precipice.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 6, line 14, after the word "announce," to strike out the word "no" and insert:

Provided, That as between the two articles mentioned preference shall be given to the exportation of flour, except when the public interest would, in the judgment of the President, be injuriously affected thereby. No

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word in regard to a verbal change in the amendment. Following the reading as I did I am unable to make very good sense out of the amendment taken in connection with the text, considering the punctuation and everything. It occurs to me that there should be a comma after the word "thereby" and that that should not be the end of the sentence. This proviso is thrown in parenthetically.

Mr. GORE. The Senator may be correct about that. If so, I ask that the necessary change be made.

The SECRETARY. After the word "thereby," in the committee amendment, strike out the period and insert a comma and the word "no" with a small "n."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 7, before the words "wheat flour," strike out the word "or" and after the words "wheat flour" to insert "bran or shorts."

Mr. GRONNA. That should read "bran and shorts."

Mr. GORE. I think the word "or" ought to go out and "and" be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 8, line 23, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina"; on page 9, line 6, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina"; on page 9, line 13, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina"; in line 13, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina or wheat flour"; in line 18, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina or wheat flour"; in line 23, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina or wheat flour"; and on page 10, line 3, after the word "wheat," to insert "semolina or wheat flour," so as to read:

SEC. 6. That whenever the President shall find it essential in carrying out the guaranties aforesaid, or to protect the United States against undue enhancement of its liabilities thereunder, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to import into the United States from any country named in such proclamation, or to export from or ship from or take out of the United States to any country named in such proclamation, wheat, semolina, or wheat flour, except at such time or times, and under such regulations or orders, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President shall prescribe, until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress: *Provided*, That no preference shall be given to the ports of one State over those of another. Any person who shall import, export, ship, or take out of the United States, or attempt to import, export, ship, or take out of the United States, any wheat, semolina, or wheat flour in violation of this section or of any regulation or order made hereunder shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine

not exceeding \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both: *Provided further*, That when the President finds that the importation into the United States of any wheat, semolina, or wheat flour produced outside of the United States materially enhances or is likely materially to enhance the liabilities of the United States under guaranties of prices therefor made pursuant to law, and ascertains what rate of duty added to the then existing rate of duty on wheat and to the value of wheat, semolina, or wheat flour at the time of importation would be sufficient to bring the price thereof at which imported up to the price fixed or prevailing under the direction of the President under or pursuant to this act, he shall proclaim such facts, and thereafter there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon wheat, semolina, or wheat flour when imported, in addition to the then existing rate of duty, the rate of duty so ascertained; but in no case shall any such rate of duty be fixed at an amount which will effect a reduction of the rate of duty upon wheat, semolina, or wheat flour under any then existing tariff law of the United States.

Mr. KING. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I ask for information under what authority is there a provision that in time of peace the President may prohibit exports from the United States; and does the Senator think it is wise to give the power to prevent the exportation of wheat or wheat products to any country?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator's memory is playing truant for the moment, because I know he is one of the best lawyers in the Senate. The first embargo laid in this country was, I think, the 23d of December, 1806. It was a general embargo against the exportation or importation of all goods. Even our own ships were not permitted to depart from our ports. That measure was repeatedly reenacted and was sustained by the courts of the country.

There can not be any question about the power of Congress to lay an embargo in peace as well as in war. As to the advisability of conferring this power, I may say that my first inclination and my first determination was to favor the elimination of this power from the bill. It struck me that the power to prevent exports was to favor the elimination of this power from the bill. It struck me that the power to prevent exports was in every circumstance a bad power; that it could only result in depressing the price of wheat here at home and in aggravating the indemnity to be paid.

I almost hesitate to tell the Senate what changed my mind. Those in charge of the measure in the other House advised me that they were advised that the fear existed that if the power to prevent exports was not included in this bill there might be an arrangement abroad not to take our wheat except at a price so low that it would not be justified by world conditions, and at a price so low that it would enormously aggravate our burden. The power to prevent its export was included in this bill in order that if any effort of that sort should be made abroad we would refuse to let them have the wheat they did need until they consented to take such supplies of wheat as they required at a reasonable price.

When assured in such an authoritative way that that fear was entertained I felt that I had no choice but to invest this authority in some agency of the Government, because if that contingency should arise the power ought to be invested somewhere to combat it, and I was not willing to take the responsibility of withholding such a power and subjecting ourselves to such treatment. I do not know that there is any danger of such treatment or that the fear was justified, but my information upon the subject did not leave me free as to the course I should take.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word. I am familiar with the act to which the Senator refers, and I know it provoked a great deal of discussion, and there was a great deal of opposition to it, and its constitutionality was questioned. As I recall the statute which was passed at that time, it was not left to the discretion of the President of the United States to lay the embargo upon certain articles. Our controversies at that time with France and with Great Britain and the discrimination under which we were suffering in our trade and commerce with Great Britain and France alternately led some of the American statesmen to a recommendation of the policy of an embargo for the purpose of retaliation.

Mr. GORE. It was a very unwise policy.

Mr. KING. I think it was very unwise, and proved to be very unwise, and the President of the United States at that time was subjected to a great deal of criticism and the officers were subjected to a great deal of criticism in their attempt to enforce it. They attempted to enforce it in the shipment of cargo from one port to another, from one part of the United States to another, and it provoked, as I recall the history of that time, not only verbal controversy but there were some very serious physical encounters. If the Senator will pardon me, and then I shall desist, notwithstanding he has made a very logical statement as a justification for this legislation, I am not persuaded that the reason he assigns warrants us in departing from sound economic principles.

Mr. GORE. This is undoubtedly an unsound economic proposition and only as a weapon of economic warfare would it be justified at all. I remind the Senator that one of the early acts during Jefferson's administration authorized the President to lift the embargo either as to France or England if either one of them would revoke their orders in council or the decrees which were oppressing our commerce.

This I may say to the Senator is merely a case of economic isolation, which will probably become universal at an early date. At least if the power is to be vested in our league of nations to make economic isolation universal, it might be well to experiment with it on a small scale.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask whether amendments are in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 13, line 7, after the word "flour," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That the President may, if necessary in his judgment to carry out the provisions of this act and protect the public interest, extend said time for a period not exceeding 60 days in which to sell or dispose of any wheat which the Government may have on hand and to wind up the affairs of the Grain Corporation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there was considerable division of view in the committee in regard to the insertion of the proviso just read; and while I am not authorized by the committee to withdraw it, I desire to say that Congress will be in session next winter and in the spring of 1920. If any situation should arise which shall necessitate the extension of the time, Congress could then act. I would rather see the Senate disagree to that amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on page 11, after line 16, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, it is proposed to add at the end of line 16:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to be a guaranty of the price of spring wheat harvested in 1919 to the producers who did not sow or produce spring wheat in 1918, and no portion of said moneys herein appropriated shall be paid to such producers of spring wheat.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to offer just a word in explanation of this amendment. The armistice was signed on November 11 last, and the guaranty which was given extended to the crop of 1919. I have been advised by a number of correspondents that in certain sections of the country where, as a rule, only winter wheat is produced, it is now proposed by a good many farmers that they shall not in the spring plant corn, but shall sow spring wheat, when they have not been accustomed heretofore to do so, in order that they may get the benefit of this guaranty. I think that that is a gross imposition upon the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the Senator from Ohio know about what time spring wheat is usually sowed?

Mr. POMERENE. That of course depends upon the section of the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is there any section of the country in which it has now been sowed?

Mr. POMERENE. I assume there is in the Southwest. I am not entirely familiar with the matter.

Mr. KELLOGG. There are sections of the country in which spring wheat is now being sowed.

Mr. POMERENE. I think that is so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Ohio that as to the sowing of the spring wheat that is now in the ground and which was certainly sowed under the guaranty provisions of the existing law, would it not be fairer to provide that from the date of the passage of this act the crop of spring wheat which is sowed shall not receive the benefit of this appropriation?

Mr. POMERENE. Possibly that may be a wise suggestion. My only thought is to prevent the deliberate taking advantage of the bounty of the Government under circumstances which can only be equal to a gross fraud upon the Government. I

may suggest that this amendment be adopted, and if it needs any modification in conference let it be done there. The matter was only called to my attention recently.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. Will the Senator from Ohio entertain a modification of the amendment so as to provide that spring wheat should have been produced in 1917 or 1918 by farmers desiring to get the benefit of the law? With many farmers, I am told, it is the custom to alternate crops, so that a farmer who is producing wheat in 1917 might be planting for corn in 1918 and then seeding spring wheat in 1919.

Mr. POMERENE. I hardly think that it would be necessary to modify the amendment in that respect. If farmers were encouraged during the existence of this law guaranteeing the price to sow spring wheat in 1918, and they had not been sowing it theretofore, I am disposed to think that they are entitled to the benefit of this guaranty; but if they did not see fit to take advantage of the guaranty that was given in 1918 and go along down to the point where the war is practically ended, and then see this opportunity to get their hands into the public till, I think that Congress owes it to the public to prevent just that situation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know of a condition in one State in the Union where there are a great many renters, and I know that some renters who did not raise wheat in 1918 have already rented land especially adapted to wheat growing, and expect to put that land in wheat. They did this sometime ago. Now, it does not seem to me that they should be cut out, and they would be cut out under the Senator's amendment. They have made their preparations for seeding spring wheat.

Mr. POMERENE. If they have made their preparations, I can see how there may be some equity in their behalf. It is not my desire to interfere in that respect.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the Senator can see the difficulties of applying his amendment without working a very great injustice on some very innocent people.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

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

Mr. STERLING. Does not the Senator from Ohio believe that the guaranty by the President of a price of \$2.26 a bushel for wheat applies to the grower of spring wheat in 1919 as well as it does to any winter-wheat grower?

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, it goes to him.

Mr. STERLING. He has made his arrangements with reference to the sowing of spring wheat.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Dakota misconstrues the purpose of this amendment. The farmer that I have in mind is the man who knows that the war was over in November, but he sees that under the order which was made by the President he can come in and change his crop, refuse to plant corn, put his corn land into wheat, and then get the benefit of this excessively high price.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, it seems to me there will be the greatest difficulty in the world in administering a provision such as that proposed by the Senator from Ohio. It goes to the matter of intention upon the part of the sower of wheat, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no; it does not.

Mr. STERLING. The Government would have to be able to determine whether the man intended to sow wheat before the armistice.

Mr. POMERENE. It is the matter of intention to get the excessive price. I believe that this safeguard ought to be placed in this bill, and I insist on the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, just one suggestion about this matter. This amendment would prohibit any farmer raising any spring wheat in 1919 from obtaining the guaranteed price unless he raised spring wheat in 1918.

Mr. POMERENE. That is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish to suggest to the Senator that, of course, the spring wheat that is sowed in much of the southwestern section is already being planted. That is one serious objection. Another serious objection—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking of a locality in which spring wheat is generally produced.

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I am speaking of a locality where the prevailing crop is winter wheat, but where they do raise some spring wheat.

Mr. POMERENE. Very well; if they are raising spring wheat, then this does not affect them at all.

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; it affects them, because they have planned to sow some spring wheat this year, as I was informed by gentlemen from Texas the other day, on land which they ordinarily do not use for planting spring wheat.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, why are they planting it?

Mr. KELLOGG. Because they are going to get a good price; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. POMERENE. Most assuredly. They have an opportunity to skin the Government and the public.

Mr. KELLOGG. There is one practical objection, and a very serious objection, which is that the Government would have to survey practically every farm. The only way this wheat guaranty can be administered—and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out in this statement—as shown by the hearings, is to pay a stated price at the markets. It is impossible for the Government to deal with each farmer. That was found to be too complicated; otherwise the Government would have adopted the plan of opening the market and settling with each farmer separately, but it was found that that would entail such a detail of work on the Government that it was practically impossible of operation. This provision would compel the Government at every wheat-purchasing station to deal with every farmer as to what land he raised the wheat on or whether he raised wheat in 1918, and the Government would have to have a force and system which could not be put in existence between now and harvest time.

Mr. POMERENE. There is some provision for the making of regulations.

Mr. KELLOGG. The only regulation the Government made is this: It licenses every purchasing warehouse. All the wheat is sold at the stations, which are authorized and required to pay a stated price. The farmer brings his wheat there and gets the price. No inquiry is made where it comes from or where it was raised, but if the farmers bring it there before June 1, 1920, they get their money. This amendment would require the Government to know every piece of land on which wheat was raised in the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, no.

Mr. KELLOGG. And to show whether the farmer raised the wheat on the land previously or whether he did not.

Mr. POMERENE. That is an exaggeration which the Senator does not quite expect—

Mr. KELLOGG. I am quite accurate, I think. Let me see—

Mr. POMERENE. No; the Senator is not at all accurate in that statement.

Mr. KELLOGG. I beg the Senator's pardon. I will show him that I am accurate.

Mr. POMERENE. I beg the Senator's pardon, too. In my own State last year there were only, as I am told, 3,000 acres of spring wheat. The Senator does not mean to say that in a State where there were millions of acres of winter wheat there has got to be an inspector sent around to each particular farm?

Mr. KELLOGG. There are no such States; that is the trouble. Now, suppose we take the State of Kansas—

Mr. POMERENE. There is no such state of facts as the Senator suggests.

Mr. KELLOGG. Take the State of Kansas or the State of Nebraska—

Mr. POMERENE. Well, Mr. President, even if that is true, it is a poor argument to be made against a restriction of this kind, that it may require a little diligence on the part of the Treasury in order to prevent fraud upon the Government.

Mr. KELLOGG. It would not only require that, but it would require the purchaser in every market town to show whether the grain was raised on land on which the farmer had raised wheat in 1918. That is exactly what it would require.

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

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am in accord with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I think it is a most meritorious one. Reports are coming in from all over the country that some farmers who have been planting their fields in recent years with alfalfa, corn, sugar beets, and other crops will this spring plant them with wheat, in view of the high price they will receive.

The farmer who was patriotic last year and endeavored to raise wheat to feed our Army, our allies in Europe, and our people at home deserves the support of the Government under the circumstances; but I have no sympathy for the man who did not grow wheat last year, but planted something else because he thought he might get a higher price, and this year plants wheat on the theory that it will be more profitable, and

neglects other crops which the people will need fully as much as they will need wheat.

The larger the crop of wheat we have the greater the sum that will be taken from the Treasury.

A very large crop of wheat ordinarily would mean a low price in the world's market, but under existing circumstances the more wheat raised the more the Government will have to pay out of the Treasury. The patriotic farmer who planted wheat last year ought to be taken care of by this guaranty, but the man who did not ought not to be.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York a question?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator know how much the increased acreage of wheat was in his State?

Mr. CALDER. For the crop of 1918?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. I do not know.

Mr. GRONNA. For the information of the Senator I will say that the report shows that in the State of New York the acreage in 1917 was 40,000 acres, and in 1918, 50,000 acres, an increase of 10,000 acres. That would be an amount that could be divided up among four farmers in the western section of the country.

Mr. CALDER. I assume, Mr. President, that the same proportionate increase will be found in most of the States of the Union.

Mr. GRONNA. I take it the farmers of New York are just as anxious to get a fair price for their product as the farmers of my section of the country.

Mr. CALDER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio gives them a fair price, and takes care of the farmer who planted wheat in 1918.

Mr. GRONNA. I am merely calling attention to the facts and showing that the acreage increase in the Senator's own State was infinitesimal; it did not amount to anything.

Mr. CALDER. I am not thinking of my State alone; I am thinking of the tax upon the people of the whole country.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment, not because of the injury that I think it will do to the owners of farms, but more because of the injury that I think it will do to farmers who are renters. I am concerned for them more than for anybody else, and I know that this amendment will affect many renters in some sections of the country.

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

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRBY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. All laws authorizing or permitting the making of restrictions against the sales of cotton for export or laying embargoes on or authorizing or requiring licenses for the exportation thereof are hereby repealed.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, this amendment is plain and easy of understanding. It only provides that all laws authorizing the laying of restrictions on the sale of cotton for export, and all laws authorizing the laying of embargoes, and authorizing and permitting or requiring licenses for the exportation of cotton shall be repealed.

We are not asking any bonus of the Government here or any guaranty for the price of cotton. We are not asking anything of the Government except to take off the restrictions, since the war is over, and give us an opportunity to sell our cotton.

It can not be said that the allies can complain about it because it shows a disposition upon the part of our people now to give themselves an opportunity to do business in the products that have been restricted and held here, to the great injury of all the producers, up until this time. We are only asking that the restrictions that ought not to be here now shall be removed; and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was my original purpose to request the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to adopt and report an amendment of this character—an amendment modifying the law which authorizes an embargo on cotton. When it was decided to retain the authority to limit the exportation of wheat, I thought it would be inconsistent to do so. I was desirous of avoiding anything which might clutter up the measure and defeat its final passage. I think, in view of the amendment just adopted, offered by the Senator from Ohio, that objection has largely departed. I understand that the amendments reported by the Senate committee, if agreed to by the Senate, will be accepted by the House, thus obviating

a conference. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio and its adoption, I think, will necessitate a conference. I had intended to offer an amendment of this sort on a measure which is to come up between this time and the expiration of this session. I am not authorized to accept this amendment. If I were, I would certainly accept it. I should be very much pleased if the Senate would vote this amendment into the bill. It is justified by every consideration of sound policy and justice.

There are 2,000,000 cotton producers in the South. Their product, essential to their prosperity and one of the chief contributors to our national prosperity, has been denied the privilege of entering into foreign commerce with certain neutral countries; that privilege is now limited, notwithstanding the armistice was signed nearly four months ago. Every effort has been made by the cotton-producing States, by Representatives and Senators from those States, to prevail upon the authorities here in Washington to revoke this order. We have failed. I think the Congress ought to modify that law and permit cotton to enter into international commerce. It is now selling for less than it is worth. It is selling in my State and in the State of Texas for less than it costs to produce it.

I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia obtained the floor.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For a speech or for a question?

Mr. GERRY. I want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GERRY. I want to ask the chairman, if this embargo is repealed, if it would not be allowing cotton to go into neutral countries and to Germany, thereby breaking the armistice?

Mr. GORE. I assume that authority would exist to prevent the breaking of the armistice. I am as anxious to keep the terms of the armistice in good faith as I am to keep the terms of the wheat guaranty in good faith. Wheat is now being allowed to go into Germany to the amount of 6,000,000 bushels a month.

SEVERAL SENATORS. And the American people are paying for it.

Mr. GORE. I do not know as to that. I raise no question as to the wisdom of that policy, but I do question both the wisdom and the justice of permitting wheat to go into Germany to feed their people and at the same time exclude cotton from going into neutral countries. I do not think this involves the shipment of cotton into enemy countries. It would permit, however, the shipment of cotton into neutral countries. The Government has now limited the shipment to neutral countries. It ought not to be limited. The war is over. The President, in his address to Congress on the 11th of November, declared:

The great war thus comes to an end.

If the war is ended, why preclude cotton from going even into Germany? But I am not insisting upon that. I do insist, however, that cotton ought to be allowed to go into the neutral countries. The reason why it is excluded is because certain countries with whom our relations have been friendly think that it might resuscitate the factories in Germany to their prejudice. I do not think it will reach Germany. Perhaps it ought not to reach Germany. My purpose is to permit it to go into the neutral countries. Exclusion from those countries is unjustified.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. GERRY. Will the Senator yield again just for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GERRY. I simply want to ask the chairman, if cotton is allowed to go into neutral countries, if that will not mean that eventually it will go into Germany; that the neutral countries will buy more than they need, and that will be simply a subterfuge; and that therefore the matter should be left to the President to deal with?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator's question on broader grounds. There is no authority under international law to prevent innocent goods from going to neutral countries. It has been done. It has been done during this war. There was a list of noncontraband articles agreed to by the London convention in 1909, in which it was declared that certain articles should never be classified as contraband. The first article upon that list was raw cotton, but there is no acknowledged authority to prevent innocent goods from going into neutral countries even if it is certain that they will go to enemy countries. Contraband of war can be interdicted from going into neutral countries if they have enemy destination. Conditional contraband goods can be prevented from going into neutral countries if they have an enemy destination and be de-

signed for the combatant forces. Innocent goods can not, in accordance with international law, be precluded from going into neutral countries, even if they have enemy destination and be intended for the combatant forces.

These are the old-fashioned principles of international law before the new era of the "new magic." I do not think any country on earth ever observed those principles except the United States of America. It did observe them during the Civil War. Arms shipped to Matamoras, Mexico, designed, undoubtedly, for the Confederate service, were interdicted. I believe it was in the Peterhof case that the Supreme Court of the United States held that those goods could not be interdicted even though they were consigned to Matamoras, and even though it was morally certain that they had an enemy destination, because that fact had not been conclusively proved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that no part of the agricultural interests of this country has suffered during the war as have the cotton growers of the Southern States. First, in 1914, the entire market was cut off. Cotton could not go abroad. Sixty-five per cent of it was dependent upon the foreign market, and cotton went down to almost half the cost of production. Last year's crop cost the average farmer about 30 cents a pound to produce it. It has been beaten down by its own Government from the price at which it was selling last September. In the early part of last September cotton was selling at 38 cents a pound. Merchants and farmers advanced money upon it around 30 cents. The War Industries Board raided it, threatening to fix a price that they had no authority to fix and no power to maintain; and after talking about it, and talking about it for several weeks, they broke the market, and got it down to about 30 cents.

Then, when they admitted that they had no authority and no power to fix or maintain a price we thought the market would begin again, and what did we find? The War Trade Board, under the power given as a result of cotton having been put on the embargo list, was declining licenses to ship cotton even to Spain in considerable quantity compared with the demand of that country; it was requiring licenses even to go to Japan; and the market was again broken.

Now, we do not come to the Government that has injured the cotton grower—breaking his price down by its conduct from 38 cents a pound to now about 24 cents, substantially less than it cost him to raise it—we have not come to the Government and asked a billion dollars to take care of our crop or to take off our hands the cotton that has been cut off from its markets. We simply ask that the embargo put upon it be taken off of it, and that it be permitted free shipment; that is all.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. I just wish to ask the Senator if he does not remember that when cotton was put in the food bill, authorizing the Government to fix the price, he and all his friends cut it out?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On the contrary, I stated that if they would fix the price at any reasonable sum I would not object; but I added that "if you do it, the Government does not need the cotton, the Government will not need to buy any, and you will burden the Treasury."

Mr. KELLOGG. But the committee put it in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the committee did not.

Mr. KELLOGG. The committee put it into the food bill; and when it came into the Senate cotton and iron and steel and many other products were in the bill, as I recall.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is mistaken. They were put in on the floor of the Senate—

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And we all joined together and took them all out.

Mr. KELLOGG. I did not join together with anyone else. I voted against taking it out. I was in favor of leaving it in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, most of those industries joined.

Mr. KELLOGG. The iron and steel industries and cotton made a combination and cut it out. That is what occurred.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the folly of putting into the bill things that the Government did not intend to take over was realized, and the burden it would place upon the Government if it gave a guaranteed price was also realized.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator knows that the wheat growers opposed putting wheat in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I insisted at the time that if the wheat market was to be in a measure controlled by the Government, a guaranty that would take care of the wheat grower should be made; and I voted for \$2 wheat and I voted for \$2.50 wheat. I said upon the floor of the Senate, "If you wish to put cotton in and give it a relatively increased price, so far as

the cotton growers are concerned, I am willing, but I do not think it is wise for the Government; for, if you give that kind of guaranty, our people will plant for an immense crop, and the Government may be compelled to buy from 16,000,000 to 20,000,000 bales of cotton"; and my opposition to it was, at least in part, upon that ground.

Mr. KELLOGG. There is just one other question I wish to ask the Senator. I am not familiar with this situation. Has the President got power now to remove the embargo on cotton?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think he has.

Mr. KELLOGG. Why does he not do it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I differ with him about it. I think he ought to.

Mr. KELLOGG. What reason is given for not doing it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MYERS. I ask to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The Secretary again stated the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by adding at the end of it the following words:

Provided, That no cotton be allowed to go to Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, or Turkey.

I do not think we ought to furnish cotton to any of the central powers.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are under the blockade. The objection to that is that when the war is over it would prohibit its going there.

Mr. GORE. Let me suggest to the Senator that he put in a proviso that the President can prohibit it from going to Germany.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; it is already prohibited. The blockade stops that; and the amendment of the Senator from Montana, even after peace is reached and the blockade is raised, would continue the prohibition against cotton going to those countries.

Mr. MYERS. That would be very agreeable to me.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But not to the owners of cotton.

Mr. GORE. Six million bushels of wheat a month are now going to Germany.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, that will give rise to another difficulty, because objection might be made to a shipment on the theory or supposition that it was going there, and the shipment might be entirely stopped from going to any country upon the assertion that it was likely destined to Germany.

Mr. MYERS. No; I think it would only stop or prohibit shipments going directly to Germany.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a request of a very important character, and that it comes at a time when it is impossible for the Senate to understand the merits of the proposed amendment.

No committee, so far as I am advised, has taken any testimony upon this proposition. We do not know what the reason is why the embargo is not raised already. It is conceded that the President has power now to raise this embargo and without legislation. Unquestionably some of the Senators who have been speaking upon this question to-night have insisted that this thing be done. It is apparent that it has not been done; and is there anybody here who believes that it has not been done without some cause? Do you not believe there is some good reason why this thing has not been done? And are we, without information, to pass upon this amendment and to take out of the control of the Commander in Chief this most important activity? Do we want to act at this time upon legislation which is so serious in its nature without having examined it most carefully?

I can not recall any proposition which has been presented to the Senate which seems to me to be more in the nature of a half-baked proposition than this. Before you repeal a law of this character, which was entered into after the most careful consideration, and before you repeal it against the protest of the President, who has in his hands its execution, should you not at least know the facts? Should not some one appear here and state why this embargo has not been raised before? Do you want to act in this way without careful consideration and stay the hand of the President of the United States in the performance of his duty without even knowing why he himself fails to perform the thing which the Senators now seek?

I simply ask that Senators give this matter careful consideration. For one I know nothing about it. I have had no opportunity to ascertain the facts. So far as I know it may be that the embargo should be removed, but the people who are entrusted with the duty of enforcing it must have some reason or else this would not be done.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana withdraws his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it had not been my intention to take up any of the time of the Senate at this late hour in the day and in the session in the discussion of this bill. I assumed, and I believe that assumption was right, that the Senate was practically unanimous in the belief that the guaranty given by the President under a law of Congress as to wheat should be carried out in good faith. I supposed that the bill would not be before the Senate more than a few moments before it would be passed.

I regret, Mr. President, that this amendment has been offered. In my judgment it endangers the success of the legislation which I believe we are all anxious to bring about. As has been truly said, the President has the right under this law to remove the embargo on cotton, and that is what this amendment seeks to bring about. No new legislation is necessary if the President wants to act. The fact that he does not act and remove the embargo is evidence to my mind that, at least, in the judgment of the President, the embargo ought not to be removed. Personally, I do not know why it should be removed.

It may be that if this were a separate proposition and a bill by itself or if hearings could have been had and those connected with the enforcement of the embargo act heard, I would be convinced that we ought to pass this law and repeal the embargo act. But I would not want to vote for its repeal now without a hearing and without getting the viewpoint of the President and those whose duty it is to enforce the law.

I am impressed, and that is a serious argument, with the fact that has been stated on the floor of the Senate here this evening to me that this very day when the President was in his room across the hall in the Capitol he stated to members of the Senate that he did not intend to remove the embargo on cotton. If he did so then he is convinced in his own mind that it ought not to be removed.

I do not know how serious it might be. I do not know what his argument is. I do not know what his reasons are; but at least he is convinced it ought not to be done.

We are now confronted with this legislative proposition: If we tack this amendment on the bill that everybody wishes to become a law it will put up to the President the necessity of either doing what in his judgment ought not to be done or to veto the entire bill, and thus defeat all legislation on the guaranty of the price of wheat. If his reasons are in his mind sufficient that it would be seriously wrong to remove the embargo, he would veto the bill, and the Government would therefore not be in a position to carry out the guaranty that has been solemnly made under the law of Congress. So it seems to me it is not right to tack on this bill this particular amendment.

I think those facts have a direct bearing on the question, but there is still another reason. I heard the argument made in the Senate when the pure food act was before this body. I remember how we put in a large number of articles in that clause which gave to the President the power to control and fix prices, and that cotton was one of them. I voted, I think, for all those amendments. I thought we ought to keep everything out or put practically everything in. I thought if we were going to limit the price the farmer ought to get for his wheat we ought also to limit the price of those things he had to buy to produce the wheat.

I remember an argument being made by some Senator from a cotton State that was rather appealing to me. It was to the effect that there was a reason for putting wheat in and limiting the price that did not exist as to cotton, because he said we must have wheat to live, and while it would be a hard thing to get along without cotton, we could do so. The man who produces wheat did not want the price limited and the historic fact is that the day we passed the law wheat was selling in Minneapolis, as I remember it, for a little over \$3 a bushel on the open market, and when we placed the limit at \$2 it practically meant that every farmer in the United States contributed to the Treasury of the United States for war purposes \$1 for every bushel of wheat he owned. So there is some equity if the farmer lost a dollar a bushel then for his getting next year \$1 more. That is outside of the guaranty. I take it we all want to make the word of the Government good since it has been solemnly pledged, no matter what the reason may have been, but that is the equity in it.

Mr. President, there is another thing. Nobody knows now whether there will ever be a dollar necessary to pay to the farmer producing wheat that is to be harvested next summer. We know that if the wheat crop, which now appears to be in good shape, would turn out and no accident happen, if God

gives us rain and the wheat yields as it indicates now that it will, if the hail does not destroy it, if pests do not destroy it, it looks now as though it will be necessary to use some of this money to make that guaranty good. But there is no certainty about it. It may be that wheat on the open market will sell higher next year than it would sell now if there was no law on the subject.

It seems to me, Mr. President, taking it all in all, that it is hardly fair to the President to put up to him a proposition that he must either sign a law that will repeal the embargo act or he must violate the pledge of the Government and veto the entire bill.

I hope, therefore, the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. President, there seems to be a misapprehension on the part of a great many Senators here as to the purposes of this amendment. I might say that I am heartily in favor of the passage of this wheat bill whereby the taxpayers of the United States will contribute to the wheat growers of America more than \$1,000,000,000. So far as I am concerned—and, I believe, all those who represent the section of the country from which I come are concerned—we are going to see to it that the pledge of the Government made through its President is kept to the letter. We are going to pledge to the wheat growers of America \$1,000,000,000 out of the pockets of the American people, and there need not be any fear on the part of gentlemen on the other side or from any section of the United States that the pledge will not be carried out.

But, Mr. President, that is not the only thing before the American people right now. This is not the only question which is of vital interest to a large number of farmers of this country. The farmers from my section of the country, from the South, from the cotton-producing section, have by reason of this war, by reason of the action of the Government in part, lost more than \$1,000,000,000 in the fall in the price of cotton recently. Cotton has dropped, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has said, from around 38 cents a pound down to a little over 20 cents a pound. The cotton growers have lost from \$70 to \$80 a bale. On a crop of 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 bales that means a loss to the people of the South of more than \$1,000,000,000. We are going to take our less like men and we are not going to come here and ask the Government to make good any loss we have suffered.

In order that Senators may realize fully how this has struck the South, if you take 20 cents a pound as the reasonable and ordinary price for cotton, and that is higher than it was before the war, the amount we are going to appropriate out of the Treasury is more than enough to pay every dollar that the southern cotton crop, the American cotton crop, would bring in gross without allowing one cent for the use of the land, one cent for fertilizer, one cent for labor, one cent for marketing, one cent for anything else. We are going to vote to you gentlemen in the wheat section as much money out of the Treasury as the whole cotton crop of the South is ordinarily worth, and more still.

What is the proposition before the Senate at this time? We merely ask that we be given a free market, as far as it is possible to sell our crop. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas is not merely to raise the embargo that the United States Government has established against the exportation of cotton. There is no embargo. Let me read it:

All laws authorizing or permitting the making of restrictions against the sale of cotton for export or laying embargoes on or authorizing or requiring licenses for the exportation thereof, are hereby repealed.

There is not an embargo as far as the United States is concerned. Whatever embargo foreign countries have adopted and put in force we can not change by the passage of any act here. But, Mr. President, we can repeal a law which gives any board here in Washington the power to require a license before cotton can be shipped out of America to any other country, and that is all the effect this amendment will have if it is adopted. We ask the balance of the country, we ask the American Senate, we ask American people to do this as a matter of common justice to us. We ask no money out of the Treasury. All we want is that these restrictions be taken off the free movement of cotton wherever the Government of the United States can take it off. We can not take it off in so far as France, Italy, Germany, Austria, England, or any foreign country is concerned, but in so far as the restriction placed upon the movement of it as far as the United States Government is concerned, we ask that these laws be repealed in order that in so far as we are concerned we may find an open market for our cotton. That, Mr. President, it seems to me, ought to be sufficient to appeal to the sense of fairness and justice of every Senator in this body.

We are going to give you \$1,000,000,000. We do not ask you for a billion dollars for our cotton; but we do ask you to help

us, as far as it is in your power, to open up the gates of commerce and let us go out and sell that cotton wherever we can, and that you do not require us to get a license, which is oftentimes refused, and which, so far as I can see, is without any reason at all.

I therefore hope the amendment will be adopted for whatever it is worth. I do not believe it is worth as much as perhaps some might think, but whatever it is worth I hope it will be adopted in order that we may get the benefit of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say a single word. As I understand it, we agreed in the armistice to maintain the status quo; and therefore if we undertake to change it, and it would be a change to remove any embargo, we violate that agreement. I imagine that is the view of the President, though, of course, I know nothing about it. I do not see how he could fail to take that view. It seems to me an unfortunate preface or preliminary to a league of nations to begin by breaking existing agreements.

I am for this bill. I know it is an enormous sum of money. It was improvidently contracted, but it seems to me that it is a debt of honor that ought to be paid and must be paid, and to attach to it something which I should think it extremely improbable the President would sign—for I do not see how he could sign it—is a way of beating the bill that is not very creditable to the Senate and would not be very creditable to the Congress if the House should agree to it.

Mr. POLLOCK. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. POLLOCK. Is it not a fact there is no embargo, in so far as the United States Government is concerned, on the exportation of cotton?

Mr. LODGE. I supposed there was.

Mr. POLLOCK. Where did you get the information upon which to base such a supposition?

Mr. LODGE. What does the amendment propose?

Mr. POLLOCK. To repeal all laws that have placed any restrictions upon the exportation of cotton.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from South Carolina draws a line of distinction between restriction and embargo. The repeal of any laws affecting the status quo agreed to under the armistice is a breach of the armistice to which we have agreed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not think for the United States to take an item off its own embargo list would be a change of the status quo.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Pollock] that there is no embargo, that it is only a restriction.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not agree with the Senator from South Carolina. I think that the President put cotton on the embargo list, and there is an embargo on the exportation of cotton, and I think it has to go out under the rules and regulations prescribed by him and licenses issued by the War Trade Board.

Mr. LODGE. That is my precise impression.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am agreeing with you.

Mr. LODGE. I was disagreeing with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts upon that subject, but I do not understand that for the President to take it off of our own embargo list interferes with the status quo. The status quo is the blockade of Germany and Austria, and for us to allow cotton to be exported without a license does not mean that it will go to Germany or Austria at all, but the blockade continues just as the status quo provides. We have taken barley off the embargo list since the armistice was signed. Did that interfere with the status quo? We have taken a number of items off the embargo list in the last 30 days. Indeed, the rules as to the export of cotton have been modified since last November.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Without taking any stand on the particular question as to whether we have an embargo or not, at least the President, as I understand it, has declined to remove it. I understand the President was here to-day and talked with Senators; perhaps he talked with the Senator from Georgia. If he did, I should like to know if he told the Senator from Georgia—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should not feel at liberty to repeat any discussion I might have had with the President.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I will not ask the question. I thought perhaps you would not object to stating that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I would not feel at liberty to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not at all sure that I would not agree with the Senator fully, but I at least would not want to take this action until the President's side could be heard. If he has only indicated his ideas in confidence and the Senator can not give it to the Senate, I would not like to act upon it until I had that information.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have perfect confidence in my judgment as to the propriety of relieving all agricultural products from the embargo.

Mr. NORRIS. I likewise have confidence in the Senator's judgment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will yield to the Senator if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I was just going to agree with the Senator so far as his judgment is concerned, and yet I think that when the President has the duty to enforce this embargo and refuses to remove it, I am justified in halting before I act without having the President's side.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not criticizing the Senator from Nebraska. When we allowed this embargo to go into the espionage act, we first beat it on the floor of the Senate on my motion, because I considered it a weapon put into the hands of any set of men dangerous to the people of the country. Subsequently we went into executive session, and upon the assurance that it would only be used during the war to keep supplies out of Germany and Austria, I moved to reconsider the action of the Senate and put the embargo back. Now, I know it has served its purpose. I am glad we took barley off the embargo list. That was done since the armistice; that was within the past 30 days. The Senator from California presented to me views on that subject that made me feel that it was an outrage to keep barley on the embargo list. Other agricultural products have been taken out of the embargo list since the armistice. This did not change the status quo; and I think it but fair that cotton should be taken out.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have always been under the impression that no one more than the Senator from Georgia has wanted to have Senators fully informed upon any question before being called upon to act with reference to it. Now, if I understand the Senator from Georgia, his position is this: A reason has been given by the President, with information from those who have been executing this authority, against doing what this amendment proposes to do. What that reason is we are not permitted to know. The Senator from Georgia, I have no doubt, with all propriety withholds that information, and as against the withheld information, upon the ipse dixit of the Senator from Georgia, he would have us take his word and say that this thing should be done, when he knows that we do not know the things which can be said upon the other side. I ask the Senator from Georgia, with all respect and deference, if he thinks that is the right position in which to put Senators?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think we understand it perfectly. The Senator from Massachusetts suggested the objection, which was that the terms of the armistice required the status quo maintained. Now, the status quo does require the continuance of our embargo list, for within the past 30 days barley has been removed from the embargo list and other items have also been removed from it.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it not fair to say—or to assume, at least—that the Senator from Massachusetts did not give the reason why the President was keeping it on the list, because, as the Senator says, the President has taken it off of something else within the last 30 days? So there must be some other reason besides that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not believe there is another reason. I have never heard any other reason suggested. I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not heard any reason for his action.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have given the only reason that anyone has communicated to me. I can say that much to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Then it is evident the President did not even give to the Senator from Georgia his reasons for keeping it on.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is the only reason anyone has ever suggested to me, and I insist that it is not a reason which should control action by Congress.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, it seems to me there ought to be no great mystery about the embargo on cotton. Cotton is peculiarly available for making nitrocellulose, which is an explosive, and the Germans have, of course, been desirous of getting cotton; but they have been using wood pulp since 1916, which is within a few per cent as available for making nitrocellulose as is cotton.

The British Government has a complete embargo in the form of a blockade against any explosives going into Germany or any cotton going into Germany. The Germans have surrendered their fleet; they have surrendered their submarines; they have surrendered their warships. They are perfectly defenseless against the blockade which Great Britain has established. There is no reason in my mind, when Norway and Sweden want to use our cotton for the making of cloth, why the cotton should not go to Norway and Sweden to be used in the making of cloth.

So far as this embargo on material is concerned on going into Germany, Great Britain herself is now sending to Germany all of her surplus pork products, while we are supplying her with new pork products.

Mr. PENROSE. Will the Senator from Oklahoma permit an inquiry?

Mr. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. Does he still retain the same position concerning filibustering as he gave expression to three hours ago?

Mr. OWEN. An inquiry came from that side of the Chamber with regard to the reason, and I am answering that inquiry. It will take me about two minutes.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator's remarks are interesting, but he is taking a great deal of time and delaying this bill.

Mr. OWEN. But the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized in the Senate as the leader of filibustering on that side.

Mr. PENROSE. I am beginning to suspect that I have an able colleague in the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator from Oklahoma will not use many minutes.

Mr. PENROSE. I am glad to know it.

Mr. OWEN. I have explained now the reason why cotton has been regarded as subject to the embargo.

I do not know what commitments might have been made some executive officer in dealing with an allied commission that might meet in London with regard to certain products here and there. There may be some agreements of that sort of which I have no knowledge; but I think the Senate is entitled to know if agreements committing the United States against shipping cotton abroad exist. I think we have a right to know it. If we do not know it, I think we have a right to act as if they did not exist. I do not believe that the Senate of the United States should be kept in darkness with regard to commitments made in behalf of the United States. If there are commitments made, we are entitled to have them; and, if we are not advised with regard to them, then I am in favor of acting regardless of any such commitments.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has stated. If this were a proposition where there had been an opportunity to be heard by the President and his advisers, and they did not give us the information, or give any reason why the law should not be repealed, then I would follow those who say it ought to be repealed; but here we have a proposition presented to the Senate without an opportunity for those in favor of it to be heard.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does not the Senator think that if any such agreement had been made to bind our Government it ought to have been made public, and if it has not been made public, have we not the right to conclude that it was not made?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will not yield just at this moment. If there is any agreement that was kept secret I could not say whether it ought to be made public, unless I knew all the circumstances. Without knowing, I should say yes. I am not trying to make an argument against this proposed amendment, if those who enforce it, particularly the President, decline to take it off and have the power to do it, and, without giving him an opportunity to be heard, it does not seem to me to be right to pass the law. If he had the opportunity and had the time to give us the information, and refused to do it, as has been stated by those who favor the amendment, that would be an entirely different proposition; but there has not been such an opportunity.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. The very fact that he declined to remove it, having the power to do so, makes a fair and honest presumption that, in his judgment, it ought not to be removed; and, without giving him or those who enforce

the law an opportunity to give their reasons, I am opposed to putting up to him the necessity of either vetoing another proposition or backing down on that. If it were standing by itself, I would not hesitate to vote for it, because then he could veto it without hurting anything else.

Now I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am glad to say to the Senator, before making the observations which I wish to make, that I am very much in favor of the bill carrying the appropriation for the wheat growers of America, but, as was suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], if there is an agreement which prevents the President from removing the embargo on cotton, the American Senate is entitled to know that such an agreement exists and the reason for its existence.

This is no simple, trivial, little thing; it involves an amount equal to a billion dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator that the Senate ought to know; I am not disputing that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Pardon me, if the President has given no reason—

Mr. NORRIS. He has not had an opportunity.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Oh, the matter has been discussed with him repeatedly. A delegation of Senators from the South called on the President this afternoon and discussed it with him.

Mr. NORRIS. Privately; but not a single Senator is at liberty to disclose what the President said. There has been no opportunity to hear his side.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] says that there has been no reason given by him.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not mean that the President does not have a reason.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Georgia was the head of the delegation which presented this request to the President.

Mr. NORRIS. If we had had this matter pending before a committee, or something of that kind, or if it were where there had been some opportunity to ascertain all the circumstances, then the argument of the Senator would appeal to me and would be decisive; but I submit that it is a dangerous thing at the very end of a Congress to put up to the President the proposition that this pledge of the Government as to the price of wheat shall either be violated or that he shall be compelled to do what, in his judgment, he ought not to do—remove the embargo on cotton. I will say to the Senator that if he will put it in a separate bill here to-night, so that it can stand on its own bottom, I will vote for it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have no desire to embarrass the President, and I would not put this amendment on the bill if I knew it would imperil the passage of the pending measure; but I do not see why it should embarrass the President. I am quite interested in saving to my constituents a billion dollars; it is a matter that affects me quite as deeply as the possibility of displeasing the President.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let us have the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who seems to be absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. GORE (when Mr. HARDWICK's name was called). The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. LEWIS (when his name was called). "Present."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained from the Chamber on account of the serious illness of his wife.

Mr. HARDING. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD], and vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on account of illness.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. McNARY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]; and

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Ashurst	Kirby	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	McKellar	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	Myers	Robinson	Swanson
Gay	Overman	Sheppard	Trammell
Gore	Owen	Simmons	Vardaman
King	Pollock	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—36.

Beckham	Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Shafroth
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sherman
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
France	Kellogg	Norris	Spencer
Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Nugent	Sterling
Gerry	Kenyon	Penrose	Sutherland
Gronna	Knox	Pittman	Thompson
Hale	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Harding	Lodge	Saulsbury	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—37.

Baird	Goff	McNary	Townsend
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Underwood
Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Wadsworth
Brandeggee	Hollis	Page	Walsh
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Warren
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polindexter	Watson
Cummins	Lenroot	Shields	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Smith, Md.	
Fall	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	
Fernald	McLean	Thomas	

So Mr. KIRBY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit further debate on this bill and amendments to five minutes, and that no Senator shall speak on the bill or on any amendment to the bill more than five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LODGE. I ask to have the request stated.

Mr. GORE. That no speech by any Senator on the bill or amendments hereafter shall be of more than five minutes.

Mr. KING. The Senator means, five minutes on each amendment?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; on the bill, or on any one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, on page 10, line 5, after the words "United States," to insert a new section, to be known as 6a, which I will ask the Secretary to state. After it is read I desire an opportunity to explain it briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina offers an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, after line 5, it is proposed to insert a new section, section 6a, to read as follows:

SEC. 6a. That cotton that, because of the presence of extraneous matter of any character or irregularities or defects, is reduced in value below that of low middling, or cotton that is below the grade of low middling, or, if tinged, cotton that is below the grade of strict middling, the grades mentioned being of the official cotton standards of the United States, or cotton that is less than seven-eighths of an inch in length of staple, or cotton of perished staple or of immature staple, or cotton that is "gin cut" or reginned, or cotton that is "repacked" or "false packed" or "mixed packed" or "water packed," shall not be delivered on, under, or in settlement of such contract.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is simply to provide that, in the contracts for delivery of cotton, cotton of unmerchantable grades shall not, as now, be tendered on a contract. Under the present cotton-grading law the cotton-grading com-

mittee has standardized a great variety of grades of cotton, so that the exchanges are tendering these very low and unmerchantable grades to such an extent that it has driven legitimate business away from the exchanges and has practically converted them into mere gambling places and not a place for legitimate business. In other words, there is now a difference of anywhere from \$25 to \$30 a bale between the contract and spot market. This amendment is simply to make the exchanges legitimate trading places and make the contracts commercial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish to give notice that I shall ask for a separate vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I call attention to page 3 of the bill. A few moments ago I invited attention to an amendment tendered by the committee, and stated that at the proper time I should move to strike out those parts of the paragraph that related to the matter then under consideration.

I now move to strike out, beginning on line 20, page 3, and ending with the word "crops," on line 25, the following words: "including the protection or indemnification of millers, wholesalers, jobbers, bakers, and retail merchants who purchase in carload lots against actual loss by them on account of abnormal fluctuations in the price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops."

It seems to me that the Government is under no moral obligation, and certainly under no legal obligation, under any of the proclamations made by the President to care for the losses, if there should be any losses, upon the part of bakers or merchants who may have had flour on hand when the armistice was signed.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I do not think that language ought to be stricken out. As the chairman of the committee explained, it was absolutely necessary to keep the grain in the millers' hands, and 10,000,000 bushels were constantly in transportation in the form of flour, and without that guaranty the milling of grain in the country would stop; that is all there is of it.

The chairman of the committee suggests that an amendment, after the word "crops," so as to read, "the fluctuations in price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops due to Government action," would certainly remove any possible objection that the Senator has.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, because I will have no chance to explain the amendment any further, as I presume the few words I uttered would be construed as part of my five minutes? I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that if this bill goes through in the way it is drawn, persons who are engaged in the milling business, or bakers, or wholesalers, or retailers, who bought flour or wheat months ago, and who now would lose by reason of any decline—not any decline caused by the Government, but by the operations of the law of supply and demand—could not compel the Government to reimburse them?

Mr. KELLOGG. Certainly not, because there can not be any decline until the Government fixes the price, and there never will be any decline until the Government takes off the price on the product, so as to lower the market, and then the loss comes; and if the words "due to Government action" should be inserted, they would cover everything.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. KING. Suppose the Government concludes to let the law of supply and demand take its course, and the farmers put their wheat on the market—if at the end of the year, or at any time when it is called upon to purchase the wheat under the guaranty, it would do so, and in the meantime under that law wheat goes to \$1.50 per bushel, would not those persons who bought flour and wheat at war prices be entitled to reimbursement for their loss at the hands of the Government?

Mr. KELLOGG. The Government can not take off the guaranteed price. It has been made and fixed, and fixed in this law; and there will be no fluctuations, no decreases at least, until the Government takes off the price which is fixed upon the wheat; and when it does, of course, it may go down. In that event the Government would make it good, but it would only make it good once. If it made it good on wheat, it would make no allowance for it on flour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, beginning on line 20, after the word "trade," it is proposed to strike out the comma and the

following words: "including the protection or indemnification of millers, wholesalers, jobbers, bakers, and retail merchants who purchase in carload lots against actual loss by them on account of abnormal fluctuations in the price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I want to give my support to the motion of the Senator from Utah. Why should we protect them? We have made no obligation to them. It is the farmer who raised the wheat that I want to take care of. I do think the obligation of the Government is enough now. That is all right; I am in favor of taking care of the farmer, if some of the wheat-growing people did help beat us on cotton just now. I have stuck by them all the way through on wheat, and I am going to go the rest of the way; I think it is right; but I do not believe in carrying this to the merchants.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Utah will prevail.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia must be under a misapprehension as to the effect of this amendment. The only indemnification that it provides for is where a miller is obliged to sell his wheat at a less price than he paid, due to the action of the Government. The Government compelled him to buy it at \$2.26.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why, the Government could not compel him to buy it at all.

Mr. GORE. Well, the Senator understands that wheat must move in this country from the farm to the table. The millers have to buy wheat at the Government price or else they have to stop operation. There is not any choice about it. That is the practical situation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that is not all. The ruling was made by the Food Administration that if any miller did pay any other price than the one fixed the miller lost his license.

Mr. GORE. Yes; that is true. It was a sword of Damocles over his head. He had no choice. Now, the Senator will realize that when the Government reduces the price below what the miller paid, and leaves wheat in the miller's hands which he bought at the high Government price, the Government ought to make good the difference between the high price which it compelled him to pay and the price which results from the Government's letting wheat go to the market on any other basis than the market price.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KING. It has been stated repeatedly by the advocates of the bill that if it had not been for the Government fixing the price of wheat it would have gone to four or five or six dollars a bushel. Suppose the mills, retailers, and wholesalers had purchased wheat, the Government not having fixed the price, at four or five or six dollars a bushel, does the Senator think—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And the war should suddenly come to an end—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move now to insert after the word "crops" the words "due to the action of the Government." I think those words ought to be in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma to insert, on page 3, line 25, after the word "crops," the words "due to the action of the Government," so as to read:

Including the protection or indemnification of millers, wholesalers, jobbers, bakers, and retail merchants who purchase in carload lots against actual loss by them on account of abnormal fluctuations in the price of wheat and wheat flour of said crops, due to the action of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I now move to strike out section 5 of the bill. I am in favor of carrying out, of course, the promise which has been made to the farmers. I think the Government is under obligation to pay according to the proclamation which was made by the President; but I do not think it is necessary to perpetuate the machinery which is now in existence and to create another organization in part as provided by the bill. I believe all that is necessary is for the Government to pay the amount it has agreed to pay. I am opposed in time of peace to the Government superimposing itself upon the States—going into the States and licensing individuals so that no man may engage in the purchase or sale of wheat or flour without obtaining a Federal license and making himself amenable to the rules and regulations and being subject to prosecution under the Federal law for a violation of those rules and regulations.

Mr. GORE. This license is just as odious to me as it is to the Senator from Utah. I consented to it only as a matter of necessity. The Senator will observe that in section 2 the committee struck out the words "create and" and substituted the word "existing," so that it reads "use any existing agency or agencies." We do not intend to have a multiplicity of agencies in this country. I am not certain that this artificial situation can be relieved or that we can restrict the ways and means through which it shall be enforced except by the use of the machinery through the operation of which we got into this situation.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I now move, on line 2, page 11, to strike out the figures "\$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$500,000,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have been obliged to be out of the Senate during the greater part of the evening, and I wish now to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Section 4 is still open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. REED. I move to strike out on line 4, on page 6, the following language: "\$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than four years, or both," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. President, I have not been giving this bill the attention which it no doubt deserves. I wish to say to the Senate, and I say it in all sincerity and with all the earnestness with which I am capable, that when it is proposed to authorize anybody to make rules and regulations simply governing trade transactions and then fine a man \$10,000 and send him to the penitentiary for two years for having violated those rules and regulations, any such provision is simply barbarous and a disgrace to a democracy. There is no use in it; there is no sense in it; there is no dignity in it; there is no democracy in it; there is no republicanism in it; there is no humanity in it.

While it is said these rules and regulations will be made by the President, they will, in fact, be made by some clerk, and to impose a penitentiary sentence upon a man for failure to obey the order and mandate issued by some clerk is an outrage upon decency and any such provision in the bill is a reflection upon the committee that reported it.

I therefore move to strike out those words and insert \$1,000 fine, which, indeed, is entirely too much.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the adoption of this amendment. The bill bristles with penalties from beginning to end. It was my purpose to have the committee recommend the elimination of some of them, but it was an oversight.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the same amendment should be made in line 10, page 8, by striking out "\$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. GORE. I will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I move, on page 9, line 10, to strike out the words "or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 10, line 21, I move to strike out "\$5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. REED. Before the bill goes to the Senate I move to insert before the word "willfully," in line 23 on page 5, the words "intentionally and," so that it will read: "intentionally and willfully."

Mr. GORE. I have no objection to that amendment and will accept it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I move that the same amendment be inserted at the same point in all the penalty clauses in the bill.

Mr. GORE. That is acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed amendments are agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole, with the exception of the one reserved.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. KELLOGG. The question is now on the so-called Pomere amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the Pomerene amendment, which the Secretary will report. The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall be considered to be a guaranty of the price of spring wheat harvested in 1919 to producers who did not sow or produce spring wheat in 1918, and no portion of said moneys herein appropriated shall be paid to such producers of spring wheat.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like to explain that amendment. It simply means this, and I want the Senate to understand what it is: Unless a farmer can show that he raised spring wheat in 1918—he may have made all preparations to plant his crop and raise it in 1918—but unless he can do that he does not get the guaranteed price, while everybody else gets it. You will find that spring wheat is being planted in all the Southwestern States. That is not all. Every grain raiser sells his wheat at a market town, and the market town has got to find out whether he raised spring wheat in 1918 or not, and if he did not they allow him no price and he will sell his grain in a country where there is no open market.

In my judgment the amendment is inequitable and unjust and will require the Government to make every elevator company in every part of the country an agent of the Government to find out where the spring wheat came from and whether the man had raised any in 1918 or not.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if I may say just a word, I believe the Senate wants to be just in this matter and wants to see that the Government pledge with regard to the price of wheat is fulfilled. It will not be just nor will the Government pledge be fulfilled if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is adopted. It will be unjust, of course, to the owner of the land on which the spring wheat is grown in 1919 in many cases. It will be unjust to the tenant in many cases. It may be that the owner, notwithstanding the inducements for raising wheat in 1918, found it impossible by reason of his particular situation to grow wheat, but he is so situated in 1919 that he may grow wheat. Relying on the pledge of the Government, the guaranty of the Government made in September, 1918, he prepares his ground and sows his crop in the spring of 1919 in pursuance of that idea, and the preparation that he has made for the spring wheat crop in 1919.

Take my own State, for example, where we grow both the winter and spring wheat; winter wheat in the southern part of the State, where I think there is more winter wheat grown than there is spring wheat. There is a tenant on a farm there. He raised in 1918 not a bushel of spring wheat, and he grows winter wheat that year; but he changes his tenancy or moves into the northern part of the State or moves to the newer country west of the river where it is all spring wheat, and relying on the Government guaranty he prepares his ground in the fall of 1918 for the spring wheat crop of 1919. The Government has not fulfilled its pledge to him and has not done justice by him—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I realize that we have got to a point where it is very unpopular to try to save any money for the public under any circumstances, and particularly is that true when we are dealing with this subject. I submit there is not an instance before the Senate now in which it is shown that one party has moved from the southern part of the State of South Dakota to the northern part of the State of South Dakota. The amendment which I have offered, and which was adopted, presents this situation: Spring wheat in South Dakota and in Ohio or Indiana and Illinois is not yet sown. They are starting to sow wheat of this kind now that the armistice has been signed, and they conclude they will sow spring wheat because they can get the high price guaranteed by the Government. That course by men who pursue it is not prompted by patriotism; it is prompted by self.

Mr. President, I do not know why the United States Senate should sit silently by when men are threatening to take this very course and thereby take the money out of the Public Treasury. I do not yield to other Senators in any respect in their eagerness to have good faith kept with the farmer. We ought to keep faith with the farmers when the pledge has been made, but they ought certainly not to adopt a method whereby they can take advantage of the Government, and ought not to be permitted to do it. For these reasons I insist upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to get some light on this proposition. The form of the amendment, as I take it, will mean that a farmer who raised spring wheat in 1918, whether he raised 10 bushels or 10,000 bushels, will be paid the full price for his wheat in 1919 whether he raises 10 bushels or 10,000 bushels. I can not see the fairness of that rule. There are entire sections of this country that raise nothing but spring wheat. There are other entire sections that raise nothing but winter wheat. The winter-wheat country will get the guaranteed price for what it raises, but the spring-wheat country will get a less price, being obliged to sell upon the open market.

Mr. POMERENE. It is to be assumed that if there is a spring-wheat section, they are raising spring wheat; but what I am seeking to do is to go into those sections where they have not been raising spring wheat, but are doing it now because they can take advantage of the Government. That is the reason for this amendment.

Mr. REED. The Senator knows I have a very short time.

Mr. POMERENE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. REED. Will he just let me ask him a question for light? Is it the idea of the Senator from Ohio that if it passes in this form, then if a man rotates his crop and is prepared to plant spring wheat this year and would have planted it any way, even if he did not plant it last year because it was rotation year, when he had corn in that ground, shall not be allowed to plant spring wheat this year?

Mr. POMERENE. In only a very small portion of the country has spring wheat been sown up to this date. In sections in the northern and central West they have not even begun plowing for spring wheat, and in many of these sections the reports show that the people, instead of planting corn in the spring, are going to refuse to plant corn and sow spring wheat. It is to meet that situation.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator supposes that that will come, but it is the fact that the man in the spring-wheat section rotates his crop; that he plants his field with corn in one year and perhaps some other crop another year, and then comes his spring-wheat year. So a great number of men in the spring-wheat section will be cut out under this provision, and I can not see why you should discriminate against one section.

Mr. GRONNA. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand those who are in favor of the so-called Pomerene amendment will vote "yea" to keep it in the bill, and those opposed will vote "nay." Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a proper interpretation of the vote to be taken.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say that if this amendment is adopted it will be very difficult to administer. I have considered and analyzed a great many propositions of this kind. They could not be administered at all without doing a great deal of injustice.

Now, I have no doubt there are some people who will plant wheat this year on account of the guaranty who would not have planted it but for the guaranty. They are animated, of course, by mercenary motives or motives other than patriotic ones. They may be subject to just criticism. On the other hand, if we adopt this amendment, people will be precluded from the enjoyment of this guaranty who have every moral right to enjoy it and for whom it was originally intended. I believe that, upon the whole, the amendment will do more harm than good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the former vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I wish to inquire if the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with that Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. I am glad to see the Senator from Mississippi in the Chamber. I was engaged in conversation when my name was called, and not knowing that the Senator was present, I postponed my vote until the close of the roll call. At the proper time, and at the first opportunity after the call is completed, I shall ask the privilege of voting.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I vote "yes."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOWLIS], and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—23.

Ashurst	Hale	New	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Kirby	Pomerene	Trammell
Fletcher	Knox	Robinson	Williams
Gay	McKellar	Saulsbury	Wolcott
Gerry	Martin, Ky.	Simmons	

NAYS—31.

Chamberlain	Kellogg	Nugent	Smoot
Curtis	Kendick	Owen	Spencer
France	Kenyon	Pollock	Sterling
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Ransdell	Sutherland
Gore	Lewis	Reed	Swanson
Gronna	Moses	Sheppard	Thompson
Henderson	Myers	Sherman	Vardaman
Jones, Wash.	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—42.

Baird	Harding	McNary	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin, Va.	Thomas
Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Townsend
Brandegee	Hollis	Overman	Underwood
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Wadsworth
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Walsh
Cummins	King	Phelan	Warren
Dillingham	Lenroot	Polindexter	Watson
Fall	Lodge	Shafroth	Weeks
Fernald	McCumber	Shields	
Goff	McLean	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. POMERENE's amendment was nonconcurrent in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE CENSUS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. ASHURST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the census bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the motion is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. Does the Senator from Washington desire to be heard?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] desires to be heard.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to be heard. I have no objection to the conference report being laid before the Senate, but I have some observations which I desire to submit upon it, and therefore, while I am on my feet, I will proceed to make them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. FRANCE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow the motion to be put to lay the conference report before the Senate?

Mr. FRANCE. Yes; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, before that is done, of course, the Senator from Maryland is not to be taken off the floor.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not at all.

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

Mr. FRANCE. I yield to the Senator from Texas. He interrupted me.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My intention was to yield at once to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], to move a short executive session, and then to adjourn.

Mr. PENROSE. That is satisfactory. That is what I wanted to understand—that the proposition is to make this conference report the unfinished business, and then to move a short executive session, and then adjourn.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENROSE. That will permit the Senator from Maryland to complete his very important remarks to-morrow.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will.

Mr. PENROSE. That is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon proceeding to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 11984, known as the census bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

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 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes a. m., Friday, February 28, 1919) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 28, 1919, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1919.

ATTORNEY GENERAL.

A. Mitchell Palmer, of Pennsylvania, to be Attorney General of the United States, vice Thomas W. Gregory, resigned.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Hugh Campbell Wallace, of Washington, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France, vice William G. Sharp, resigned.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

The following named, now secretaries of embassy or legation of class 4, to be secretaries of embassy or legation of class 3 of the United States of America:

Cornelius Van H. Engert, of California.

Matthew E. Hanna, of Connecticut.

Charles H. Russell, jr., of New York.

John W. Belt, of Kentucky.

Walter C. Thurston, of Arizona.

Arthur Bliss Lane, of New York.

T. Hart Anderson, jr., of New York.

Ray Atherton, of Illinois.

Frederick C. Chabot, of Texas.

Casper Y. Offutt, of Nebraska.

J. Donald C. Rodgers, of Pennsylvania.

Harold L. Williamson, of Chicago, Ill., to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4 of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

J. D. Clements, of Helena, Mont., to be United States attorney, District of Alaska, division No. 2, vice G. J. Lomen, appointed by court.

Mrs. Annette Abbott Adams, of San Francisco, Cal., to be United States attorney, northern district of California. (Mrs. Adams is now serving as United States attorney under appointment by court.)

Edward C. Knotts, of Springfield, Ill., to be United States attorney, southern district of Illinois. A reappointment; his term having expired.

Alfred Jaques, of St. Paul, Minn., to be United States attorney, district of Minnesota. A reappointment; his term having expired.

Edwin S. Wertz, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be United States attorney, northern district of Ohio. A reappointment; his term expiring March 1, 1919.

John A. Fain, of Oklahoma, Okla., to be United States attorney, western district of Oklahoma. A reappointment; his term having expired.

Edwin Lowry Humes, of Pittsburgh, Pa., to be United States attorney, western district of Pennsylvania, vice R. L. Crawford, appointed by court.

Charles L. Rigdon, of Cheyenne, Wyo., to be United States attorney, district of Wyoming. A reappointment; his term having expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Samuel J. Burris, of Denver, Colo., to be United States marshal, district of Colorado. A reappointment, his term expiring March 2, 1919.

John J. Mitchell, of Boston, Mass., to be United States marshal, district of Massachusetts. A reappointment, his term having expired.

John E. Lynch, of St. Louis, Mo., to be United States marshal, eastern district of Missouri. A reappointment, his term having expired.

Albert Bollschweiler, of Trenton, N. J., to be United States marshal, district of New Jersey. A reappointment, his term having expired.

James M. Power, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to be United States marshal, eastern district of New York. A reappointment, his term expiring March 3, 1919.

George H. Bellamy, of Lanvale, N. C., to be United States marshal, eastern district of North Carolina, vice W. T. Woodley, appointed by court.

William R. Bennett, of San Juan, P. R., to be United States marshal, district of Porto Rico. A reappointment, his term expiring March 2, 1919.

Stanley H. Trezevant, of Memphis, Tenn., to be United States marshal, western district of Tennessee. A reappointment, his term having expired.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF MINT.

William A. Burns, of Carson City, Nev., to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson City, Nev., in place of Ed Ryan, deceased.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Miss Effie A. Frisbee, of Alaska, to be register of the land office at Juneau, Alaska, vice Clyde B. Walker, resigned.

Frank P. Wheeler, of California, to be register of the land office at Eureka, Cal., his present term having expired February 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Henry A. Meier, of Nebraska, to be register of the land office at Lincoln, Nebr., his present term expiring March 2, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Gould B. Blakely, of Utah, to be register of the land office at Salt Lake City, Utah, his present term expiring March 2, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Emmett Patton to be register of land office at Roswell, N. Mex., his term having expired March 19, 1918. (Reappointment.)

John L. Burnside to be register of land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex., his term having expired March 19, 1918. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank F. Steele, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Helena, Mont., his present term having expired January 24, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Mrs. Lulu Hurley, of Elko, Nev., to be receiver of public moneys at Elko, Nev., vice Ashley G. Dawley, deceased.

Heber C. Jex, of Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Salt Lake City, Utah, his present term expiring March 2, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Matthias N. Fegty, of Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at Vale, Oreg., his present term having expired February 12, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Blair E. Hoar, of Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Lewiston, Idaho, his present term having expired February 3, 1919. (Reappointment.)

William G. Cowan to be receiver of public moneys at Roswell, N. Mex., his term having expired March 19, 1918. (Reappointment.)

Raymundo Harrison to be receiver of public moneys at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., his term having expired January 25, 1919. (Reappointment.)

Donaciano E. Rodriguez, of La Mesa, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice Santiago P. Ascarate, term expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Sanders Louis Christian to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 8, 1919.

Asst. Surg. Charles Joseph McDevitt to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 9, 1919.

Asst. Surg. Roscoe Roy Spencer to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 5, 1919.

Asst. Surg. Walter Casper Teufel to be passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to rank as such from January 7, 1919.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Roscoe P. Strough, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Herbert R. Grummann, of Nebraska, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

Second Lieut. John J. Hutson to be a permanent first lieutenant in the Coast Guard from the 17th day of November, 1918.

The following-named third lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Coast Guard from the 7th day of June, 1918:

Earl G. Rose,
Edward H. Smith, and
Henry Coyle.

Third Lieut. Rae B. Hall to be a second lieutenant in the Coast Guard from the 21st day of July, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Clarence C. Williams, Ordnance Department (Chief of Ordnance with rank of major general), from January 27, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Hof, Ordnance Department, from January 27, 1919.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Maj. Lewis H. Rand, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant colonel from February 7, 1919.

Capt. Clarence L. Sturdevant, Corps of Engineers, to be major from February 7, 1919.

First Lieut. Llewellyn B. Griffith, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 21, 1918.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas E. Merrill, Field Artillery, to be colonel from January 31, 1919.

Maj. George M. Brooke, Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from January 31, 1919.

Capt. William Bryden, Field Artillery, to be major from January 31, 1919.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels with rank from February 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Henry J. Hunt, Infantry, detailed in division train (subject to examination required by law).

Lieut. Col. Truman O. Murphy, Infantry, detailed in The Adjutant General's Department.

Lieut. Col. Ross L. Bush, Infantry (subject to examination required by law).

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains with rank from November 24, 1918.

First Lieut. Horace S. Villars, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Donald G. Russell, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Allen D. Lazenby, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Patrick F. McGuire, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. James W. McClaran, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Louis F. Boyd, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Tom S. Mebane, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Edmund B. Spaeth, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Phillip L. Coulter, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. James B. Montgomery, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Percy E. Duggins, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Brown S. McClintic, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Henry K. B. Hufford, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph G. Fernbach, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Howard H. Dignan, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles W. Sale, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Robert H. Lowry, jr., Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Hertel P. Makel, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Ward S. Wells, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Seymour C. Schwartz, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Burgh S. Burnet, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Karl F. Kesmodel, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Ross Golden, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Curtis D. Pillsbury, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Nelson A. Myll, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John R. De Velling, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Roy L. Scott, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William W. Southard, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. George H. Dorsey, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Laurent L. LaRoche, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Henry C. Dooling, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Frank S. Matlack, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Cleon J. Gentzkow, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. James P. Crawford, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Robert A. Hale, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Allen R. Howard, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Benjamin B. Rowley, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Henry C. Bradford, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Harry H. Towler, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Oral B. Bolibaugh, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph R. Jones, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Harold E. Clark, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Roland A. Davison, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles R. Snyder, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Haskett L. Conner, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Edward B. Macon, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Percy J. Carroll, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Virginus Minervini, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. James V. Falisi, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William D. Petit, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Glenn H. Reams, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Jay DeP. Mingos, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Allan W. Dawson, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John W. McKeever, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Ottis L. Graham, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Edwin H. Roberts, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Arthur M. Bacon, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John J. Moore, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Anthony J. Vadala, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Maurice S. Weaver, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. John M. Stanley, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Arthur H. Nylen, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Myron P. Rudolph, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Noble Du B. McCormack, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles E. Sima, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Bascom H. Palmer, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Harold D. Rogers, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John R. Hall, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Arthur R. Gaines, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. William L. Starnes, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. William A. Boyle, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Manton L. Shelby, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Paul H. Streit, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. John E. Robinson, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Lewis E. J. Browne, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Ernest K. Stratton, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. James A. Orbison, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Paul M. N. Kyle, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William C. Whitmore, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Albert B. Pavy, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Francis E. Evans, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Charles E. Brenn, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Francis T. Duffy, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Leonard W. Weaver, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Louie Felger, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Leo S. Trask, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Raymond A. Tomassene, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Lowyd W. Ballantyne, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Otto R. Brown, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles E. Yoho, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Cornelius A. Denehy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Joseph P. Madigan, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Robert K. Simpson, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Patrick S. Madigan, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Frederick B. Little, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Chester A. Stayton, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Herbert W. Rogers, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. John R. Evers, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Ralph E. Curti, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Daniel C. Hankey, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Frederick A. Blesse, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles C. Dickey, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. George B. Fletcher, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Walter H. Mytinger, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John J. Carden, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Henry E. Fraser, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John R. Whisenant, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Harold H. Golding, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Harry P. Shugerman, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. William C. Pollock, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William W. McCaw, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Edward H. Tonolla, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Earle D. Quinnell, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Harold O. Brown, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Douglas H. Mebane, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Paul B. Johnson, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Irving K. Lovett, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Montreville A. St. Peter, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Frank McA. Moose, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Percy K. Telford, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William B. Brigman, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Benjamin F. Pence, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Wayne R. Beardsley, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Warren Stirling, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Don G. Hilldrup, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Richard S. Magee, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William A. Smith, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Frank W. Pinger, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Ivy A. Pelzman, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Edward S. Murphy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Richard E. Werlich, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Herbert R. Stolz, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Louis de K. Belden, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Andrew W. Smith, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Willard S. Howard, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Philip P. Green, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. William H. Barrow, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Gordon F. Willey, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Frank A. Plum, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Charles R. Irving, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William W. Jones, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Charles C. Hawke, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Noland M. Canter, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Pierre N. Charbonnet, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. James C. Kimbrough, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Meredith R. Johnston, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Merrill K. Lindsay, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William D. Middleton, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Leon H. Cornwall, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Read B. Harding, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. James W. Duckworth, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Bradford Massey, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Edgar H. Howell, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. George W. Snyder, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Paul S. Wagner, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. John A. P. Millet, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph D. Foley, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Lewis A. Newfield, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Thomas M. Leahy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Louis A. La Garde, jr., Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Edward L. Moore, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains with rank from July 13, 1918.

First Lieut. Samuel J. Rohde, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Leroy P. Hartley, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Frederick C. Daniels, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Nathan C. Pickles, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Robert L. Lowry, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Oliver J. Christiansen, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Timothy Harden, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Lawrence K. Anderson, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Timothy F. Leary, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William C. Webb, jr., Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Edward C. Alley, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Clinton R. Boone, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. David I. Edwards, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Orville A. Grove, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Roy M. Kisner, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Edward A. Thorne, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Lynn H. Tingay, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Claude R. Hollister, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Marhl H. Welch, Dental Corps.

To be captains with rank from October 4, 1918.

First Lieut. Walter D. Vail, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Richard K. Thompson, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Leslie S. Harlan, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Neil J. McCollum, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Clement J. Gaynor, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Walter A. Rose, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Melvin R. Eiche, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. George Krakow, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Eugene A. Smith, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Jerome L. Fritsche, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Clarence J. Wright, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Milton A. Price, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William H. Hohlitzell, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Francis M. Tench, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Alvin E. Anthony, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William J. R. Akeroyd, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Fletcher D. Rhodes, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William B. Caldwell, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Lewis W. Maly, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Arthur T. Burchill, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Glover Johns, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Herms, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Harold J. Parker, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Leslie D. Baskin, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Curtis W. Hallam, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. James F. Dean, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Henry L. Hogan, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. John C. Campbell, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Leland S. Wilson, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Benjamin H. Deau, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Dell S. Gray, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Julius L. Bischof, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Charles H. Brammell, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. John A. Rowe, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William T. Williams, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Hooker O. Lindsey, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Alvin D. Dannheiser, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. James R. Conner, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Robert L. Strickland, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Roy R. Newman, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Boyd L. Smith, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Avery G. Holmes, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. George R. Kennebeck, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Alexander M. Smith, jr., Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Horace R. Finley, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Cecil R. Hays, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Roy C. Starr, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Harold S. Embree, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Charles L. Andrews, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph L. Boyd, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph L. Rahm, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Clarence R. Jacobson, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. Norman M. Mackenzie, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Richard F. Thompson, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Henry H. Collins, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. William A. Moore, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Adrain C. Ragan, Dental Corps.

To be captain with rank from October 8, 1918.

First Lieut. Byram S. Purviance, Dental Corps (subject to examination required by law).

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS, BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Simon Medine, Corps of Engineers, from October 23, 1918.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. George W. Coffey, Corps of Engineers, from October 21, 1918.

Second Lieut. George O. Consoer, Corps of Engineers, from October 23, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Paul A. Wolf, from December 31, 1918.

Lieut. Col. George D. Moore, from January 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Willis Uline, from January 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Clark, from January 4, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Vernon A. Caldwell, from January 8, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Edmund L. Butts (subject to examination required by law), from January 9, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Hugh D. Wise, from October 8, 1918.

Maj. Pegram Whitworth, from October 8, 1918.

Maj. James A. Moss, from November 2, 1918.

Maj. Ulysses G. Worrilow (subject to examination required by law), from January 2, 1919.

Maj. Frank J. Morrow, from January 4, 1919.

Maj. Henry C. Clement, jr. (subject to examination required by law), from January 4, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Alvin C. Voris, from October 8, 1918.

Capt. Fred L. Davidson, from October 8, 1918.

Capt. George E. Kumppe, from November 2, 1918.

Capt. Milo C. Corey (subject to examination required by law), from December 19, 1918.

Capt. Arthur M. Ferguson, from December 19, 1918.

Capt. De Witt W. Chamberlin, from January 4, 1919.
 Capt. Walter H. Johnson, from January 4, 1919.
 Capt. Robert G. Rutherford, jr. (subject to examination required by law), from January 4, 1919.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Samuel M. Waterhouse, Medical Corps, to be colonel from December 3, 1918.
 Maj. Leartus J. Owen, Medical Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from December 3, 1918.

To be majors with rank from September 18, 1918.

Capt. William M. Archer, jr., Medical Corps.
 Capt. Henry F. Phillips, Medical Corps.

To be major with rank from October 9, 1918.

Capt. Nicholson F. Curtis, Medical Corps.

To be major with rank from November 8, 1918.

Capt. John S. C. Fielden, jr., Medical Corps.

To be majors with rank from November 24, 1918.

Capt. John M. Hewitt, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Claude W. Cummins, Medical Corps.
 Capt. James M. Troutt, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Alan DeF. Smith, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Frank M. Ende, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Samuel A. White, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Albert W. Greenwell, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Francis M. Fitts, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Eric A. Fennel, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Paul E. McNabb, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Harvey E. Webb, Medical Corps.
 Capt. George F. Aycock, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Henry W. Grady, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Phillip J. Lukens, jr., Medical Corps.
 Capt. Norman McL. Scott, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Marion R. Mobley, Medical Corps.
 Capt. Frederick K. Herpel, Medical Corps.

To be captains with rank from September 18, 1918.

First Lieut. William M. Archer, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry F. Phillips, Medical Corps.

To be captain with rank from October 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Nicholson F. Curtis, Medical Corps.

To be captain with rank from November 8, 1918.

First Lieut. John S. C. Fielden, jr., Medical Corps.

To be captains with rank from November 24, 1918.

First Lieut. John M. Hewitt, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Claude W. Cummings, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James M. Troutt, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Alan DeF. Smith, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frank M. Ende, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Samuel A. White, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Albert W. Greenwell, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Francis M. Fitts, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Eric A. Fennel, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul E. McNabb, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harvey E. Webb, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George F. Aycock, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry W. Grady, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Phillip J. Lukens, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Norman McL. Scott, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Marion R. Mobley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frederick K. Herpel, Medical Corps.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. William Chamberlaine, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel with rank from January 9, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Maj. Edward T. Donnelly, Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from January 5, 1919.

Capt. Charles J. Ferris, Field Artillery, to be major from January 5, 1919.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be majors with rank from November 2, 1918.

Capt. Walter S. Grant, Cavalry (General Staff).
 Capt. Charles M. Wesson, Cavalry (Ordnance Department).
 Capt. Morton C. Mumma, Cavalry.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Harold M. McClelland, Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from August 8, 1917.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 16th day of December, 1918:

Benjamin C. Bryan, an additional number in grade, and William L. Howard.

Capt. George W. Kline to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 31st day of December, 1918.

Commander William H. Reynolds to be a captain in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 16th day of December, 1918.

Commander Clarence L. Arnold to be a captain in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Frank C. Martin to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Henry M. Jensen to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 11th day of October, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Stephen Doherty to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 7th day of November, 1918.

Lieut. Commander William C. I. Stiles to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 14th day of November, 1918.

Lieut. Commander William B. Howe to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 28th day of November, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Alfred W. Brown, jr., to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 11th day of December, 1918.

Lieut. Commander John A. Monroe to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 16th day of December, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Charles R. Clark to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 13th day of January, 1919:

Bryson Bruce and Alfred W. Atkins.

Lieut. Commander Archibald D. Turnbull to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 17th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Aubrey W. Fitch to be a commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 23d day of July, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Douglas W. Fuller to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1917.

Lieut. Glenn B. Strickland to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Fred K. Elder,
 Laurence R. Brown,
 Edward H. McKittrick, and
 Neil H. Geisenhoff.

Lieut. Paulus P. Powell to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 9th day of January, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 13th day of January, 1919:

Roy Pfaff and Benjamin H. Lingo.

Lieut. Earl H. Quinlan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 17th day of January, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

John W. Rowe and Ford L. Wilkinson, jr.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 28th day of November, 1918:

Samuel A. Wilson,
 Steve V. Edwards, and
 Max P. Schaffer.

Lieut. (junior grade) Karl Hart to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of December, 1918.

Lieut. (junior grade) Julius Holbin to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 27th day of December, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Casper H. Husted,
Allen J. Gahagan,
George F. Fredenburg,
John A. Lemanski,
Arthur A. Travis,
William C. Procknow,
Frank S. Miller,
Harry F. Quandt,
Harry M. Dickerson,
Frederick A. Mack,
William Pollock,
Frank Schlapp,
Bruce M. Parmenter,
Benjamin F. Schmidt,
Robert E. Simon,
Bea L. Jarvis,
Felix M. Kelley,
Fred J. Pope,
Arthur Bolleau,
Frederick Seefeldt,
Frank W. Dunning,
Louis H. Rassler, and
Ferdinand H. Ehlbeck.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Glenn O. Twiss to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 5th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin Brown to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 6th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William P. Bachman to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 8th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hal W. Barnes to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 9th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Conrad F. Holzermer to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 11th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Pearles to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 13th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Tattersall to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 16th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter M. Blumenkranz to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 17th day of January, 1919.

Ensign Ray C. Hopkins to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Ensign Arthur F. Armstrong to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

John W. Bishop, jr.,
John A. Cleverly,
Carl King,
Francis Earle,
John H. Jones,
Roy L. Maryatt,
Ira D. Bertolet, jr.,
Frederick R. Rogers,
Edward S. Esty,
Egmont G. Hildner,
Edgar C. Earle,
Stephen S. Whitby,
Harold P. Manly,
John W. Savage,
Rodney N. Landreth,
Thacher Jenny,
Robert F. Massoneau,
Percy E. Ricketts,
Frederick H. Hunter,
Ralph McK. Hamner,
Rodney W. Henry,
Paul G. Neal,
Warren C. Dubois,
Raymond D. Thiery,

James B. Griffin,
Donald C. Burnham,
Hal C. Harding,
Edward K. Crothers,
Frank O. Wilhelm,
Robert M. MacDonald,
Donald S. Good,
Lewis J. D. Truhan,
Samuel W. Roberts,
Leo M. Blancke,
Gilder S. Horne,
Francis L. Hamill,
Harold B. Leland, and
Paul F. Dudley.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Clarence R. Reed,
Bernard F. Toner,
Robert H. Cline,
Maxmillian B. Deleshe,
Norris L. Wilcomb,
William R. Dolan,
John Bjorling,
Gunder Z. Johnston, and
Cornelius Murphy.

Boatswain Charles Lucas, of the United States Coast Guard, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

William B. Baggaley,
Edward Dethloff,
Otis K. Ketchum,
John T. Ferris,
George R. Groh,
James R. Harrison,
Milo W. Pevonak,
Walter J. Williams, and
Charles H. Silvia.

Ensign William K. Wilbur, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of January, 1919:

Frederick E. Peterson and
Walter E. Ross.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of January, 1919:

Jacob E. De Garmo and
John W. Dillinder.

Ensign Harry W. Abrams, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of January, 1919.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1919:

Lester K. Daniels,
Martin Nyburg,
Arthur K. Pounds,
John W. Alcorn,
Dennis B. Boykin,
Robert H. Kerr,
William F. Skyles, and
William T. McMahon.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1919:

Louis F. Calabres,
Walter H. Springer,
Harry T. Gower,
Francis M. Sutton, and
James D. Dice.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1919:

Herbert E. Clarke,
Corneal N. Van Der Heuel,
Ove P. O. Hansen,
Charles R. Brown, and
Edgar C. Suratt.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1919:

David L. Jones,
James A. Dover, and
Harvey N. Corwell.

Medical Inspector John M. Brister to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 22d day of January, 1919.

Surg. Harry A. Garrison to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 22d day of January, 1919.

The following-named pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918:

Arthur A. Lee,
Jonas F. Rupert, and
Edwin R. Gallagher.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of December, 1918:

Charles T. Flannery,
Carl L. Biery,
Lyle S. Gunn, and
Harry H. Hines.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Edwin H. Bradley,
Evans A. Powell,
William H. Phillips,
Percy Briggs,
Louis L. Lindenmayer,
John L. H. Clarholm,
Robert W. Durden,
Edgar H. Shaffer,
George H. Crofut,
William D. Burroughs,
Mathew T. Betton,
Theodore W. S. Runyon,
John B. Cattermole,
Robert O. Caples,
Lamar Lee,
William C. Corning,
Andrew O. Shiver,
Claude R. Clerk,
Sebastian A. Biehn, and
John Ball.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Peter B. Wood, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of January, 1919:

Jesse H. Porth,
Cecil B. Bosley,
Joseph G. Hagstrom,
Andrew L. Frelinger, and
Carl W. Seitz.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1919:

Edward W. Hawkes,
Earl F. Coddling,
Archie J. McDaniel,
Charles D. Kirk, and
Charles S. Bailey.

Ensign William A. White, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1919.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1919:

Joseph P. Burke and
Clark H. Wiley.

The following-named naval constructors with the rank of commander to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 21st day of December, 1918:

John E. Bailey,
John A. Spillman,
Henry M. Gleason, and
Sidney M. Henry.

The following-named naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant commander to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 21st day of December, 1918:

Robert B. Hilliard,
Lee S. Border,

James O. Gawne,
Allan J. Chantry, jr.,
Harry G. Knox,
Philip G. Lauman,
Alva B. Court,
Whitford Drake,
Lew M. Atkins, and
Arthur W. Frank.

Naval Constructor Ralph T. Hanson to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919.

The following-named carpenters to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918:

Whitney Collins and
John K. Bacon.

The following-named carpenters to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 14th day of December, 1918:

Sterling C. Girardez,
William Tavenner,
Robert F. Roberson,
Hamilton P. K. Lyons,
William Neidert,
Dorus Nyburg,
Ellis B. Berkstreser,
Frank D. Allen,
Ernest F. Kiefer,
John F. Colvin, and
Otto Meobius.

Boatswain Lloyd R. Moore to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1919.

The following-named pharmacists to be chief pharmacists in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1919:

William S. Burr and
Frederick L. Cogswell.

Chief Boatswain Carston Nygaard, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade), retired, to be lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Michael A. Rossiter and
Thomas G. McDonough.

Chief Machinist John T. Riley, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy, for temporary service, from the 26th day of November, 1918.

Charles E. Chamberlain, chief machinist's mate, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918.

Acting Pay Clerk Arthur M. Bryan to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918.

Acting Pay Clerk Roy L. Davis to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of September, 1918.

Carpenter George D. Barringer to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918.

Capt. Harold P. Norton, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1918.

Capt. John D. McDonald to be a rear admiral in the Navy, from the 31st day of December, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Herbert C. Cocke to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Chester H. J. Keppler to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, from the 15th day of August, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Francis L. Shea to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 7th day of March, 1918.

Acting Chaplain Herbert Dumstrey to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 31st day of January, 1919.

Naval Constructor John D. Beuret to be a naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 21st day of December, 1918.

Naval Constructor Clayton M. Simmers to be a naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 21st day of December, 1918.

The following-named captains, additional numbers in grade, to be rear admirals in the Navy, from the 20th day of March, 1918:

Thomas W. Kinkaid and
William S. Smith.

Capt. Clarence S. Williams to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 16th day of December, 1918.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Bion B. Bierer and
Raymond DeL. Hasbrouck.

Lieut. Commander Adolphus Andrews to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Roger Williams to be a commander in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918.

Lieut. William L. Beck to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Felix X. Gyax to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 26th day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Guy E. Davis,
Lemuel M. Stevens, and
Roy LeC. Stover.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Harry W. Hosford,
Aylmer L. Morgan, jr.,
Edward W. Hanson,
Harold R. Keller, and
Harold T. Bartlett.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Charles H. McMorris,
Ernest W. Broadbent,
Edgar M. Williams,
Hamilton Harlow,
Fred K. Elder,
Ellis M. Zacharias,
William S. Hogg, jr., and
Grady B. Whitehead.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Aaron S. Merrill and
Robert E. P. Elmer.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Glenn B. Strickland to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of September, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Howes Bodfish,
Julius C. Delpino,
Myron W. Hutchinson, jr.,
Scott Umsted,
George C. Kriner, and
William S. Hactor.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918:

Albert Osenger, and
Eugene G. Herzinger.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Ralph W. McDowell,
Lucius W. Johnson,
Harry W. B. Turner,
William M. Kerr, and
John B. Pollard.

The following-named officers to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 10th day of December, 1918:

Henry B. Conrad,
Henry S. Whisman,
DeWayne G. Richey,
James H. Wallace,
Charles L. Trickey,
Leo B. Norris,
Lester C. Todd,
Gustave B. Dudley, jr.,
Max Shaweker,
Charles C. Hoffman,
Isador H. Tumpowsky,
Harold C. Beau,
Wendell P. Blake,
Sterling N. Pierce,
Frederick H. Rapoport.

Hugh R. Phinney,
Albert G. Wenzell,
Carl G. Swendsen,
Oliver W. Miner,
Charles Koenigsberger,
Paul W. Best,
Edward J. Cummings,
Carl J. Bucher,
Kenneth S. Caldwell,
John R. Marshall,
Sylvia L. Johnson,
Edwin Peterson,
Furman Angel,
John J. Keegan,
Harry J. Prall,
Clifford G. Hines,
Arthur S. Judy,
Howard H. Montgomery,
Berton V. D. Scott,
Jesse J. Cancelmo,
Carl H. Fornell,
Pierce J. Dunphy,
William S. McEllroy,
James B. Moloney,
Claiborne T. Smith,
James C. Dickson,
Delbert H. Nickson,
William F. Krone,
Warren C. Ives,
Arthur Van Dusen,
Eugene P. Pendergrass,
Fred W. Granger,
Edgar F. McCall,
Earl H. Mitchell,
John B. Farrior,
John I. B. Vall,
Earl S. Pomeroy,
James F. Runner,
Oscar Davis,
Cecil C. Davis,
Joseph P. Mulhern,
Francis P. Gardner,
Charles H. Carroll,
Arthur C. Dean,
Henry K. Seelaus,
Donald D. Prentice,
John A. Sharkey,
Adrian H. Grigg,
Arvid W. Erickson,
Hjalmar W. Sybilrud,
Hugh McC. Miller,
Robert B. Smalley,
Ammi L. Johnson,
John E. Linden,
Arthur W. Phillips,
Harrison H. Leffler,
Clifton F. West,
William A. Frascolla,
Clark D. Stull,
Hillard L. Weer,
Horace S. Cragin,
Randall F. White,
Edward G. Archibald,
Daniel C. Reyner,
Joseph W. Ratliffe,
Frank J. Clancy,
Blaine R. Goldsberry,
Herbert L. Strong,
John M. Whalen,
Warren Le R. Fleck,
Charles B. Bleasby,
Clifford E. McElwain,
Charles W. Rose,
James C. Walker,
Joseph M. Murphy,
Edward Lewis,
George E. Fortmiller,
Gates Collier,
Israel S. Otis,
William P. Mull,
Walter C. Harris,
Joseph A. Doyle,
John B. Craig,
Harvey L. Basinger,
Martin M. Gould,

Harold P. Cole,
John J. Darby,
Karl McC. Scott,
Cary D. Allen,
Joseph A. Melody,
Leopold J. DeBacker,
Gerald A. Sullivan,
Richard P. Landis,
William D. Small,
Henry J. Murray,
Francis W. Carl,
Haliburton McCoy,
Ross A. Kelly,
Roger A. Nolan,
Eugene W. Torrey,
William W. Davies, jr.,
James E. Bellinger,
Leo L. Davis,
Willis O. Barney,
Thomas J. Sullivan,
Berman Dunham,
August Saska,
Herbert T. Hayes,
Joseph D. Peluso,
Lamar S. Vorhees,
Charles E. Irwin,
Edward D. Leete,
Norman J. Haverly,
Arthur J. Langan,
William E. Stone,
Sherman B. Forbes,
Frank S. Hundley,
Norman Roberts,
Eugene P. Steinmetz,
Claude V. Timberlake,
Walter N. Rowley,
George T. Dill,
James J. Regan,
Lawrence R. Hazzard, and
Edward L. McDermott.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of February, 1916:

Ernest W. Lacy,
Harry D. Johnson,
Harry W. Blaisdell, and
Paul G. White.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Hugh T. Meyers to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 5th day of June, 1917:

Logan A. Willard,
George H. Reed,
John R. Barber,
John V. McAlpin, and
Marson W. Mangold.

Assistant Dental Surgeon Thomas L. Sampsell to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 30th day of July, 1918.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 21st day of April, 1915:

Alexander G. Lyle and
Alexander J. Zuehlke.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 17th day of January, 1917:

George M. Frazier,
Frederick C. Vossbeck, and
Frank S. Tichy.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 20th day of February, 1917:

Rufus A. Ferguson and
Alfred W. Chandler.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 8th day of May, 1917:

Albert Knox,
Everett K. Patton,
Irvin G. Kohlmeier, and
Richard C. Green.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 3d day of July, 1917:

James C. Lough,
George C. Fowler,
Deane L. Chamberlain,
William R. Taylor,
John E. Herlihy,
Charles C. Bockey,
Errol W. Willett, and
Robert Van Patton.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 5th day of July, 1917:

DeWitt C. Emerson and
Lou C. Montgomery.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 30th day of July, 1917:

Robert S. Maxwell,
Robert S. Davis,
James I. Root,
Harold A. Daniels,
Joseph A. Tartre,
Kemper K. Weaver,
Charles C. Tinsley,
Hubert F. Delmore, and
Paul W. Yeisley.

The following-named dental surgeons to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 16th day of October, 1917:

William T. Davidson,
Lawrence E. McGourty,
Herbert A. Sturtevant, and
Hubert J. Lehman.

Dental Surg. Armin T. Fellows to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 9th day of February, 1918.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 26th day of December, 1918:

Francis D. Van Valin,
Edward A. Ryland,
Ignatius G. Brennan,
Paul R. Smith,
Harry M. Seldin,
Elmer A. Jasper,
Arma E. Rush,
Lawrence V. Feike,
Leo G. Pollock,
Raymond C. Sheridan,
Clemens V. Rault,
John J. Hass,
Howard C. Wicham,
Harry C. Striffler,
Charles R. Wells,
Rex W. Faulkner, and
Herbert F. Buchanan.

The following-named dental surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 26th day of December, 1918:

Walter Rehrauer,
Lloyd C. Austin,
Robert M. Askin,
William S. Thompson,
Cornelius L. Norris,
William F. Hawthorn,
Harry L. Kalen,
Phillip H. MacInnis, and
Joseph P. Copp.

The following-named chaplains, with the rank of commander, to be chaplains in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Arthur W. Stone,
Evan W. Scott, and
Sydney K. Evans.

The following-named naval constructors, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 21st day of December, 1918:

Henry M. Gleason and
Sidney M. Henry.

Boatswain Frank Schultz to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 19th day of February, 1918.

Gunner William A. Vick, to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 13th day of January, 1919.

Machinist Frederick R. Kalde to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1918.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 28th day of December, 1918:

Charles Antrobus,
John W. Boldt,
August Logan, and
Claude S. Padgett.

Machinist Charles E. Briggs to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 2d day of January, 1919.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1918:

Frederick B. Britt,
Frank Welch,
James S. Jones,
William H. Hewitt,
Charles N. Liguod,
William F. Twitchell,
John H. Jack, jr.,
Clarence W. Chaddock, and
James A. Cook.

Pay Clerk Benjamin Berkowitz to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 10th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Palmer J. McCloskey to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Orly Tagliand to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 21st day of August, 1918.

Pay Clerk Albert S. Freedman to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 27th day of September, 1918.

Pay Clerk Harry E. Stengele to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 23d day of October, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Carl C. Clark, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jefferson B. Goldman, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 14th day of January, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stanley P. Tracht, retired, to be a lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy from the 30th day of January, 1919.

Passed Asst. Surg. Burt F. Jenness, retired, to be a surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1918.

The following-named pay clerks on the retired list to be chief pay clerks on the retired list of the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Frederick H. Ramsay,
Charles W. Loomis,
Isaac T. Van Patten,
William R. Pattison,
George A. White,
George B. Kimberly,
Theodore G. Hansche,
Thomas S. Veitch,
Frederick K. Hunt,
Roland W. Bell,
Floyd C. Miller,
John W. Caum, and
Phillip T. Lansdale.

Pay Clerk Ray E. Ames, retired, to be a chief pay clerk on the retired list of the Navy from the 17th day of August, 1918.

Commander Philip Williams to be a captain in the Navy from the 20th day of March, 1918.

Commander Joel R. P. Pringle to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Commander William R. White to be a commander in the Navy from the 18th day of January, 1918.

Lieut. Commander Thomas R. Kurtz to be a commander in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Manley H. Simons and
Ivan E. Bass.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

William B. Howe,
Albert C. Read, and
David A. Scott.

Lieut. Miles A. Libbey to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 2d day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Raymond A. Spruance to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 23d day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Joseph S. Evans and
Charles R. Clark.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Herbert W. Underwood and
Roy W. Lewis.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Henry M. Kieffer,
John H. Culin,
Louis P. Wenzell,
Donald F. Patterson,
Louis E. Denfeld,
William A. Corley,
Oliver W. Bagby,
Emory P. Eldredge,
Herbert G. Gates, jr., and
Campbell D. Edgar.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

John K. Richards,
Paul S. Theiss, and
Garnet Hulings.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Louis R. Ford to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Hugh G. Eldredge,
George W. Grove,
Frank C. Huntoon,
Nathaniel M. Pigman,
Robert M. Farrar,
Walter J. Confer,
Noble Withers, and
Claude C. Vickrey.

Surg. Harry F. Hull to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Roy Cuthbertson and
Donald H. Noble.

Paymaster Ray Spear to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 11th day of January, 1918.

Naval Constructor Richard M. Watt to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 21st day of December, 1918.

The following-named naval constructors with the rank of lieutenant commander to be naval constructors with the rank of commander in the Navy from the 21st day of December, 1918:

John A. Spilman and
Julius A. Furer.

Civil Engineer Carl A. Carlson to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of commander from the 1st day of February, 1918.

Pharmacist James A. Winterbottom to be a chief pharmacist in the Navy from the 9th day of October, 1918.

Pay Clerk George E. Lord to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 9th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Alphonso H. Cobb, retired, to be a lieutenant commander on the retired list of the Navy from the 28th day of October, 1918.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Raymond R. Wright,
Pedro A. del Valle,
Owen E. O'Neill,
Walter H. Sitz,
William G. Hawthorne,
Oscar R. Cauldwell,
Arnold W. Jacobsen,
Earl H. Jenkins,
Charles A. Wynn,
Thad T. Taylor,
Glenn D. Miller,
Phillip T. Chase,
Herbert Rosenzweig,
Thomas E. Watson,
Burwell H. Clarke,
Walter G. Sheard,

Paul Brown,
Robert S. Hunter,
Roger W. Peard,
Charles A. Howell,
John D. Nevin,
Peter C. Geyer, jr.,
James E. Davis,
Lloyd L. Leech,
Charles P. Gilchrist,
Gustav Karow,
Joseph E. Brewster,
Raphael Griffin,
Karl I. Buse,
Harold S. Fasset,
Samuel A. Woods, jr.,
William C. Byrd,
George C. Hamner,
Arthur B. Jacques,
David H. Owen,
James M. Bain,
George B. Reynolds,
James T. Moore,
Horace C. Cooper,
Benjamin T. Cripps,
Louis W. Whaley,
John M. Arthur,
James F. Jeffords,
Jacob M. Pearce, jr.,
Gordon Watt,
Thomas P. Cheatham,
Thomas E. Bourke,
William C. James,
Daniel E. Campbell,
Maurice G. Holmes,
Charles C. Gill,
James E. Betts,
Norman S. Hinman,
George Faunce Adams,
Wethered Woodworth,
James W. Webb,
John M. Tildsley,
Le Roy P. Hunt,
Louis E. Woods,
Edward R. Rhodes,
Donald R. Fox,
William McN. Marshall,
George H. Scott,
Alexander Galt,
Paul R. Cowley,
Bailey M. Coffenberg, and
Eugene F. C. Collier.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Lee H. Brown,
Carl J. Jessup,
Vernon R. Buxton,
Donald B. Creecy,
George R. Jackson,
Clinton I. Smallman,
Robert E. Mills,
Stewart W. Chaffee,
William F. Brown, jr.,
Roswell G. Ham,
Antonio Moschella,
Earle F. Swett,
George L. Cherry,
Paul S. Hanway,
William W. Nottingham,
Charles J. Churchman,
Allan C. Perkinson,
Everett R. Brewer,
Blythe G. Jones,
Robert D. Evans,
Melvin H. Hass, and
Henry Gund, jr.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of July, 1918:

Philander B. Briscoe,
Herman R. Anderson,
Clarence M. Ruffner,
Philip B. Blake,
Horace L. Hirschler,
Kenneth K. Boynton,

Frederick L. Kolb,
George R. Cox,
Paul E. Cheney,
Samuel J. Melick,
Darrell J. Bogardus,
Walter M. Brewer,
Garrison P. Anthes,
Chester L. Fordney,
William J. J. Elger,
King H. Young,
Hu H. Phipps,
Harold P. Nachtrieb,
Roy E. Bledsoe,
Thomas A. Langford,
Lucius Q. C. L. Lyle,
Alexander P. Brown,
Walter E. Lawson,
Neil F. Dougherty,
Evans Spalding,
Carman B. Smith,
Donald U. Bathrick,
Norman E. Burbidge,
Leland I. Tolman,
Ulva L. Ettinger,
Gerald J. Pyle,
Frederick C. Lusk,
Matson C. Terry,
Willis F. Ostrander,
Frank J. Haight,
Roy A. Stoner,
Thomas G. MacCarthy,
James H. Williamson,
George G. Munce,
Carroll F. Byrd,
Frederick S. Manter,
Ralph W. Marshall,
Samuel F. Hollins,
Raymond J. Kirwan,
Clifton B. Cates,
George T. Hall,
Hans H. Harders,
Darius T. Wool,
William W. Ashurst,
Frank C. Young,
Willard P. Leutze,
George C. Dickey,
Allan MacRossie, jr.,
John W. McIver,
Walter B. Allen,
James R. Stockton,
Phillip G. Stiles,
Richard F. Boyd,
Edward J. Winters,
Hal N. Potter,
Ralph McN. Wilcox,
Clement A. Berghoff,
Bernard W. Bierman,
Walter S. Hallenberg,
Max D. Gilfillan,
Charles A. Etheridge,
Carlton Hill,
Cecil L. Eaton,
Herman A. Zischke,
William O. Lowe,
Samuel N. Lawrence,
Wallace A. Bell,
Kenneth D. Ransom,
George W. Renwick,
Willis Brodhead,
James B. Riley,
Harry W. LeGore,
Morgan R. Mills, jr.,
Harold Moore,
James M. Garvey,
Donald T. Winder,
Victor A. Barraco,
Thomas O. Tate,
James G. Somerville,
Jack H. Tandy,
Augustine Healy,
Eric A. Johnston,
Fred W. Maack,
Kenneth O. Cuttle,
William P. T. Hill,
Robert A. Bowen, jr.,

Henry T. Dunn,
 William E. Embry,
 Philbrick W. Jackson,
 John D. Bowling, jr.,
 Walter S. Weeks,
 William W. Carson,
 Carl G. James,
 Norman R. Jensen,
 Albert V. Williams,
 Holcom's York,
 George A. Percy,
 William B. Moore,
 Harold B. Hoskins,
 Benjamin T. Reidy,
 Paul S. Taylor,
 Marshall P. Madison,
 Lucian H. Vandoren,
 Stanley W. Burke,
 Carroll J. Single,
 John L. Gregson, jr.,
 Thornton Wilson,
 Daniel W. Bender,
 Clyde N. Bates,
 Richard V. Hood,
 Frederick M. Bock, jr.,
 Samuel W. Meck, jr.,
 George H. Whisenhunt, jr.,
 Carl D. Brerein,
 Vincent J. Fitzgerald,
 Anthony W. Durell, jr.,
 William R. Brown,
 Moore M. Peregrine,
 Dunlevy C. Downs,
 James M. Wallace,
 John G. Vowell,
 Lewis R. Stickle,
 William A. Eddy,
 Lucius L. Moore,
 Oliver T. Francis,
 Carlos H. McCullough,
 Cornelius H. Reece,
 John A. West,
 Lemuel A. Haslup,
 James P. Adams,
 Edward A. Fellowes,
 William A. Morrison,
 Haskin U. Deeley,
 Frederick B. Davy,
 Sparling B. Anderson,
 Henry W. Paret, jr.,
 Louis F. Timmerman, jr.,
 Gordon M. F. Chance,
 George K. Campbell,
 Maco Stewart, jr.,
 Harry H. Barber,
 Henry R. Heebner,
 Fred C. Eastin, jr.,
 Robert C. Kilmartin, jr.,
 Edward A. Craig,
 James E. Hunter, jr.,
 William O. Rogers, 3d,
 Julian P. Brown,
 William E. Riley,
 John R. Hardin, jr.,
 Albert G. Skelton,
 Walter S. Fant, jr.,
 Andrew L. W. Gordon,
 Percival L. Wilson,
 Victor Romaine,
 Bernard Dubel,
 George C. Medary,
 Charles C. Simmons, jr.,
 Maurice P. King,
 Thomas G. Letchworth,
 Edwin C. McDonald,
 Earle M. Randall,
 Leland S. Swindler,
 John P. Manton,
 Ernest H. Lowenthal,
 Ray A. Robinson,
 Howard N. Stent,
 Gillis A. Johnson,
 Kenneth B. Collings,
 Basil Gordon,
 Donald Spicer,

Ford O. Rogers,
 Creswell M. Micou,
 Walter G. Farrell,
 Raymond T. Presnell,
 Lloyd A. Houchin,
 Roy M. Simpson,
 William L. Harding, jr.,
 John B. Neill, jr.,
 David Duncan,
 Lyle C. De Veaux,
 Charles G. Thoma,
 Henley M. Goode,
 Ralph R. Robinson,
 Floyd W. Bennett,
 Norman E. Truc,
 Thurston J. Davies,
 Walter E. Billisoly,
 John K. Martenstein,
 Francis J. Kelly, jr.,
 Daniel B. Brewster,
 Douglass P. Wingo,
 Conrad S. Grove, 3d.,
 Dale S. Young,
 Charles M. Portis,
 St. Julien R. Childs,
 Hamilton M. H. Fleming,
 Walter I. Greth,
 Frederick E. Stack,
 George C. Collar,
 John F. Roy,
 Edward S. Shaw,
 Stanford H. Moses,
 Edward L. Pollock, jr.,
 William J. Parrish, jr.,
 Gardiner Hawkins,
 Leland D. Breckinridge,
 Merritt A. Edson,
 Laurence T. Stallings, jr.,
 Edgar A. Poe, jr.,
 Edward O. Bogert,
 Randolph A. Christie,
 George Wale, jr.,
 John A. Tebbs,
 John C. Wemple,
 Curtis W. Le Gette,
 Cleghorn Foote,
 Thomas B. McMartin, and
 Thomas H. Raymond.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of August, 1918:

Donovan Wilmot,
 Arthur F. Chmelik,
 John C. McLean,
 Colin J. Macdonald,
 William R. Langford, jr.,
 Harry B. Liversedge,
 Merton J. Batchelder,
 Joseph H. Mueller, jr.,
 George E. Monson,
 Howard A. Rogers,
 Arthur J. Bancroft,
 Jacob Lienhard,
 Thomas E. Boliver,
 Harry R. Swanson,
 Charles F. Hansel,
 Patrick J. Grealy,
 Frank P. Graham,
 Arthur C. Prine,
 Harry S. Radcliffe,
 James G. Brennan,
 Arthur D. Challacombe,
 Stewart P. Corning,
 Harold P. Williamson,
 Otey H. Pettigrew,
 James P. Scherwin,
 Daniel L. Clifford,
 Joseph F. Szeszycki,
 David S. Craig,
 Bernard L. Fritz,
 Guy Lewis,
 James J. Keating,
 Norman T. Alexander,
 William J. Mosher,
 Maxwell F. Musser,

Bradford A. Parrish,
Lawrence R. Patterson,
Vernon Bourdette,
Joseph F. Burke,
Edward W. Mahan,
Charles V. Iredell,
Robert I. Avery,
John F. Connaughton,
John W. McNamara,
Frank B. Bready, jr.,
Samuel T. Jackson,
Charles W. Creaser,
William B. Pressey,
Homer H. McIntyre,
Guy L. Pyle,
Michael J. Kelley,
Martin L. McManus,
Alfred H. Branham,
Marvin Scott,
James W. Flett,
Earl J. Witt,
John J. Bogardus,
William P. Henchel,
Oliver D. Brown,
Harry W. Bacon,
George R. Lewis,
Irving F. Bigelow,
Barton I. Jenson,
Earl L. Ryan,
John L. Hunt,
Lester E. Power,
Edmund D. Nelson,
William G. Hall,
Delos D. McKenzie,
James C. Faw,
James P. J. McKeivitt,
Clinton W. McLeod,
Charles A. Ingram,
Ruel G. O'Neel,
Clinton S. King,
Edward Earle,
Edward T. Bayman,
Paul A. Lesser,
Ross M. Hutchinson,
Nathan S. Noble,
John T. Thornton,
Sidney M. Michael,
Charles W. Ebnother,
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan,
Arnold C. Larsen,
Rees Skinner,
John R. Jacob,
Joseph N. Shaw,
William J. Wallace,
Harold E. Kelsey,
Fletcher H. Lansing,
Ralph C. Judd,
Byron M. Bickford,
Edward Selby,
William F. Brown,
Chauncey H. Applegate,
Carey J. Scott,
Joseph W. Rafter,
Edward F. O'Day,
John H. Andrews,
William D. Bassett,
James B. Johnson,
James McClelland,
Ivan E. Bigler,
Ralph R. Rieker,
Earl S. Eastham,
Tom E. Wicks,
Hansel D. Wilson,
Ralph K. Lawson,
William W. Eustis,
John A. Gustafson,
Olin L. Beall,
Charles E. Richardson,
Jacob J. Kesel,
Francis A. Porter,
William B. Prior,
William F. May,
James Carbary,
Charles F. Morrison,
Harvey D. Weaver,

Stanley E. Wilson,
Murl Corbett,
Harold S. Jones,
Edward P. Simmonds,
Richard F. Mott,
Sidney Hodges,
Miner P. Gross,
Harvey B. Alban,
Ray Rindfleisch,
Sherman H. Bowles,
Jackson C. Palmer,
Byron J. Walters,
William P. Grow,
Paul R. Schoenlaub,
Harry P. Crouch,
Eugene West,
Frank D. Gibson,
Bernard W. Coldewey,
Alan M. Cohen,
Amor L. Sims,
Allen R. Sherman,
James D. Waller,
Robert C. Pitts,
Francis M. Smith,
Aubrey L. Johnson,
Eugene G. Henry,
Joseph B. Carhart,
Hubert C. White,
Leo Healey,
Irving A. Jennings,
George L. Brown,
James B. Darby,
Laurens H. Reyburn,
Raymond D. Andrews,
Howard L. Vose,
Clifford Prichard,
Harry N. Salet,
Emmet Trainor,
Loren P. Kesler,
Cyril W. Martyr,
Leslie Brown,
Earl T. Martineau,
Eugene D. Bradbury,
Oscar E. Kelly,
George M. Hunter,
Kenneth W. Harding,
Robert T. Carrithers,
Oscar B. Kaufman,
Frederick L. Spear,
Roy S. Moore,
Samuel B. Ryau,
Moses J. Gould,
Peter Morgan,
Dale R. South,
Edmund C. Norton,
Newell S. Gordy,
Henry L. Nabbefeld,
Harry C. Swanstrom,
Robert E. Hutchinson,
Clay R. Apple,
Maurice F. Mackey,
James G. White,
William J. Jones,
William A. Zook,
Arthur O. Bodine,
Don D. Newton,
John D. Wagstaff,
George Bower,
Kenneth S. Ferguson,
Ernest L. Wright,
Herbert F. Adey,
Charles W. Brooks,
Jack B. Loraine,
William M. Thomas,
Donald E. Paul,
Ben L. Taylor,
James C. Norton,
Robert C. Patchell,
Charles A. Craig,
William F. Dummer,
George M. Wolcott,
Chauncey L. Mullen,
Oscar D. McDaniel,
Lloyd E. Battles,
Robert B. Moore,

Harvey J. Rice,
 Corlies Adams,
 Jay Van Housen,
 William S. Ive,
 Josiah B. Bristol,
 Merwin C. Morrison,
 Oscar D. Keown,
 Basil H. Pollitt,
 Henry P. Cottingham,
 Gerald A. Craig,
 Dan McFarland,
 Jo G. Martin,
 Arthur C. Cooper,
 Laurence D. Berlin,
 Lynn E. Perry,
 Homer J. Gravelle,
 John Groff,
 James W. O'Neil,
 Carlton A. Fisher,
 Ray F. Wetter,
 Henry P. Glendinning,
 Frank W. Heinrichs,
 Irwin T. Brown,
 Michael J. Barry,
 Willis H. Prather,
 Nathaniel W. Emery,
 Samuel F. Vance,
 Prentice S. Geer,
 Frank A. Messmer, jr.,
 Leonard Kinsell,
 Wendell S. McRae,
 Irving G. Beckwith,
 John F. Eskay,
 John McP. Gault,
 Clifton G. McMeen,
 William R. Bockus,
 George Tholin,
 Hilliard C. Wellborn,
 Gomer W. Morgan,
 George W. Walker,
 Clarence E. Briggs,
 Page V. Hart,
 John W. Housewright,
 Richard R. Day,
 Ross G. Van Gundy,
 Gerald R. Patten,
 Frank S. Gilman,
 Marshall E. Simmons,
 John A. Zimmerman,
 William E. Bowe,
 Arthur L. Whiteside,
 George Draine,
 Maurice B. Wiedemer,
 George S. Atkinson,
 James B. Gracy,
 Paul F. Moran,
 George C. Flanders,
 George R. Rowan,
 William R. McKee,
 Michael J. Finn,
 Joseph F. Simmons,
 Leonard E. Rea,
 August L. Huhn, jr.,
 Sydney M. Moore,
 Joseph E. Watson,
 Harry G. Lane,
 Melville L. Moore,
 James F. Wilmeth,
 Gail D. McDowell,
 James E. Stanners,
 Theodore H. Cartwright,
 Edward C. Apperson,
 George M. Goodman,
 Clell G. Johnson,
 Barney M. Shively,
 Henry D. Shields,
 Lucas I. Bruns,
 Elijah H. Ikard,
 James H. Eason,
 Charles L. Turner,
 Richard H. Schubert,
 Louis F. Peifer,
 Walter S. Farley,
 Aubrey O. Loughmiller,
 Herbert V. Hansen,

Grover C. Moore,
 Kenneth R. Berkey,
 Egbert J. Wood,
 Ogbourne A. Hill,
 Joseph F. Verhelle,
 Gerald K. Hemsing,
 Melvin E. Fuller,
 Howard Mayes,
 Robert B. Jeffrey,
 Vincent M. O'Donnell,
 George E. Gardner,
 Walter Roll,
 Paul Jahn,
 Holton Y. Ditto,
 Frank M. Keller,
 Robert L. Wadel,
 Frank P. Simons,
 Claude D. Taugher,
 Eldred I. Rawles,
 Leo W. Horejs,
 Richard V. H. Ridgely,
 William B. Kinkead,
 Philips T. Lehmer,
 John J. Emmons,
 William T. Howze,
 Bruce C. Lubers,
 Joseph A. Yeager,
 Francis I. Fenton,
 Joseph De Paiva,
 Thomas R. Wert,
 Sherman B. Kramer,
 Paul E. Bierly,
 Frank W. Rugg,
 Charles F. Dalton,
 Tom H. Hayden,
 Joseph L. Doll,
 John W. Cunningham,
 Samuel K. Eaves,
 Frank D. Upchurch,
 Alvan E. Stoddard,
 Charles M. Adams,
 George W. R. Davidson,
 Lindley H. Pryor,
 Earl F. Lucas,
 Joseph A. Jensen,
 Elmer W. Johnson,
 Axel G. Johnson,
 Charles H. Hassenmiller,
 Bertram S. Nickerson,
 Hugh A. McGann,
 Bert O. Herreid,
 Leslie R. Smith,
 Herbert B. Renninger,
 Alfred J. Wainman,
 William K. MacNulty,
 Carlton E. Edwards,
 Kenneth M. Stead,
 Edwin J. Davenport,
 Ralph W. Luce,
 George W. Houghton,
 Chester A. Zeller,
 Hamlet C. Sharp,
 Marshall Y. Chapman,
 Edward C. Fowler,
 Richard Cornelius,
 William English,
 George W. Hopke,
 Frederick Israel,
 Carl J. Nostrand,
 Cecil J. Widdifield,
 Frank Neider,
 Morris C. Richardson,
 George Belmont,
 George B. Batten,
 John T. Foster,
 Russell M. Frederick,
 Edward E. Lindgren,
 Bayard Vasey,
 Jesse L. Crandall,
 Edward F. Dunk,
 Harry L. Smith,
 Robert L. Young,
 Charles S. Thompson,
 Terrence J. Callan,
 Paul J. Ogden,

Maurice E. Barnett, jr.,
William W. Rogers,
George F. Stockes,
William J. Whaling, and
Curtis T. Beecher.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of January, 1919:

Alfred Dickerson,
Rowan C. Pearce,
Harry A. De Butts,
Francis Parkman,
Axel Enholm,
Edward F. Bailey,
Stanley E. Ridderhof,
Albert T. Kelly,
Willard R. Enk,
Charles E. Emery,
Crusselle D. Woodward,
Eben C. Mann, 2d,
Elton C. Hersman,
Albert E. Gagnon,
William A. Hunter,
Richard F. Cleveland,
Walter F. McKittrick,
Robert E. Quinn,
Ara J. Miller,
Edward S. Bates,
Odilo N. Kass,
George L. Chumbley,
Barton W. Murray, and
Wylie F. McKinnon, jr.

The following-named officers in the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Alfred Dickerson,
Rowan C. Pearce,
Harry A. De Butts,
Francis Parkman,
Axel Enholm,
Edward F. Bailey,
Stanley E. Ridderhof,
Albert T. Kelly,
Willard R. Enk,
Charles E. Emery,
Crusselle D. Woodward,
Eben C. Mann, 2d,
Elton C. Hersman,
Albert E. Gagnon,
William A. Hunter,
Richard F. Cleveland,
Walter F. McKittrick,
Robert E. Quinn,
Ara J. Miller,
Edward S. Bates,
Odilo N. Kass,
George L. Chumbley,
Barton W. Murray,
Wylie F. McKinnon, jr.,
Joseph Lubomski,
Edwin H. Poulnot, jr.,
Samuel B. Witt,
Richard A. Cullum,
Charlton P. Lee,
Blaine G. Wiley,
Clarence E. Lee,
Stanley S. Herman,
Edwin G. Schwartzman,
George P. Buell,
Bertram L. Smith,
Jullan N. Frisbie,
Walter H. Strand,
Ervin R. Whitman,
Harry E. Lelve,
Louis F. Weyand,
William Scruggs,
Willard L. Peach,
Benjamin W. Atkinson, jr.,
Ralph C. Battin,
Laurance B. Nourse,
Gilbert C. Henderson,
Max D. Smith,
Walter H. Burt,
Anthony Rinkevich,
Carl J. Allenbaugh,

Herbert H. Von Rohr,
Webster S. Rutledge,
Minter L. Lowther,
Scott Snodgrass,
Franklin H. Hayner,
Wilbur V. Styles,
Joseph Lacey,
Houston P. Sewell,
George E. Ladd, jr.,
Herman Kingsnorth,
John A. Self,
Philip R. Hockenberger,
Donald A. Trayser,
Charles S. Dandridge,
Edward J. Moneypenny,
George S. Van Riper,
Alexander D. Shaw,
William L. McKittrick,
Gerald C. Thomas,
James W. Lea,
George Esau,
Philip W. Mohr,
Adolphus Cannon,
Albert B. Wohlsen,
James B. Gambrell,
Albert L. Winner,
James T. Elliott,
Frank Saddler, jr.,
Howard B. Enyart,
Harold H. Jeter,
William A. Kelter,
Weir R. Goodwin,
Herbert S. Keimling,
Ramie H. Dean,
Karl F. Umlor,
Guy P. Shafer,
Raymond P. James,
Scott Tidyman,
Fred J. Zinner,
George W. Dodd, jr.,
Rueben E. Puphal,
Charles F. Harper,
Stephen Skoda,
Clark W. Thompson,
Frederick J. Pullen,
Harold A. Strong,
James E. Foster,
Clarence L. Seward, jr.,
William A. Siefert,
Roscoe M. Kaiser,
Wilbur T. Love,
William S. Fellers,
Henning F. Adickes,
Roy W. Conkey,
Lee B. Cox,
Samuel H. Wood,
Gerald R. White,
Merile H. Stevenson,
Augustus Paris,
Chester E. Orcutt,
Louis B. West,
Denzil R. Fowls,
Forest J. Ashwood,
George C. Buzby,
Augustus H. Fricke,
Francis C. Lathrop,
Edward M. Butler,
Andrew W. Herron, jr.,
William A. Dole, jr.,
Thomas J. Caldwell,
Louis E. McDonald,
George H. Towner, jr.,
Robert A. Cobban,
Stephen E. St. George,
Louis Cukela,
Harry M. Grayson,
James M. Burns, jr.,
John Gay,
Emmons J. Robb,
Robert E. Caldwell,
Allan S. Heaton,
Erwin F. Schaefer,
William C. Melcher, jr.,
Charles W. Breedlove,
Daniel D. Thompson,

Wilbur Summerlin,
 Charles F. Cummings,
 Walter W. Wensinger,
 Sidney F. High,
 Robert O. Williams,
 John T. Stanton,
 Virgil P. Schuler,
 Harry S. Davis,
 Peter P. Wood,
 Keating L. Simons,
 Lawrence E. Westerdahl,
 David N. Richeson,
 Merle J. Van Housen,
 James C. Lecch,
 Stanley G. Fickes,
 Richard S. Ross,
 Vinton H. Newell,
 Emmit R. Wolfe,
 Thomas F. Babcock,
 James K. Riley,
 Stephen A. Norwood,
 Thomas L. Shackford,
 Harold A. Robinson,
 Raymond A. O'Keefe,
 Frank M. Cross,
 George W. McHenry,
 Gale T. Cummings,
 Elisha B. Carter,
 Lawrence E. Teberg,
 Thomas H. Mitchell,
 Ward H. Olmstead,
 John H. Culnan,
 Charles W. Holmes,
 Samuel H. Woods,
 John T. Aikins,
 Wilbur Eickelberg,
 Robert A. Butcher,
 Edward E. Embree,
 John A. Turner,
 Allen J. Burris,
 Earl M. Rees,
 John E. Doran,
 Carl Gardner,
 Charles K. Safford,
 William J. Morrison,
 Orla Fightmaster,
 Henry G. Hyde,
 Wiley F. Shepherd,
 Oscar P. C. Wagenknight,
 Donald W. Stewart,
 John K. Strubing, jr.,
 Lewis J. Murphy,
 Gordon T. Campbell,
 Charles E. M. Norton,
 Franklin Petri,
 Charles N. Crary,
 Roy H. Burton,
 Oscar J. Jennings, jr.,
 Robert P. Wood,
 James F. Smith,
 Benjamin N. Trahan,
 Mirza L. Black,
 Rudolph F. Schmidt,
 Donald F. Webb,
 John T. Thorndike,
 Robert M. Nevins, jr.,
 James Cummins,
 Henry C. Murray,
 John C. Hammond,
 Cleveland H. Norton,
 William M. Murray,
 John L. McSweeney,
 Frank L. Dale,
 Ezra I. Shaw,
 Bert M. Dudley,
 Louis J. Giffels,
 Douglas L. McBride,
 Frederick C. Biebusch,
 Robert T. Devlin,
 Elver B. Lamkin,
 Tim J. Sanders,
 Joseph K. Giffen,
 Paul M. Potter,
 Sherman H. Dalrymple,
 Stanley B. Smith,

Edwin Gould,
 Otto B. Osmondson,
 Philip Ebling,
 William E. Cort, jr.,
 Lawrence V. Morrill, jr.,
 Hollis W. Huntington,
 Vern A. Coverdell,
 Dumas Malone,
 Daniel E. Holland,
 Richard G. Howard,
 Arthur S. King,
 Karl E. Bleser,
 Edgar W. Federer,
 Homer K. Rowley,
 Joseph F. Driscoll,
 Leslie H. Wellman,
 Harold Ogden,
 David E. Walker,
 John W. Winford,
 William E. Hedger,
 John J. Dougherty,
 Thomas I. Corddry,
 Harold J. Sayers,
 Sidney H. Graves,
 Harry B. Lovell,
 Charles W. Drew, jr.,
 Harry A. Worth,
 Terrell J. Crawford,
 Fred H. Thompson, jr.,
 George A. MacLiesh,
 Raymond H. Gordon,
 John O. Flautt, jr.,
 Chesley G. Stevens,
 John S. Gray,
 Barney Kane, jr.,
 Waldo W. Norris,
 Charles L. Wright,
 James Ackerman,
 Marshall B. Williams,
 Robert M. Mount,
 Clifford F. Laible,
 John A. Jordan,
 Michael Novak,
 Julia F. Anderson,
 Randolph D. Thomas,
 John C. Feland,
 Fred S. Matthews,
 Ralph E. Parker,
 Hail V. Cartmell,
 Dutton S. Peterson,
 George P. Shannon,
 Marck L. Tooker,
 Charles R. Bird,
 Elbert W. Ross,
 Fred J. Zeitz,
 Floyd S. Baker,
 Harold O. Crist,
 William B. Jackson,
 Walter L. Ross, jr.,
 Robert A. Grant,
 Joseph F. Whitney,
 Robert M. Balch, jr.,
 Jay D. Swartwout,
 Ralph D. Logan,
 Morris L. Shively,
 Simon J. Madden,
 Joseph N. Anderson,
 Guy B. Hall,
 Ernest M. Baker,
 Herbert H. Akers,
 Carl E. Johnson,
 Arthur A. Nelson,
 Robert E. Coghlan,
 Guy D. Atmore,
 John W. Scott,
 Harold W. Dice,
 James E. Frew,
 Claude Thompson,
 Thomas McK. Schuler,
 David A. Stafford,
 Charles W. Ockstadt,
 Wayne C. Gilbert,
 Andrew S. Hardin,
 Ralph R. Westfall,
 Raymond Buchanan,

James S. Withington,
 Daniel N. Mohler,
 Herbert C. Schettler,
 Kenneth E. Shepard,
 Donald R. Spawr,
 George M. Phillips,
 Russell Travis,
 Keith K. Ambrose,
 Holmes J. Smith,
 Howard B. Smith,
 Frank W. Hanlon,
 Charles H. McAvoy,
 Harry Davis,
 Luther D. Bell,
 Edward J. Goldenberger,
 David M. Hastings,
 Edwin L. Ballard,
 Roger Smith,
 William J. Stamper,
 Glenn W. Helms,
 Thomas Whitesel,
 John F. Meagher,
 Carl A. Janson,
 Julius C. Brandt, jr.,
 Charles S. Turpin,
 Benjamin D. Bleecker,
 Morton Stigers,
 Joseph E. Barnett,
 Jim W. Sutherland,
 Harold T. Snider,
 Thomas J. White,
 Henry M. Husted,
 John MacRitchie,
 Howard E. Clark,
 Charles F. Patterson,
 Ralph H. Woods,
 Frederick Dimig,
 Ralph D. Leach,
 Harry Huddleston,
 George S. Jones,
 Walter B. Casey,
 James G. Horan,
 John M. Patton, jr.,
 Howard E. Cholet,
 James H. Satterfield,
 Harry W. Pfisterer,
 William T. Burris,
 Walter G. Fitzpatrick,
 Johann A. Bolline,
 Charles E. Koff,
 Fred G. Dupuy,
 Lynott R. Jones,
 Eric W. Ojerholm,
 Robert E. Hughes,
 John M. Jamieson,
 Claude W. Geiser,
 Monitor Watchman, jr.,
 John W. E. Warner,
 Leland C. Dickie,
 George H. Waterman,
 Thomas Orgo,
 Homer G. Parker,
 John W. Fulton,
 William R. Davis,
 Anthony P. Rumpa,
 Ivan C. King,
 Gordon Hall,
 Rudolph Swan,
 John A. Stewart,
 Newell F. Guernsey,
 William E. McKeivitt,
 James J. Caffrey,
 John H. Purtee,
 Gustave P. Schenk,
 John B. Cassell,
 Samuel B. Kehoe,
 Wilbur A. Young,
 Robert R. Boswell,
 William J. Vierbuchen,
 Frank E. McFarland,
 Charles H. Van Meter,
 Walter S. Cole,
 Frank V. Artig,
 Edward A. Robbins,
 James C. Jackman,

Frank L. Johnson,
 Herbert C. Bluhm,
 George E. Krebbiel,
 Italph H. Manny,
 Frederick L. Ruth,
 Edgar G. Kirkpatrick,
 Paul Skarstad,
 Harry W. Frost,
 Edwin J. Farrell,
 Reuben Hurtt, jr.,
 John J. Kennedy,
 Henry D. Hynds,
 William B. Bower,
 Morel P. Lewis,
 Willard J. Hammel,
 Leo C. Madden,
 Cedric R. Worth,
 John L. Creighton,
 Bruce N. Pulver,
 Paul A. Bridge,
 John C. Fabbrini,
 Robert E. Barrett,
 Simond B. Kozuhowski,
 Gerald Feuille,
 Harold Hamstreet,
 Frank S. Matheny,
 Semon Wolf,
 Waldo W. Lyman,
 Cyrus M. Birney,
 Alfred O. Halvorson,
 Vernon Littlejohn,
 Hyatt M. Cribbs, jr.,
 Clarence W. Wheaton,
 Robert L. Thieme,
 John D. Brand,
 Herman K. Houlberg,
 Merle L. Dunbar,
 Adolph L. West,
 Francis R. Washington,
 Donald R. Jack,
 Arvid H. Anderson,
 Wallace J. Scott,
 Alexander C. Reed,
 Clarence M. Kline,
 Clarence H. Yost,
 Staniford Squire,
 William L. Bales,
 Bert L. Beaty,
 Stephen Brown,
 Oscar J. Closset,
 Warner F. Hamet,
 Walter G. Bagley,
 John T. Sheffield,
 James D. Baker,
 Albert C. Grunow,
 Elmer J. Keitz,
 Irving G. Hamilton,
 Roscoe K. Garver,
 George L. Hollett,
 Robert T. Ishmael,
 Joseph J. McFawn,
 David B. Buffum,
 Orville A. La Motte,
 Donald Hamilton,
 Clarence H. Gresham,
 Raymond J. Riefler,
 Chester L. Arnold,
 Fred S. Ebertz,
 John A. Nesbit,
 Fred C. Howard,
 Thomas McC. James,
 Thomas M. O'Sullivan,
 Robert W. Mason, jr.,
 Warren B. Hewitt,
 William J. Fitzpatrick,
 James B. Sizer, jr.,
 Robert R. Gibson,
 William A. Rae,
 Romel T. Dahl,
 Ernest R. Love,
 Charles R. Lucas,
 Bernard W. Pravitz,
 Clyde S. Erskine,
 Nick E. Gronland,
 Marvin V. Yandle,

Ralph C. Alburger,
 John B. Lambson,
 Joseph R. Caldwell,
 Phil J. Libby,
 Benjamin G. Plummer,
 Frederick A. Cullimore,
 Elmer L. Sutherland,
 Uriah D. Sandidge,
 Charles L. Smith,
 Walter J. Buhrman,
 Karl S. Weiner,
 Ira F. Gillikin,
 Charles W. Pohl,
 Stanley Hudgins,
 Thomas Jones,
 James B. Hardie,
 Samuel Culbertson,
 La Vergne E. Waite,
 Frank J. Tupa,
 Otto S. Jolliff,
 Waldo J. Mathias,
 Frank De L. McClelland,
 John J. McDonald,
 Rowland R. Street,
 Maurice R. Kerr,
 John A. Riley,
 Vincent M. Carter,
 Howard E. Pritchett,
 William J. Barham,
 Charles A. Bell,
 Charles E. Windram,
 Donald W. Brennen,
 Frank L. Hudson,
 Kenneth P. Corson,
 William R. Sheets,
 James P. Hyde,
 Floyd H. White,
 Ralph J. Wikan,
 Richard A. Thomas,
 Joel H. Nichols,
 James F. Windiate,
 Charles Paget,
 Elwood H. Gallien,
 Joel D. Mason,
 Ellsworth S. Van Der Veer,
 Vernon M. Guymon,
 Harold N. Miller,
 William A. Bayer,
 Gilbert C. Chandler,
 Austin W. Boden,
 James M. White,
 Albert K. Komdat,
 Edmund McC. Callaway,
 Herbert M. Goodwin,
 John G. Kapowich,
 Frederick J. Knob,
 Samuel G. Storberg,
 Charles W. Smith, jr.,
 Alfred R. Southard,
 William H. Winseman,
 Sterling P. Anderson,
 Theodore J. Cloonan,
 William Z. Weems,
 Handel V. Rivinius,
 Ivan L. Rice,
 Morris V. Coleman,
 William J. Brothers,
 Winfield F. Swallow,
 Wylie C. Banks,
 Fred W. Hill,
 Jeremiah Kinsella,
 Howard E. Hadley,
 Stanley G. Beebe,
 Henry S. Bogan,
 Alvin E. Neal,
 Herbert A. Miles,
 John D. O'Leary,
 Clyde H. Hartsel,
 Dwight W. Francisco,
 Allen P. Carr,
 Eugene G. Reid,
 Grover C. Darnall,
 Willis T. Conway,
 George W. Morgan,
 John E. Brannon,

Lawrence W. Esckilsen,
 Delmar Byfield,
 Lloyd R. Pugh,
 Hugh M. Todd,
 Harold W. Talbot,
 Sam H. Pitts,
 Cornelius S. Lynch,
 Russell E. Smith,
 Edward Kellison,
 Frederick F. Nagel,
 Charles Connette,
 Joseph G. Whalen,
 Elmer I. Fadden,
 Arthur C. Small,
 Anthony A. Krzyzaniak,
 William H. Faga,
 William A. McCleery,
 Henry C. Bock,
 Harold C. Kearney, and
 Clyde Brandon.

The following-named officers to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 10th day of December, 1918:

Henry B. Conrad,
 Henry S. Whisman,
 DeWayne G. Richey,
 James H. Wallace,
 Charles L. Trickey,
 Leo B. Norris,
 Lester C. Todd,
 Gustave B. Dudley, jr.,
 Max Shaweker,
 Charles C. Hoffman,
 Isador H. Tumpowsky,
 Harold C. Bean,
 Wendell P. Blake,
 Sterling N. Pierce,
 Frederick H. Rapoport,
 Hugh R. Phinney,
 Albert G. Wenzell,
 Carl G. Swendsen,
 Oliver W. Miner,
 James B. Moloney,
 Claiborne T. Smith,
 James C. Dickson,
 Delbert H. Nickson,
 William F. Krone,
 Warren C. Ives,
 Arthur Van Dusen,
 Eugene P. Pendergrass,
 Charles Koenigsberger,
 Paul W. Best,
 Edward J. Cummings,
 Carl J. Bucher,
 Kenneth S. Caldwell,
 John R. Marshall,
 Sylvia L. Johnson,
 Edwin Peterson,
 Furman Angel,
 John J. Keegan,
 Harry J. Prall,
 Clifford G. Hines,
 Arthur S. Judy,
 Howard H. Montgomery,
 Berton V. D. Scott,
 Jesse J. Cancelmo,
 Carl H. Fornell,
 Pierce J. Dunphy,
 William S. McEllroy,
 Clifton F. West,
 William A. Frascolla,
 Clark D. Stull,
 Hillard L. Weer,
 Horace S. Cragin,
 Randall F. White,
 Edward G. Archibald,
 Daniel C. Reyner,
 Fred W. Granger,
 Edgar F. McCall,
 Earl H. Mitchell,
 John B. Farrior,
 John I. B. Vail,
 John M. Whalen,
 Warren LeR. Fleck,
 Charles B. Bleasby,

Clifford E. McElwain,
 Charles W. Rose,
 James C. Walker,
 Joseph M. Murphy,
 Edward Lewis,
 George E. Fortmiller,
 Gates Collier,
 Israel S. Otis,
 William P. Mull,
 Walter P. Harris,
 Joseph A. Doyle,
 Hjalmar W. Sybilrud,
 Hugh McC. Miller,
 Robert B. Smalley,
 Ammi L. Johnson,
 John E. Linden,
 Arthur W. Phillips,
 Harrison H. Leffler,
 Joseph A. Melody,
 Leopold J. De Backer,
 Gerald A. Sullivan,
 Richard P. Landis,
 William D. Small,
 Henry J. Murray,
 Francis W. Carl,
 Haliburton McCoy,
 Ross A. Kelly,
 Roger A. Nolan,
 Joseph W. Ratliffe,
 Frank J. Clancy,
 Blaine R. Goldsberry,
 Herbert L. Strong,
 Henry C. Weber,
 Earl S. Pomeroy,
 James F. Runner,
 Oscar Davis,
 Cecil C. Davis,
 Joseph P. Mulhern,
 Francis P. Gardner,
 Charles H. Carroll,
 Arthur C. Dean,
 Henry K. Seelaus,
 Donald D. Prentice,
 John A. Sharkey,
 Adrian H. Grigg,
 Arvid W. Erickson,
 Ira E. Gaston,
 John B. Craig,
 Harvey L. Basinger,
 Martin M. Gould,
 Harold P. Cole,
 John J. Darby,
 Karl McC. Scott,
 Cary D. Allen,
 Herbert T. Hayes,
 Joseph D. Peluso,
 Larnal S. Vorhees,
 Charles E. Irwin,
 Edward D. Leete,
 Norman J. Haverly,
 Arthur J. Langan,
 William E. Stone,
 Sherman B. Forbes,
 Frank S. Hundley,
 Eugene W. Torrey,
 William W. Davies, jr.,
 James E. Bellinger,
 Leo L. Davis,
 Willis O. Barney,
 Thomas J. Sullivan,
 Berman Dunham,
 August Saska,
 Norman Roberts,
 Eugene P. Steinmetz,
 Claude V. Timberlake,
 Walter N. Rowley,
 George T. Dill,
 James J. Regan,
 Lawrence R. Hazzard, and
 Edward L. McDermott.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 26th day of December, 1918:

Francis P. VanValin,
 Edward A. Ryland,
 Ignatius G. Brennan,

Paul R. Smith,
 Harry M. Seldin,
 Elmer A. Jasper,
 Arma E. Rush,
 Lawrence V. Feike,
 Herbert F. Buchanan,
 Leo G. Pollock,
 Raymond C. Sheridan,
 Clemens V. Rault,
 John J. Hass,
 Howard C. Wichan,
 Harry C. Striffler,
 Charles R. Wells, and
 Rex W. Faulkner.

The following-named dental surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 26th day of December, 1918:

Walter Rehrauer,
 Lloyd C. Austin,
 Robert M. Askin,
 William S. Thompson,
 Joseph P. Copp,
 Cornelius L. Norris,
 William F. Hawthorn,
 Harry L. Kalen, and
 Philip H. MacInnis.

The following-named temporary majors to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of March, 1917:

Frederick A. Barker and
 William T. Hoadley.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of July, 1918:

David C. Levy,
 Joseph H. Fellows,
 Louis G. De Haven,
 John S. Tyler,
 Luther W. Jones,
 Harry E. Stovall,
 Chester R. Milham,
 David P. Cowan,
 Robert L. Montague,
 Lester A. Dessez,
 John R. Minter,
 Robert B. Stuart,
 James Wood,
 Andrew R. Holderby, 3d,
 Charles S. Willcox,
 Fillmore W. Eiker,
 Timon J. Torkelson,
 Ross S. Wilson, and
 Merton A. Richal.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 2d day of January, 1919:

Walter Sweet,
 Joseph Lubomski,
 Edwin H. Poulnot, jr.,
 Samuel B. Witt,
 Richard A. Cullum,
 Charlton P. Lee,
 Blaine G. Wiley,
 Clarence E. Lee,
 Stanley S. Herman,
 Edwin G. Schwartzman,
 George P. Buell,
 Julian N. Frisbie,
 Ervin R. Whitman,
 Harry E. Leive,
 Louis F. Weyand,
 William Scruggs,
 Willard L. Peach,
 Benjamin W. Atkinson, jr.,
 Ralph C. Battin,
 Laurance B. Nourse,
 Gilbert C. Henderson,
 Max D. Smith,
 Walter H. Burt,
 Anthony Rinkevich,
 Carl J. Allenbaugh,
 Herbert H. Von Rohr,
 Webster S. Rutledge,
 Oliver D. Bernier,
 Minter L. Lowther,
 Scott Snodgrass,

Franklin H. Hayner,
 Wilbur V. Styles,
 Joseph Lacey,
 George E. Ladd, jr.,
 Herman Kingsnorth,
 John A. Self,
 Phillip R. Hockenberger,
 Donald A. Trayser,
 Charles S. Dandridge,
 Edward J. Moneyppenny,
 George S. Van Riper,
 Alexander D. Shaw,
 William L. McKittrick,
 Gerald C. Thomas,
 James W. Lea,
 George Esau,
 Phillip W. Mohr,
 Adolphus Cannon,
 James B. Gambrell,
 Albert L. Winner,
 James T. Elliott,
 Frank Saddler, jr.,
 Howard B. Enyart,
 William A. Keiter, and
 Weir R. Goodwin.

The following-named officers in the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1919:

Walter Sweet and
 Oliver D. Bernier.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Samuel F. Clabaugh to be postmaster at Tuscaloosa, Ala., in place of S. F. Clabaugh. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Bettie T. Forster to be postmaster at Thomasville, Ala., in place of B. T. Forster. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Joseph S. McCain to be postmaster at Lineville, Ala., in place of J. S. McCain. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Nannie S. Coleman to be postmaster at Jasper, Ala., in place of N. S. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Robert L. O'Neal to be postmaster at Huntsville, Ala., in place of R. L. O'Neal. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1918.

M. W. Camper to be postmaster at Florence, Ala., in place of M. W. Camper. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

Robert Stephens, jr., to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ala., in place of R. Stephens, jr. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

John J. Dunlap, jr., to be postmaster at Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Dunlap, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 29, 1918.

Jesse B. Hearin to be postmaster at Demopolis, Ala., in place of J. B. Hearin. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1918.

Louis C. Kelley to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, Ala., in place of L. C. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

James W. Horn to be postmaster at Brantley, Ala., in place of J. W. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired October 18, 1918.

Jesse G. Turner to be postmaster at Slocomb, Ala. Office became presidential October, 1918.

Howard F. Little to be postmaster at Linden, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Dawson M. Swint to be postmaster at Lanett, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Sarah M. Salley to be postmaster at Hayneville, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Arthur A. Weeks to be postmaster at Hanceville, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Leona Randall to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Robert B. Evans to be postmaster at Elkmont, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Bays D. Calthes, to be postmaster at Pell City, Ala., in place of W. L. Milner, resigned.

Ruth K. Conerly to be postmaster at Lockhart, Ala., in place of J. B. Sinquefield, resigned.

Walter H. Speegle to be postmaster at Hartsells, Ala., in place of Elizabeth Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

ALASKA.

Robert S. McDonald to be postmaster at Nenana, Alaska. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

ARIZONA.

John Towner to be postmaster at Naco, Ariz., in place of J. Towner. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Charles Osborne to be postmaster at Holbrook, Ariz., in place of Charles Osborne. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Ida E. M. Carty to be postmaster at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of Ida E. Carty. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Tula L. Copening to be postmaster at Casa Grande, Ariz., in place of Tula L. Humphreys. Name changed by marriage.

Leonard D. Redfield to be postmaster at Benson, Ariz., in place of L. D. Redfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Ora J. Moss to be postmaster at Somerton, Ariz. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles P. Heisser to be postmaster at Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of James L. Byrnes, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

Ella H. Smith to be postmaster at Wynne, Ark., in place of E. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

James M. Crider to be postmaster at Winslow, Ark., in place of J. M. Crider. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

John P. Stafford to be postmaster at Springdale, Ark., in place of J. P. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1918.

Lucius Pilkington to be postmaster at Searcy, Ark., in place of L. Pilkington. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John W. Puckett to be postmaster at Rogers, Ark., in place of J. W. Puckett. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Charles McB. Cox to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of C. M. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

John A. Marr to be postmaster at Prescott, Ark., in place of J. A. Marr. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1918.

Isaac N. Deadrick to be postmaster at Parkin, Ark., in place of I. N. Deadrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Stella W. Harris to be postmaster at Junction City, Ark., in place of C. A. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Nelson H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Gentry, Ark., in place of N. H. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

Linn Turley to be postmaster at Forrest City, Ark., in place of L. Turley. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Seaborn J. Smith to be postmaster at Beebe, Ark., in place of S. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Ned P. Atkin to be postmaster at Parkdale, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John E. Bittinger to be postmaster at Grady, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Aubrey Gore to be postmaster at Dierks, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

David D. Draper to be postmaster at Ashdown, Ark., in place of Arthur R. Hill, resigned.

Kay S. Rolley to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ark., in place of Alice L. Rolley, deceased.

Fannie M. Zearing to be postmaster at Devall Bluff, Ark., in place of George C. Cooper, resigned.

William J. Lenehan to be postmaster at De Witt, Ark., in place of Duffy Allen, resigned.

Claude J. Cotter to be postmaster at Marianna, Ark., in place of Emmet H. McMurry, resigned.

Allen G. Blankenship to be postmaster at Monette, Ark., in place of Hollis S. Bass, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Nellie Hawkins to be postmaster at Yreka, Cal., in place of Nellie Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

John J. Blaney to be postmaster at Weaverville, Cal., in place of J. J. Blaney. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Ernest H. Haack to be postmaster at Watsonville, Cal., in place of E. H. Haack. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

William B. Hagans to be postmaster at Ukiah, Cal., in place of W. B. Hagaus. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

George E. Meekins to be postmaster at Stanford University, Cal., in place of G. E. Meekins. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Ross H. Hille to be postmaster at San Fernando, Cal., in place of R. H. Hille. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Margaret C. Hamilton to be postmaster at San Anselmo, Cal., in place of M. C. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Wilmot D. Wood to be postmaster at Paso Robles, Cal., in place of W. D. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Charles E. Tabler to be postmaster at Parlier, Cal., in place of C. E. Tabler. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Elgin C. Hurlbert to be postmaster at Pacific Grove, Cal., in place of E. C. Hurlbert. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Fred N. Paxton to be postmaster at Oroville, Cal., in place of F. N. Paxton. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

John E. Walden to be postmaster at Napa, Cal., in place of J. E. Walden. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1918.

Thomas H. Miller to be postmaster at Morgan Hill, Cal., in place of T. H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Harrington Brown to be postmaster at Los Angeles, Cal., in place of Harrington Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1918.

Reuben E. Baer to be postmaster at Healdsburg, Cal., in place of R. E. Baer. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Charles H. Coffey to be postmaster at Gonzales, Cal., in place of C. H. Coffey. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

H. P. Martin Eriksen to be postmaster at Ferndale, Cal., in place of Martin Eriksen. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Rosalie A. Crandall to be postmaster at Etna Mills, Cal., in place of R. A. Crandall. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1918.

Charles H. Guy to be postmaster at Concord, Cal., in place of C. H. Guy. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Wellington E. Hiatt to be postmaster at Cloverdale, Cal., in place of W. E. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Benjamin F. Hudspeth to be postmaster at Chico, Cal., in place of B. F. Hudspeth. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Charles G. Clyne to be postmaster at Benicia, Cal., in place of C. G. Clyne. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Myron P. Meacham to be postmaster at Altadena, Cal., in place of M. P. Meacham. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Valentine L. Dillow to be postmaster at Yucaipa, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ruby Vinten to be postmaster at Terminal, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William Henson to be postmaster at Riverdale, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Fred F. Darcy to be postmaster at Montebello, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1917.

Joseph P. Schaefer to be postmaster at Mayfield, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Cinie J. Mills to be postmaster at La Harbra, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Patrick S. Quigley to be postmaster at Hamilton City, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ethel R. Costello to be postmaster at Acampo, Cal. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Anna M. McVeigh to be postmaster at Brea, Cal., in place of R. G. Pettigrew, resigned.

Selma A. Porter to be postmaster at Dunsmuir, Cal., in place of George B. Coon, removed.

Ambrose E. Daneri to be postmaster at Merced, Cal., in place of C. D. Radcliffe, resigned.

Maye S. Large to be postmaster at Moorpark, Cal., in place of Yeteve G. Sanders. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

George G. Hughes to be postmaster at San Bruno, Cal., in place of Charles A. Bacon, removed.

George E. Kirby to be postmaster at San Luis Obispo, Cal., in place of George A. Barnett, deceased.

Mary A. Thornton to be postmaster at Yosemite, Cal., in place of William D. Thornton, resigned.

Frank F. Smith to be postmaster at Oilcenter, Cal., in place of J. W. Heard, resigned.

Milton L. Spencer to be postmaster at Oilfields, Cal., in place of E. F. Orwig, resigned.

Laura B. Rowden to be postmaster at Riverbank, Cal., in place of R. L. Evans, resigned.

COLORADO.

Marion R. McCauley to be postmaster at La Junta, Colo., in place of M. R. McCauley. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

Andrew V. Sharpe to be postmaster at Fruita, Colo., in place of A. V. Sharpe. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William F. Ordway to be postmaster at Dolores, Colo., in place of W. F. Ordway. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Frederick C. Tighe to be postmaster at New Raymer, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frank G. Colburn to be postmaster at Mount Harris, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John Davis to be postmaster at Arriba, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Clarence H. Reagan to be postmaster at Aguilar, Colo., in place of Joseph Ray, resigned.

Earnest G. Beechler to be postmaster at Akron, Colo., in place of Frederick W. McIntyre, resigned.

Edward Slates to be postmaster at Walsenburg, Colo., in place of A. T. Manzanares, removed.

Robert E. McCunniff to be postmaster at La Jara, Colo., in place of Thomas Cunniff, deceased.

Lester T. Britton to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, Colo., in place of J. E. Hanley, deceased.

CONNECTICUT.

Emery W. Doolittle to be postmaster at Plantsville, Conn., in place of E. W. Doolittle. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

John F. Penders to be postmaster at Meriden, Conn., in place of J. F. Penders. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Walter H. Bishop to be postmaster at North Haven, Conn., in place of W. H. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Timothy J. Kelly to be postmaster at Oakville, Conn., in place of T. J. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

William C. Saunders to be postmaster at Waterford, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frank La Favre to be postmaster at Central Village, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John W. Cook to be postmaster at Beacon Falls, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Irving F. Putney to be postmaster at Saugatuck, Conn., in place of Patrick T. Oates, resigned.

DELAWARE.

Effie M. Truitt to be postmaster at Rehoboth Beach, Del., in place of E. M. Truitt. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

George R. Mears to be postmaster at Georgetown, Del., in place of G. R. Mears. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frederick L. Willey to be postmaster at Bridgeville, Del., in place of F. L. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

FLORIDA.

John R. Thompson to be postmaster at St. Andrew, Fla., in place of J. R. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Benjamin S. Hancock to be postmaster at Pensacola, Fla., in place of B. S. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

William C. McLean to be postmaster at Orlando, Fla., in place of W. C. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Laura Knight to be postmaster at Millville, Fla., in place of Laura Laird. Name changed by marriage.

James L. Stokes to be postmaster at Micanopy, Fla., in place of J. L. Stokes. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Milton D. Bell to be postmaster at Inverness, Fla., in place of M. D. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Johnson Y. O'Neal to be postmaster at Dade City, Fla., in place of J. Y. O'Neal. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

John M. Kelly to be postmaster at Bocagrande, Fla., in place of J. M. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Caroline D. Simrall to be postmaster at Ormond, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Rinda Daniel to be postmaster at Moore Haven, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Leonora K. Gilbride to be postmaster at Fort Dade, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George L. Drew to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Fla., in place of Peter A. Dignan. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Dona H. Weaver to be postmaster at Mayo, Fla., in place of Thomas J. Weaver, resigned.

John W. Doe to be postmaster at Palm Beach, Fla., in place of Eleanor R. McKenna, resigned.

GEORGIA.

James C. Newsom to be postmaster at Washington, Ga., in place of J. C. Newsom. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Tilden A. Adkins to be postmaster at Vienna, Ga., in place of T. A. Adkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Josephine H. Lunceford to be postmaster at Union Point, Ga., in place of Josephine Hilliard. Incumbent's commission expired by marriage (name changed).

John Q. West to be postmaster at Thomson, Ga., in place of J. Q. West. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Frank D. Colson to be postmaster at Ocilla, Ga., in place of F. D. Colson. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1918.

George G. Brinson to be postmaster at Millen, Ga., in place of G. G. Brinson. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Thomas Davis to be postmaster at Meigs, Ga., in place of T. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

Walter B. Cheatham to be postmaster at Dawson, Ga., in place of W. B. Cheatham. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

William T. Thurmond to be postmaster at Commerce, Ga., in place of W. T. Thurmond. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1918.

Emma Pettis to be postmaster at Cave Spring, Ga., in place of E. Pettis. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

William J. Webb to be postmaster at Canton, Ga., in place of W. J. Webb. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1917.

John W. Wells to be postmaster at Adel, Ga., in place of J. W. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Sam Tate to be postmaster at Tate, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Herbert F. Rudolph to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Abbie F. Beacham to be postmaster at Glenwood, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

William D. Wallace to be postmaster at Chamblee, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Anna A. Addison to be postmaster at Carnesville, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Benjamin R. Leggett to be postmaster at Broxton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Freeman R. Hardisty to be postmaster at Statesboro, Ga., in place of Emmett M. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired October 30, 1917.

Abe Hargraves to be postmaster at Homerville, Ga., in place of Flem C. Dame, resigned.

HAWAII.

Caesar R. Jardin to be postmaster at Kohala, Hawaii, in place of C. R. Jardin. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Mary Mitchell to be postmaster at Fort Kamehameha, Hawaii. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John F. Daly to be postmaster at Hilo, Hawaii, in place of Harry D. Corbett, removed.

IDAHO.

Walter A. Fiscus to be postmaster at Potlatch, Idaho, in place of W. A. Fiscus. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Thomas J. Russell to be postmaster at Post Falls, Idaho, in place of T. J. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

William T. Roberts to be postmaster at Bellevue, Idaho, in place of W. T. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Helga M. Cook to be postmaster at McCall, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Grant A. Bristol to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Franklin B. Fiss to be postmaster at Kuna, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

James Campbell to be postmaster at Hope, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Samuel R. Gwin to be postmaster at Hagerman, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Ross D. Bothwell to be postmaster at Weiser, Idaho, in place of Frank S. Harding, deceased.

Charles D. McEachron to be postmaster at Orofino, Idaho, in place of P. H. Blake, deceased.

Elsie Harrell to be postmaster at Cambridge, Idaho, in place of Frederick J. Hill, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

George L. Hausmann to be postmaster at Vandalia, Ill., in place of G. L. Hausmann. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Merton L. Spangler to be postmaster at Plainfield, Ill., in place of M. L. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Charles Walkup to be postmaster at Oregon, Ill., in place of Charles Walkup. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1918.

George Rankin to be postmaster at Normal, Ill., in place of George Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Gus Blair to be postmaster at Murphysboro, Ill., in place of Gus Blair. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Emil J. Hess to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of E. J. Hess. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Edward F. Poorman to be postmaster at Mattoon, Ill., in place of E. F. Poorman. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1918.

Cora L. Tisler to be postmaster at Marseilles, Ill., in place of C. L. Tisler. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Robert Selby to be postmaster at Lovington, Ill., in place of Robert Selby. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Frank G. Pierski to be postmaster at La Salle, Ill., in place of F. G. Pierski. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Henry Earle to be postmaster at Hebron, Ill., in place of Henry Earle. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Frank W. Freeman to be postmaster at Grant Park, Ill., in place of F. W. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

John A. Pence to be postmaster at Gibson City, Ill., in place of J. A. Pence. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Frank H. T. Maronde to be postmaster at Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of F. H. T. Maronde. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

John Coveny to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Ill., in place of John Coveny. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1918.

Darlin H. Thompson to be postmaster at Earlville, Ill., in place of D. H. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

William F. Hogan to be postmaster at Dixon, Ill., in place of W. F. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Stephen A. D. Howe to be postmaster at Cowden, Ill., in place of S. A. D. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Walter E. Roberts to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill., in place of W. E. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

George B. Marvel to be postmaster at Clinton, Ill., in place of G. B. Marvel. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1918.

Wilbur F. Whitney to be postmaster at Byron, Ill., in place of W. F. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Joseph L. Lampert to be postmaster at Alton, Ill., in place of J. L. Lampert. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1918.

Mary Anen to be postmaster at Winthrop Harbor, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Benjamin F. Bosley to be postmaster at Ransom, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

William Sutton to be postmaster at Kempton, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Enoch M. Runyon to be postmaster at Green Valley, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Perry Westerfield to be postmaster at Frankfort Heights, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mabel G. Holmes to be postmaster at Cornell, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Glen S. Fleming to be postmaster at Catlin, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Roscoe Tygett to be postmaster at Christopher, Ill., in place of Moses Jordan, removed.

Thomas Berta to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of William Baskerville, deceased.

James W. Cogswell to be postmaster at Louisville, Ill., in place of A. J. Ikemire, deceased.

Audie Lindsey to be postmaster at Mahomet, Ill., in place of Eva Carson, resigned.

Rose C. Auth to be postmaster at Rankin, Ill., in place of George A. Griffith, sr., resigned.

Clara M. Smith to be postmaster at Weldon, Ill., in place of Edna Clemons, resigned.

Joseph H. Coffman to be postmaster at Augusta, Ill., in place of J. B. F. Agnew, resigned.

Will G. Leoman to be postmaster at Meredosia, Ill., in place of C. J. Schmitt, resigned.

William H. Roberts to be postmaster at Kincaid, Ill., in place of Ira J. Aull, resigned.

Nathan T. Crews to be postmaster at Menard, Ill., in place of Ernest C. Richter, declined.

Grace R. Skelton to be postmaster at Port Byron, Ill., in place of W. D. Hall, deceased.

INDIANA.

George E. Erdmann to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of G. E. Erdmann. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

George A. Dalton to be postmaster at West Baden, Ind., in place of G. A. Dalton. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Levi T. Pennington to be postmaster at Spiceland, Ind., in place of L. T. Pennington. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Allen Swope to be postmaster at Seymour, Ind., in place of Allen Swope. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

John A. Cody to be postmaster at New Albany, Ind., in place of J. A. Cody. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Rudolph F. Schneider to be postmaster at Montpelier, Ind., in place of R. F. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1918.

John P. Huther to be postmaster at Jasper, Ind., in place of J. P. Huther. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

William W. Drake to be postmaster at Greenwood, Ind., in place of W. W. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1918.

James J. Littrell to be postmaster at Elkhart, Ind., in place of J. J. Littrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

John W. Brand to be postmaster at Columbia City, Ind., in place of J. W. Brand. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

George E. Endres to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Ind., in place of G. E. Endres. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Miles Baxter to be postmaster at Auburn, Ind., in place of Miles Baxter. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1918.

Francis M. Fultz to be postmaster at Akron, Ind., in place of F. M. Fultz. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Benjamin H. Knapp to be postmaster at Wheatfield, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hurbert J. Harris to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Frank E. Parker to be postmaster at Colfax, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

William L. Denman to be postmaster at Greencastle, Ind., in place of William B. Vestal. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Burt E. Kimmel to be postmaster at Howe, Ind., in place of C. E. Schaeffer, resigned.

Lora J. Callihan to be postmaster at Oxford, Ind., in place of Fred H. Foster, declined.

Harrison D. Houser to be postmaster at Parker, Ind., in place of William G. Moulton, declined.

Arthur Vernon to be postmaster at Whiting, Ind., in place of David B. Purinton, declined.

IOWA.

Richard B. McSwiggin to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of R. B. McSwiggin. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Samuel W. Koster to be postmaster at West Liberty, Iowa, in place of S. W. Koster. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Francis A. Gallagher to be postmaster at Walnut, Iowa, in place of F. A. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Henry G. Kruse to be postmaster at Vinton, Iowa, in place of H. G. Kruse. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

J. Brady Piatt to be postmaster at Tipton, Iowa, in place of J. B. Piatt. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Albert A. Montgomery to be postmaster at Stuart, Iowa, in place of A. A. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Eugene F. Kieffer to be postmaster at Remsen, Iowa, in place of E. F. Kieffer. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Harry A. Nash to be postmaster at Perry, Iowa, in place of H. A. Nash. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Charles A. Sample to be postmaster at Oakland, Iowa, in place of C. A. Sample. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Harry E. Chichester to be postmaster at New London, Iowa, in place of H. E. Chichester. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

William L. Holtz to be postmaster at Newell, Iowa, in place of W. L. Holtz. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Richard J. O'Connor to be postmaster at Neola, Iowa, in place of R. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

George E. Scoles to be postmaster at Nashua, Iowa, in place of G. E. Scoles. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

John T. Lanigan to be postmaster at Monticello, Iowa, in place of J. T. Lanigan. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Elbert H. Vary to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of E. H. Vary. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1917.

James Nowak to be postmaster at Malcom, Iowa, in place of J. Nowak. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

John E. McHugh to be postmaster at Lisbon, Iowa, in place of J. E. McHugh. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Leo A. Dugan to be postmaster at Kingsley, Iowa, in place of L. A. Dugan. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

William P. Coutts to be postmaster at Kellogg, Iowa, in place of W. P. Coutts. Incumbent's commission expired October 6, 1918.

John Vanderwicken to be postmaster at Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of J. Vanderwicken. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Henry D. Mussman to be postmaster at Lakota (late Germania), Iowa, in place of H. D. Mussman, to change name of office.

William Walter to be postmaster at Dyersville, Iowa, in place of W. Walter. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Samuel B. Wesp to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Iowa, in place of S. B. Wesp. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Charles H. Bloom to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of C. H. Bloom. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1918.

John J. McAreavy to be postmaster at Coggon, Iowa, in place of J. J. McAreavy. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Bernhard M. Jacobsen to be postmaster at Clinton, Iowa, in place of B. M. Jacobsen. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1918.

John H. Pettibone to be postmaster at Burlington, Iowa, in place of J. H. Pettibone. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Maurice Fay to be postmaster at Anamosa, Iowa, in place of M. Fay. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Alma Camblin to be postmaster at Walcott, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John Grant to be postmaster at Stanwood, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Jo. G. Milligan to be postmaster at Pulaski, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John W. Waterman to be postmaster at Klemme, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Alphonso T. Joder to be postmaster at Hudson, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Clem A. Bohnenkamp to be postmaster at Duncombe, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Alva S. Lynd to be postmaster at Blairsburg, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Kathryn McGuire to be postmaster at Audubon, Iowa, in place of S. B. Morrissey, resigned.

James F. Conover to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of Jacob Meyer, resigned.

Esther Y. Walster to be postmaster at Marble Rock, Iowa, in place of Merton I. J. Ackley, resigned.

Hope C. Niemann to be postmaster at Marcus, Iowa, in place of Benjamin Delaney, resigned.

Maude E. Barkley to be postmaster at Pierson, Iowa, in place of Charles E. Perdue, resigned.

Albert H. Stoltenberg to be postmaster at Schleswig, Iowa, in place of Emil M. Peters, resigned.

Phillip W. Lembke to be postmaster at Sibley, Iowa, in place of Jacob H. Bahne, resigned.

Arthur E. Granger to be postmaster at Marion, Iowa, in place of T. T. Williams, deceased.

Frank E. Moravec to be postmaster at Oxford Junction, Iowa, in place of Frank Kenney, resigned.

KANSAS.

Oscar L. Clarke to be postmaster at Washington, Kans., in place of O. L. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

John A. Lindahl to be postmaster at Enterprise, Kans., in place of J. A. Lindahl. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Carl E. Hallberg to be postmaster at Courtland, Kans., in place of C. E. Hallberg. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Harlan W. Marmon to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans., in place of H. W. Marmon. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Catharine E. Simmons to be postmaster at Wellsville, Kans., in place of C. E. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

Joseph J. Keraus to be postmaster at Wakeeney, Kans., in place of J. J. Keraus. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

George Harman to be postmaster at Valley Falls, Kans., in place of G. Harman. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Timothy D. Seeley to be postmaster at Tonganoxie, Kans., in place of T. D. Seeley. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1919.

Henry Block to be postmaster at Syracuse, Kans., in place of H. Block. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Richard D. McCliman to be postmaster at Seneca, Kans., in place of R. D. McCliman. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Isaac N. Richardson to be postmaster at Delphos, Kans., in place of I. N. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William F. Grosser to be postmaster at Salina, Kans., in place of W. F. Grosser. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Thomas J. Ryan to be postmaster at St. Marys, Kans., in place of T. J. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Louis W. Johnson to be postmaster at Pittsburg, Kans., in place of L. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

Aldamar P. Elder to be postmaster at Ottawa, Kans., in place of A. P. Elder. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1919.

William C. White to be postmaster at Osage City, Kans., in place of W. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

James H. Cosgrove to be postmaster at Olathe, Kans., in place of J. H. Cosgrove. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

Ernest Bray to be postmaster at Neodesha, Kans., in place of Ernest Bray. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

John T. Brothers to be postmaster at National Military Home, Kans., in place of J. T. Brothers. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Henry R. Honey to be postmaster at Mankato, Kans., in place of H. R. Honey. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Lloyd E. Jackson to be postmaster at McPherson, Kans., in place of L. E. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Wenslow Cipra to be postmaster at Lincoln, Kans., in place of Wenslow Cipra. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Charles A. Taschetta to be postmaster at Leavenworth, Kans., in place of C. A. Taschetta. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1919.

Benjamin F. Tatum to be postmaster at Kinsley, Kans., in place of B. F. Tatum. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Michael A. Frey to be postmaster at Junction City, Kans., in place of M. A. Frey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Samuel S. Graybill to be postmaster at Hutchinson, Kans., in place of S. S. Graybill. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Samuel T. Osterhold to be postmaster at Holton, Kans., in place of B. T. Osterhold. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Clayton K. Simon to be postmaster at Goff, Kans., in place of C. K. Simon. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

Peter J. Murphy to be postmaster at Gardner, Kans., in place of P. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1919.

Henry F. Schmidt to be postmaster at Dodge City, Kans., in place of H. F. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Joseph A. Carson to be postmaster at Erie, Kans., in place of J. A. Carson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Frederick M. Murphy to be postmaster at Clyde, Kans., in place of F. M. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Granville S. Hoss, jr., to be postmaster at Cherryvale, Kans., in place of G. S. Hoss, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

John W. Lapham to be postmaster at Chanute, Kans., in place of J. W. Lapham. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Thomas Pore to be postmaster at Cedar Vale, Kans., in place of Thomas Pore. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Frank H. Higley to be postmaster at Cawker City, Kans., in place of F. H. Higley. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William S. Twist to be postmaster at Bonner Springs, Kans., in place of W. S. Twist. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Clarence Coulter to be postmaster at Blue Rapids, Kans., in place of Clarence Coulter. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William A. McClure to be postmaster at Baldwin City, Kans., in place of W. A. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Louis C. Orr to be postmaster at Atchison, Kans., in place of L. C. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

George S. Hartley to be postmaster at Arkansas City, Kans., in place of G. S. Hartley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Horatio C. Duckworth to be postmaster at Altoona, Kans., in place of H. C. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Julia B. Temple to be postmaster at Valley Center, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ollie N. Harbin to be postmaster at Barnard, Kans., in place of Reuben M. Long, resigned.

Anna J. Miller to be postmaster at Lebanon, Kans., in place of James W. Adams, resigned.

Frederick D. Lamb to be postmaster at Manhattan, Kans., in place of John M. Winter, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

George R. Hughes to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ky., in place of G. R. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1918.

Latt W. Springfield to be postmaster at Sebree, Ky., in place of L. W. Springfield. Incumbent's commission expired October 2, 1918.

Moses Kaufman to be postmaster at Lexington, Ky., in place of M. Kaufman. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1918.

John B. Wathen to be postmaster at Lebanon, Ky., in place of J. B. Wathen. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Ephriam P. Brown to be postmaster at Lancaster, Ky., in place of E. P. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Robert H. Anderson to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ky., in place of R. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

James N. Rule to be postmaster at Falmouth, Ky., in place of J. N. Rule. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Len Beshear to be postmaster at Dawsonsprings, Ky., in place of L. Beshear. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Orie S. Ware to be postmaster at Covington, Ky., in place of O. S. Ware. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Otis W. Jackson to be postmaster at Clinton, Ky., in place of O. W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Moses F. Moore to be postmaster at Central City, Ky., in place of M. F. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Fannie G. Wilson to be postmaster at Campbellsville, Ky., in place of F. G. Taylor. Name changed by marriage.

John W. Taylor to be postmaster at Stone, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hallie T. Vaughn to be postmaster at Ravenna, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Mattie E. Carter to be postmaster at Barlow, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Charles E. Cooke to be postmaster at Middlesboro, Ky., in place of W. C. Sleet, resigned.

George L. Penny to be postmaster at Stanford, Ky., in place of Harvey J. McRoberts, resigned.

Charles B. Burke to be postmaster at Beattyville, Ky., in place of George T. Smith, resigned.

LOUISIANA.

Robinson M. Leake to be postmaster at St. Francisville, La., in place of R. M. Leake. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Samuel L. Barksdale to be postmaster at Ruston, La., in place of S. L. Barksdale. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

William P. Willett to be postmaster at Pollock, La., in place of W. P. Willett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1918.

W. Randolph Morgan to be postmaster at Mandeville, La., in place of Randolph Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Shep B. Hanes to be postmaster at Jena, La., in place of S. B. Hanes. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Katherine J. Moynagh to be postmaster at Harvey, La., in place of K. J. Moynagh. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Hardy C. Richardson to be postmaster at Franklinton, La., in place of H. C. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Joseph Muth to be postmaster at Elizabeth, La., in place of J. Muth. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Jacob Seiler to be postmaster at Covington, La., in place of J. Seiler. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Irvin P. Duke to be postmaster at Rochelle, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Simon Kahn to be postmaster at Raceland, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

William W. Drake to be postmaster at St. Joseph, La., in place of Laura B. Beaubien, resigned.

J. Wiley Miller to be postmaster at Many, La., in place of Mary E. Vandegaer, resigned.

A. Mabelle Oaksmith to be postmaster at Welsh, La., in place of Teresa M. Stewart, resigned.

MAINE.

John P. Coughlin to be postmaster at Saco, Me., in place of J. P. Coughlin. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Dwight P. Macartney to be postmaster at Oakland, Me., in place of D. P. Macartney. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1918.

Fred A. Pitts to be postmaster at Damariscotta, Me., in place of F. A. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Allen H. Stinchfield to be postmaster at Wayne, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mary P. Ross to be postmaster at Vanceboro, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Stanley Renier to be postmaster at Madison, Me., in place of Oscar H. Dilworth, removed.

Alice C. Havener to be postmaster at Searsport, Me., in place of Amos Nichols, resigned.

George D. Vose to be postmaster at Kingfield, Me., in place of Reuben A. Huse, resigned.

MARYLAND.

Charles W. Jefferson to be postmaster at Federalsburg, Md., in place of C. W. Jefferson. Incumbent's commission expired November 29, 1917.

Elmore H. Owens to be postmaster at Perryville, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Walter S. Wilson to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Md., in place of William H. Jacobs, resigned.

William S. Kelly to be postmaster at Havre de Grace, Md., in place of Henry C. Lawder, resigned.

John D. Rowe to be postmaster at Indianhead, Md., in place of Sophie E. Posey, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Susan F. Twiss to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Mass., in place of S. F. Twiss. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Joseph Metras to be postmaster at Southbridge, Mass., in place of J. Metras. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1918.

Michael O. Haggerty to be postmaster at North Adams, Mass., in place of M. O. Haggerty. Incumbent's commission expired October 12, 1918.

Frederick J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Monson, Mass., in place of F. J. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Edward M. Bent to be postmaster at Medfield, Mass., in place of E. M. Bent. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

Nicholas J. Lawler to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mass., in place of N. J. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

James J. Gorman to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Mass., in place of J. J. Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

John F. Shea to be postmaster at Bondsville, Mass., in place of J. F. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

John McGrath to be postmaster at Amesbury, Mass., in place of J. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Patrick R. Mullany to be postmaster at Hatfield, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Margaret E. Lindsey to be postmaster at Fort Andrews, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Maynard N. Wetherell to be postmaster at Chartley, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Albert F. Newell to be postmaster at Holden, Mass., in place of Walter B. Loring, resigned.

Otis J. A. Dionne to be postmaster at Walpole, Mass., in place of Daniel A. Donnelly, resigned.

Willard H. Rowell to be postmaster at Wrentham, Mass., in place of Hiram A. Cowell, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

John B. Murphy to be postmaster at Wayne, Mich., in place of J. B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

Thomas H. Sawher to be postmaster at St. Clair, Mich., in place of T. H. Sawher. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Henry J. Klee to be postmaster at Rogers, Mich., in place of H. J. Klee. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

William E. Murphy to be postmaster at Pinckney, Mich., in place of W. E. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Duncan D. Stewart to be postmaster at Munising, Mich., in place of D. D. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1918.

James C. Beckwith to be postmaster at Marshall, Mich., in place of J. C. Beckwith. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Earl Hunter to be postmaster at Lowell, Mich., in place of E. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Charlie W. Beier to be postmaster at Lenox, Mich., in place of C. W. Beier. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Irwell Brody to be postmaster at Lawton, Mich., in place of I. Brody. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

William T. Menge to be postmaster at L'Anse, Mich., in place of W. T. Menge. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

Salem F. Kennedy to be postmaster at Lakeview, Mich., in place of S. F. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Robert M. Smith to be postmaster at Kearsarge, Mich., in place of R. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

James J. Byers to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of J. J. Byers. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Patrick Garvey to be postmaster at Hemlock, Mich., in place of P. Garvey. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

John Noll to be postmaster at Cheboygan, Mich., in place of J. Noll. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Patrick H. Schannenck to be postmaster at Chassell, Mich., in place of P. H. Schannenck. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Myron E. Miller to be postmaster at Charlotte, Mich., in place of M. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Frederick J. Kruger to be postmaster at Centerville, Mich., in place of F. J. Kruger. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Jacob C. Rough to be postmaster at Buchanan, Mich., in place of J. C. Rough. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1918.

Angus M. Miller to be postmaster at Bay City, Mich., in place of A. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

Edward Austin to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Mich., in place of E. Austin. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Fred W. Hild to be postmaster at Baraga, Mich., in place of F. W. Hild. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Albert E. Millett, to be postmaster at Armada, Mich., in place of A. E. Millett. Incumbent's commission expired October 9, 1918.

Vincent P. Cash to be postmaster at Alma, Mich., in place of V. P. Cash. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1918.

Fred J. Hohn to be postmaster at Frankenmuth, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John G. Ulrich to be postmaster at Ceresco, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

John C. Nelson to be postmaster at Midland, Mich., in place of Byron Burch, removed.

Eddy W. Fleming to be postmaster at Rose City, Mich., in place of Ina M. Hammond, resigned.

Ira E. Bush to be postmaster at Ontonagon, Mich., in place of George H. Gauthier, declined.

MINNESOTA.

John Morgan to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, Minn., in place of J. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Patrick McCabe to be postmaster at Proctor, Minn., in place of P. McCabe. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

James McGinn to be postmaster at Minneota, Minn., in place of J. McGinn. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Patrick B. Jude to be postmaster at Maple Lake, Minn., in place of P. B. Jude. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

John B. Hughes to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of J. B. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Judge D. Whaley to be postmaster at Fosston, Minn., in place of J. D. Whaley. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

Knute Nelson to be postmaster at Fertile, Minn., in place of Knute Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles Jesmore to be postmaster at Eveleth, Minn., in place of C. Jesmore. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

George W. Owens to be postmaster at Elmore, Minn., in place of G. W. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Henry P. Dunn to be postmaster at Brainerd, Minn., in place of H. P. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Frank Plotts to be postmaster at Blooming Prairie, Minn., in place of F. Plotts. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Joseph Hagggett to be postmaster at Bird Island, Minn., in place of J. Hagggett. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Agnes H. Christenson to be postmaster at Beardsley, Minn., in place of A. H. Christenson. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

F. Verne Langdon to be postmaster at St. Louis Park, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John I. Nasett to be postmaster at Robbinsdale, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Oswald C. Brunius to be postmaster at Carver, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Prudence M. Crosbie to be postmaster at Brewster, Minn., in place of Margaret McC. Maher, resigned.

William P. Marston, jr., to be postmaster at Lake Crystal, Minn., in place of Elliott A. Upson, resigned.

Albert J. Rynda to be postmaster at New Prague, Minn., in place of James J. Remes, removed.

James N. Kain to be postmaster at Round Lake, Minn., in place of Mary A. Seeley. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Theodore C. Radde to be postmaster at Truman, Minn., in place of James D. Griggs, resigned.

Martin A. H. Tagatz to be postmaster at Winthrop, Minn., in place of Jacob Scherer, resigned.

Levi M. Peterson to be postmaster at Cambridge, Minn., in place of Emanuel Yugve, removed.

MISSISSIPPI.

Frank L. Ratliff to be postmaster at Shaw, Miss., in place of F. L. Ratliff. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Rose Walley to be postmaster at Richton, Miss., in place of Rose Walley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Nannie Stuart to be postmaster at Morton, Miss., in place of N. Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

William W. Robertson to be postmaster at McComb, Miss., in place of W. W. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Benjamin R. Trotter to be postmaster at Lucedale, Miss., in place of B. R. Trotter. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Edgar G. Harris to be postmaster at Laurel, Miss., in place of E. G. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

George C. Jackson to be postmaster at Belzoni, Miss., in place of G. C. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Edgar F. Shanks to be postmaster at Taylorsville, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Louise M. Quarles to be postmaster at Minter City, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

McCreight Dansby to be postmaster at Decatur, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Frankie M. Storm to be postmaster at Benoit, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Joseph T. Farrar to be postmaster at Anguilla, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

James W. Ashcraft to be postmaster at Charleston, Miss., in place of C. S. Summers, resigned.

MISSOURI.

J. Thomas Fisher to be postmaster at Jefferson City, Mo., in place of J. T. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Rolla N. Owsley to be postmaster at Windsor, Mo., in place of R. N. Owsley. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Frederick Blattner to be postmaster at Wellsville, Mo., in place of F. Blattner. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Albert E. Michie to be postmaster at Webb City, Mo., in place of A. E. Michie. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Curry B. Ellis to be postmaster at Vandalia, Mo., in place of C. B. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired August 15, 1917.

Edwin Reavis to be postmaster at Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of E. Reavis. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Francis A. Howard to be postmaster at Slater, Mo., in place of F. A. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

William S. Dray to be postmaster at Savannah, Mo., in place of W. S. Dray. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Louis P. Kern to be postmaster at St. Genevieve, Mo., in place of L. P. Kern. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles A. Stoner to be postmaster at Ridgeway, Mo., in place of C. A. Stoner. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edgar R. Idol to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Mo., in place of E. R. Idol. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Albert R. Alexander to be postmaster at Plattsburg, Mo., in place of A. R. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Grover C. Gresham to be postmaster at Parkville, Mo., in place of G. C. Gresham. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Joel J. Thom to be postmaster at Neosho, Mo., in place of J. J. Thom. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1918.

James R. Lowell to be postmaster at Moberly, Mo., in place of J. R. Lowell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

John V. Bumbarger to be postmaster at Memphis, Mo., in place of J. V. Bumbarger. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

William A. Crow to be postmaster at Humansville, Mo., in place of W. A. Crow. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

James H. Campbell to be postmaster at Higginsville, Mo., in place of J. H. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Joseph B. Smith to be postmaster at Farmington, Mo., in place of J. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Robert W. Corum to be postmaster at Boonville, Mo., in place of R. W. Corum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1918.

Leonidas W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of L. W. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

Edson C. Utter to be postmaster at Westboro, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Richard A. Strickler to be postmaster at Wellington, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John A. Fields to be postmaster at Powersville, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Albert G. Whited to be postmaster at Goodman, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas H. E. Mathis to be postmaster at Ava, Mo., in place of John H. Orr, resigned.

Cleo J. Burch to be postmaster at Brookfield, Mo., in place of Thomas M. Brenehen, resigned.

Mary L. Shackelford to be postmaster at Bunceton, Mo., in place of Louis O. Nelson, resigned.

Delmer Pool to be postmaster at East Prairie, Mo., in place of A. S. J. Martin, resigned.

Frank P. Engleman to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mo., in place of William R. Bowles, deceased.

De Witt C. Leonard to be postmaster at Ozark, Mo., in place of Charles E. Reid, resigned.

Clyde E. Holt to be postmaster at Cardwell, Mo., in place of John F. Miller, resigned.

John A. Cooper to be postmaster at Trenton, Mo., in place of Wilbur E. Austin, resigned.

Lulu R. Conway to be postmaster at Union, Mo., in place of J. G. Moutler, resigned.

Gedney D. Hart to be postmaster at Warsaw, Mo., in place of Oliver Davis, declined.

MONTANA.

Ephraim E. Hackett to be postmaster at Victor, Mont., in place of E. E. Hackett. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

James Bartley to be postmaster at Fort Benton, Mont., in place of J. Bartley. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Jennie Bywaters to be postmaster at Sandcoulee, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Harry Kennedy to be postmaster at Rosebud, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Daniel Knapp to be postmaster at Oswego, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edna N. Ross to be postmaster at Geysers, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Earl M. Davis to be postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont., in place of Stephen J. Rigney, resigned.

John B. Hyink to be postmaster at Manhattan, Mont., in place of George E. White. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

L. Blanche Dawson to be postmaster at Polson, Mont., in place of W. H. B. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired September 1, 1917.

William L. Mank to be postmaster at Roy, Mont., in place of Frederick A. Banney, deceased.

Homer F. Cox to be postmaster at Shelby, Mont., in place of Dan Sullivan, resigned.

James H. Hadzor to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mont., in place of B. L. Golden, resigned.

Thomas H. Morse, jr., to be postmaster at Drummond, Mont., in place of Mary E. Turrell, resigned.

William L. Bruce to be postmaster at Musselshell, Mont., in place of Bruce O. Dean, resigned.

Thomas G. Hayden to be postmaster at Winnifred, Mont., in place of Lawrence C. Porter, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Jarrett W. Ragan to be postmaster at Utica, Nebr., in place of J. W. Ragan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Edward P. Griess to be postmaster at Sutton, Nebr., in place of E. P. Griess. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1918.

John Conroy to be postmaster at Shelton, Nebr., in place of J. Conroy. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

George D. Thomas to be postmaster at Seward, Nebr., in place of G. D. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Fred W. Mathews to be postmaster at Rising City, Nebr., in place of F. W. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Holton C. Letson to be postmaster at Red Cloud, Nebr., in place of H. C. Letson. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Mark W. Murray to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of M. W. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

George P. Miller to be postmaster at Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Frederick A. Mellberg to be postmaster at Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of F. A. Mellberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

George W. Ewing to be postmaster at Nelson, Nebr., in place of G. W. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Robert F. Pate to be postmaster at Minden, Nebr., in place of R. F. Pate. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Ralph L. Duckworth to be postmaster at Indianola, Nebr., in place of R. L. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

John Kinsella to be postmaster at Hemingford, Nebr., in place of J. Kinsella. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

John S. Myers to be postmaster at Grant, Nebr., in place of J. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Charles M. Rebbeck to be postmaster at Gordon, Nebr., in place of C. M. Rebbeck. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Alfred G. Corey to be postmaster at Fairfield, Nebr., in place of A. G. Corey. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Edward P. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Elm Creek, Nebr., in place of E. P. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John R. McCann to be postmaster at Beatrice, Nebr., in place of J. R. McCann. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Stephen D. Phillips to be postmaster at Albion, Nebr., in place of S. D. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1918.

Anna J. Strahl to be postmaster at Ralston, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Cora D. Barlow to be postmaster at Lodgepole, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1917.

Marguerite A. Riley to be postmaster at Dawson, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Charles M. Beggs to be postmaster at Carleton, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Olive C. Messler to be postmaster at Antioch, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Nellie M. Thayer to be postmaster at Bertrand, Nebr., in place of C. E. Hendrix, resigned.

Alfred O. Hastings to be postmaster at Chester, Nebr., in place of Delbert J. Howard, deceased.

Lewis A. Wight to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of Henry J. Dunkin, resigned.

Edith L. Andersen to be postmaster at Marquette, Nebr., in place of Lottie L. Colby, declined.

Seth W. Oleson to be postmaster at St. Paul, Nebr., in place of J. J. Sazama, resigned.

Dollie W. Hyndshaw to be postmaster at Thedford, Nebr., in place of Edward H. Hines, resigned.

Charles McCray to be postmaster at Merriman, Nebr., in place of Vernon L. Green, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles E. Shepard to be postmaster at New London, N. H., in place of G. E. Shepard. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Enoch F. Stevens to be postmaster at Raymond, N. H., in place of E. F. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. H., in place of C. L. Bemis. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Sidney F. Downing to be postmaster at Lincoln, N. H., in place of S. F. Downing. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1919.

Nellie A. Card to be postmaster at New Castle, N. H. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

NEW JERSEY.

James J. Davidson to be postmaster at Swedesboro, N. J., in place of J. J. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

James W. Rea to be postmaster at South Amboy, N. J., in place of J. W. Rea. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

James F. Beardsley to be postmaster at Pompton Lakes, N. J., in place of J. F. Beardsley. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1915.

George N. Harris to be postmaster at Newton, N. J., in place of G. N. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Arabelle C. Broander to be postmaster at Keansburg, N. J., in place of A. C. Broander. Incumbent's commission expired Matthias C. Ely to be postmaster at Jersey City, N. J., in place of Matt. Ely. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

James C. H. Sherwood to be postmaster at Hohokus, N. J., in place of J. C. H. Sherwood. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Carl L. Richter to be postmaster at Fort Lee, N. J., in place of C. L. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired August 9, 1918.

Edward W. Walker to be postmaster at Cranbury, N. J., in place of E. W. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Harry F. Hinchman, jr., to be postmaster at Convent Station, N. J., in place of H. F. Hinchman. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles E. Crane to be postmaster at Clayton, N. J., in place of C. E. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Miles W. Hargrove to be postmaster at Brown Mills, N. J., in place of M. W. Hargrove. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

John A. Smith to be postmaster at Wrightstown, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Jennie Madden to be postmaster at Tuckahoe, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Arthur D. Appleby to be postmaster at Spotswood, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Gustav H. Rottgardt to be postmaster at Montvale, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

William Fehrs to be postmaster at Little Ferry, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Alonzo P. Green to be postmaster at Chester, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John Jenkins to be postmaster at Delanco, N. J., in place of Alice E. Shaw, resigned.

NEW MEXICO.

James L. Seligman to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in place of J. L. Seligman. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Martin Q. Hardin to be postmaster at Lordsburg, N. Mex., in place of M. Q. Hardin. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1918.

Bliss Freeman to be postmaster at Las Cruces, N. Mex., in place of B. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Charles M. Samford to be postmaster at Hagerman, N. Mex., in place of C. M. Samford. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Louis L. Burkhead to be postmaster at Columbus, N. Mex., in place of L. L. Burkhead. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

George Hoffman to be postmaster at Belen, N. Mex., in place of G. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

George U. McCrary to be postmaster at Artesia, N. Mex., in place of G. U. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

NEW YORK.

Charles L. Goodell to be postmaster at Worcester, N. Y., in place of C. L. Goodell. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Allen S. Brower to be postmaster at Woodmere, N. Y., in place of A. S. Brower. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Bessie M. Wyvell to be postmaster at Wellsville, N. Y., in place of B. M. Wyvell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Barton L. Piper to be postmaster at Watkins, N. Y., in place of B. L. Piper. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1917.

Elbridge J. Stratton to be postmaster at Theresa, N. Y., in place of E. J. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

James R. Comesky to be postmaster at Suffern, N. Y., in place of J. R. Comesky. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

John W. Hamilton to be postmaster at Stillwater, N. Y., in place of J. W. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Andrew J. Fitzpatrick to be postmaster at Springville, N. Y., in place of A. J. Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Patrick Halloran to be postmaster at Sparkill, N. Y., in place of Patrick Halloran. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

William H. Hennessey to be postmaster at Skaneateles, N. Y., in place of W. H. Hennessey. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

William F. Britt to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, N. Y., in place of W. F. Britt. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

John H. Hurley to be postmaster at Rushville, N. Y., in place of J. H. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Charles M. Marnes to be postmaster at Rouses Point, N. Y., in place of C. M. Marnes. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Len R. Francis to be postmaster at Ripley, N. Y., in place of L. R. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

William T. Welden to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, N. Y., in place of W. T. Welden. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Glenn F. Pollard to be postmaster at Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of G. F. Pollard. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

James O. Murphy to be postmaster at Orchard Park, N. Y., in place of J. O. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Augustus A. Blackledge to be postmaster at Nyack, N. Y., in place of A. A. Blackledge. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Robert J. Healey to be postmaster at New York Mills, N. Y., in place of R. J. Healey. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

John A. Ganey to be postmaster at New Hartford, N. Y., in place of J. A. Ganey. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Edward A. Gross to be postmaster at New City, N. Y., in place of E. A. Gross. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles E. Miller to be postmaster at Moravia, N. Y., in place of C. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

William McNeal to be postmaster at Montgomery, N. Y., in place of William McNeal. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Elmer W. Simmons to be postmaster at Millerton, N. Y., in place of E. W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Kent Barney to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of Kent Barney. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Thomas P. Hammond to be postmaster at Middleport, N. Y., in place of T. P. Hammond. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Charles E. White to be postmaster at Middleburg, N. Y., in place of C. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

John T. Kopp to be postmaster at Martinsville, N. Y., in place of J. T. Kopp. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

James W. Kelly to be postmaster at Long Island City, N. Y., in place of J. W. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Daniel F. Shea to be postmaster at Jamaica, N. Y., in place of D. F. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Melvin W. Billings to be postmaster at Hurleyville, N. Y., in place of M. W. Billings. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Cort Kramer to be postmaster at Holland, N. Y., in place of Cort Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles Hogan to be postmaster at Harrisville, N. Y., in place of Charles Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

William Johnson to be postmaster at Groveland Station, N. Y., in place of William Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Charles Fitzpatrick to be postmaster at Goshen, N. Y., in place of C. Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Thomas J. Courtney to be postmaster at Garden City, N. Y., in place of T. J. Courtney. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Eugene M. Andrews to be postmaster at Endicott, N. Y., in place of E. M. Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Thomas P. Whalen to be postmaster at Dover Plains, N. Y., in place of T. P. Whalen. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Byron E. Ogden to be postmaster at Dolgeville, N. Y., in place of B. E. Ogden. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Harry E. Savage to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Y., in place of H. E. Savage. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Maurice F. Axtell to be postmaster at Deposit, N. Y., in place of M. F. Axtell. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John J. Heneher to be postmaster at Cornwall, N. Y., in place of J. J. Heneher. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

William M. Heaney to be postmaster at Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y., in place of W. M. Heaney. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Fred J. Land to be postmaster at Cohocton, N. Y., in place of F. J. Land. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1918.

William J. Ferrick to be postmaster at Chappaqua, N. Y., in place of W. J. Ferrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

James H. Reagan to be postmaster at Chadwicks, N. Y., in place of J. H. Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Henry J. Vollmar to be postmaster at Boonville, N. Y., in place of H. J. Vollmar. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Florence Williams to be postmaster at Bolivar, N. Y., in place of Florence Williams. Incumbent's commission expired August 10, 1918.

Fancher M. Hopkins to be postmaster at Binghamton, N. Y., in place of F. M. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Margaret D. Cochrane to be postmaster at Bedford, N. Y., in place of M. D. Cochrane. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John H. Mara to be postmaster at Beacon, N. Y., in place of J. H. Mara. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Willard H. Tappan to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Tappan. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Charles Miller to be postmaster at Baldwin, N. Y., in place of Charles Miller. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1917.

Harry J. Towner to be postmaster at Avoca, N. Y., in place of H. J. Towner. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Edward J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Amenia, N. Y., in place of E. J. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

William H. Davis to be postmaster at Altmar, N. Y., in place of W. H. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Archie S. Gould to be postmaster at Alfred, N. Y., in place of A. S. Gould. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Edward W. Harrica to be postmaster at Lyndon Mountain, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edwin Hotaling to be postmaster at Delmar, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Gertrude D. Butler to be postmaster at Croton Falls, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Archibald J. Harrison to be postmaster at Campbell, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George Q. Johnson to be postmaster at Ardsley, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Harmon S. Landon to be postmaster at Angola, N. Y., in place of Edward A. Lemmler, resigned.

Michael L. Boyle to be postmaster at Glens Falls, N. Y., in place of Charles Williamson, deceased.

William H. Chilson, jr., to be postmaster at Hannibal, N. Y., in place of Andrew B. Byrne, resigned.

William C. De Witt to be postmaster at Kingston, N. Y., in place of Sylvester R. Deyo, deceased.

Charles A. Stone to be postmaster at St. Johnsville, N. Y., in place of Chauncey G. Brown, removed.

Winfield Hocker to be postmaster at East Islip, N. Y., in place of E. J. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired November 22, 1917.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Juuius Bridger to be postmaster at Windsor, N. C., in place of J. Bridger. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Millard F. Hales to be postmaster at Wendell, N. C., in place of M. F. Hales. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

David T. Clark to be postmaster at Weldon, N. C., in place of D. T. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Robert V. Brawley to be postmaster at Statesville, N. C., in place of R. V. Brawley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Benjamin A. Summerlin to be postmaster at Mount Olive, N. C., in place of B. A. Summerlin. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Cyrus L. Linville to be postmaster at Kernersville, N. C., in place of C. L. Linville. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Thomas C. Frisbee to be postmaster at Hot Springs, N. C., in place of T. C. Frisbee. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Samuel Y. Bryson to be postmaster at Hendersonville, N. C., in place of S. Y. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1918.

Sophie H. Adams to be postmaster at Four Oaks, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles W. Bagby to be postmaster at Hickory, N. C., in place of J. H. Aiken, deceased.

William M. Hanner to be postmaster at Liberty, N. C., in place of Julia M. Smith, resigned.

Edgar P. Allen to be postmaster at Norlina, N. C., in place of Albert B. Laughter, resigned.

Thomas S. Booth to be postmaster at East Durham, N. C., in place of E. H. Avent, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Robert R. Zirkle to be postmaster at Westhope, N. Dak., in place of R. R. Zirkle. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

William W. Smith to be postmaster at Valley City, N. Dak., in place of W. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

John P. Shahane to be postmaster at Souris, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Shahane. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

John K. Diehm to be postmaster at Schafer, N. Dak., in place of J. K. Diehm. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Carl L. George to be postmaster at Sables, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Albert A. J. Lang to be postmaster at Sanborn, N. Dak., in place of A. A. J. Lang. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Patrick H. Long to be postmaster at Page, N. Dak., in place of P. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Samuel Loe to be postmaster at Northwood, N. Dak., in place of S. Loe. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Charles S. Ego to be postmaster at Lisbon, N. Dak., in place of C. S. Ego. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Robert J. Moore to be postmaster at Drayton, N. Dak., in place of R. J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Robert B. Stewart to be postmaster at Boffineau, N. Dak., in place of R. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Benjamin L. Fraser to be postmaster at Wales, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Minnie H. O'Donnell to be postmaster at Agricultural College, N. Dak., in place of Kathleen Kelly, resigned.

Minnie S. Abelein to be postmaster at Anamoose, N. Dak., in place of Peter Hengel, deceased.

Jessie J. Davy to be postmaster at Antler, N. Dak., in place of Grace E. Dumont, resigned.

Mabel Nelson to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of John McPike, resigned.

Hugh H. Parsons to be postmaster at Fessenden, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Darcy, resigned.

Thomas G. Kellington to be postmaster at New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of Walter Priest, removed.

Bernice R. Pottorf to be postmaster at Plaza, N. Dak., in place of A. O. Dahl, resigned.

Helen D. Thompson to be postmaster at Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of J. F. McMenamy, resigned.

Martin L. Vick to be postmaster at Sheyenne, N. Dak., in place of Iver K. Vick, deceased.

Ole B. Johnson to be postmaster at Forman, N. Dak., in place of Frank Argersinger, resigned.

OHIO.

John S. Gossett to be postmaster at Dennison, Ohio, in place of J. S. Gossett. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

James R. Alexander to be postmaster at Zanesville, Ohio, in place of J. R. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1918.

Emil Weber to be postmaster at Wauseon, Ohio, in place of E. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Adam E. Schaffer to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of A. E. Schaffer. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Alba A. Lathrop to be postmaster at Swanton, Ohio, in place of A. A. Lathrop. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Val Lee to be postmaster at Sidney, Ohio, in place of Val Lee. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Frank C. Schiffer to be postmaster at Shelby, Ohio, in place of F. C. Schiffer. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Fred F. Taylor to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of F. F. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

James A. Ryan to be postmaster at Sandusky, Ohio, in place of J. A. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Hiram J. Blackmore to be postmaster at Pomeroy, Ohio, in place of H. J. Blackmore. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Frank Miller to be postmaster at Paulding, Ohio, in place of F. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Harry A. Flinn to be postmaster at Orrville, Ohio, in place of H. A. Flinn. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Francis N. Cary to be postmaster at New Richmond, Ohio, in place of F. N. Cary. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Danus D. Granger to be postmaster at New London, Ohio, in place of D. D. Granger. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Jesse O. Shaw to be postmaster at Newcomerstown, Ohio, in place of J. O. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Charles B. Chilcote to be postmaster at Mount Gilead, Ohio, in place of C. B. Chilcote. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1919.

Robert E. Sickinger to be postmaster at Milan, Ohio, in place of R. E. Sickinger. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Harry C. Brown to be postmaster at Manchester, Ohio, in place of H. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Peter J. Beucler to be postmaster at Louisville, Ohio, in place of P. J. Beucler. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William E. Warren to be postmaster at Leetonia, Ohio, in place of W. E. Warren. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1918.

Jacob E. Mercer to be postmaster at Hicksville, Ohio, in place of Jacob E. Mercer. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Benjamin F. Reineck to be postmaster at Gibsonburg, Ohio, in place of B. F. Reineck. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Alexander J. Shenk to be postmaster at Delphos, Ohio, in place of A. J. Shenk. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Samuel D. Hensel to be postmaster at Continental, Ohio, in place of S. D. Hensel. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Samuel A. Kinnear to be postmaster at Columbus, Ohio, in place of S. A. Kinnear. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

David C. Van Voorhis to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of D. C. Van Voorhis. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

James A. Smith to be postmaster at Belle Center, Ohio, in place of J. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Wilber Winfield to be postmaster at Beach City, Ohio, in place of W. Winfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Anna A. Tesi to be postmaster at Yorkville, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Merril J. Humphrey to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Bronson O. Brott to be postmaster at South Euclid, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Lucius W. Carruthers to be postmaster at Groveport, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William J. Deibel to be postmaster at Doylestown, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Arthur M. Eidson to be postmaster at Cygnet, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thurman T. Courtright to be postmaster at Lancaster, Ohio, in place of Benjamin F. Price. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1917.

Rufus R. Hannahs to be postmaster at Summerfield, Ohio, in place of Russell B. Osborn. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

Charles W. Miller to be postmaster at Versailles, Ohio, in place of Thomas W. Fahnestock, deceased.

Lillie M. Neel to be postmaster at Dillonvale, Ohio, in place of Charles A. Eberle, resigned.

Tracy Forsythe to be postmaster at Brilliant, Ohio, in place of James E. Vermillion. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

OKLAHOMA.

Phillip H. Dalby to be postmaster at Ramona, Okla., in place of P. H. Dalby. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Jacob M. Casper to be postmaster at Okeene, Okla., in place of J. M. Casper. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Charles L. Williams to be postmaster at Maysville, Okla., in place of C. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Preston S. Lester to be postmaster at McAlester, Okla., in place of P. S. Lester. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Luke Roberts to be postmaster at Hollis, Okla., in place of L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Lucian B. Sneed to be postmaster at Guymon, Okla., in place of L. B. Sneed. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Michael B. Hickman to be postmaster at Coalgate, Okla., in place of M. B. Hickman. Incumbent's commission expired August 30, 1917.

William C. Parnell to be postmaster at Meeker, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Robert D. Bonham to be postmaster at Keota, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edward T. Washington to be postmaster at Douthat, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Essyl B. Logan to be postmaster at Calvin, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Bernard H. Buchanan to be postmaster at Collinsville, Okla., in place of Ernest V. Schrimsher, resigned.

Grace E. Wandell to be postmaster at Coyle, Okla., in place of J. A. Pfalzgraf, resigned.

George H. Montgomery to be postmaster at Valliant, Okla., in place of Waldo E. Watkins, resigned.

Luther E. Brown to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla., in place of T. J. Brown, resigned.

Albert E. Howell to be postmaster at Avant, Okla., in place of Dorothy A. Callen, resigned.

Starrett C. Burnett to be postmaster at Allen, Okla., in place of I. E. Strickland, removed.

Pearl B. Bouse to be postmaster at May, Okla., in place of Ellen L. Morris, resigned.

OREGON.

John P. Cooley to be postmaster at Brownsville, Oreg., in place of J. P. Cooley. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Diana Snyder to be postmaster at Aurora, Oreg., in place of D. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Nellie Elliott to be postmaster at John Day, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Albert L. Cauley to be postmaster at Fort Stevens, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Margaret Clark to be postmaster at Canyon City, Oreg., in place of C. W. Brown, resigned.

Charles A. White to be postmaster at Lakeview, Oreg., in place of T. B. Vernon, resigned.

Richard F. Evans to be postmaster at Stanfield, Oreg., in place of Edith B. Ward, resigned.

Mary J. Dunn to be postmaster at Sumpter, Oreg., in place of Ada H. Haley, resigned.

Charles R. Tyler to be postmaster at Yamhill, Oreg., in place of Guy W. Brace, declined.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John A. Robinson to be postmaster at Brownsville, Pa., in place of J. A. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Jacob L. Hershey to be postmaster at Youngwood, Pa., in place of J. L. Hershey. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Jacob T. Born to be postmaster at Wilmerding, Pa., in place of J. T. Born. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Granville L. Rettew to be postmaster at West Chester, Pa., in place of G. L. Rettew. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Corbly K. Spragg to be postmaster at Waynesburg, Pa., in place of C. K. Spragg. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Milton J. Porter to be postmaster at Wayne, Pa., in place of M. J. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Henry R. Hummel to be postmaster at Watsontown, Pa., in place of H. R. Hummel. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Abraham H. Nyce to be postmaster at Vernfield, Pa., in place of A. H. Nyce. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Michael J. O'Connor to be postmaster at Trevorton, Pa., in place of M. J. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

John F. Johnston to be postmaster at Strasburg, Pa., in place of J. F. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

George F. Trout to be postmaster at Stewartstown, Pa., in place of G. F. Trout. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

James W. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Springdale, Pa., in place of J. W. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John J. Kinney to be postmaster at South Fork, Pa., in place of J. J. Kinney. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Bartly P. McNulty to be postmaster at Ridgway, Pa., in place of B. P. McNulty. Incumbent's commission expired October 30, 1917.

Lewis Dilliner to be postmaster at Point Marion, Pa., in place of L. Dilliner. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John Kehoe to be postmaster at Pittston, Pa., in place of J. Kehoe. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Thomas Rorer to be postmaster at North Wales, Pa., in place of T. Rorer. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

James J. McArdle to be postmaster at Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of J. J. McArdle. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Charles E. Knecht to be postmaster at Nazareth, Pa., in place of C. E. Knecht. Incumbent's commission expired August 3, 1918.

Clyde S. Yothers to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of C. S. Yothers. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Edward H. Sutterley to be postmaster at Morrisville, Pa., in place of E. H. Sutterley. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Thomas E. Grady to be postmaster at Montgomery, Pa., in place of T. E. Grady. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

James P. Van Effen to be postmaster at Milford, Pa., in place of J. P. Van Effen. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John A. Hughes to be postmaster at Lyndora, Pa., in place of J. A. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Victor E. Gill to be postmaster at Latrobe, Pa., in place of V. E. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Frank M. Longstreth to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Pa., in place of F. M. Longstreth. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Joseph Rodgers, jr., to be postmaster at Lansdale, Pa., in place of J. Rodgers, jr. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Richard T. Hugus to be postmaster at Jeannette, Pa., in place of R. T. Hugus. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Peter V. Abel to be postmaster at Hastings, Pa., in place of P. V. Abel. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Edward E. Fricker to be postmaster at Glenside, Pa., in place of E. E. Fricker. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Walter K. Ashton to be postmaster at Fairchance, Pa., in place of W. K. Ashton. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Henry G. Schleiter to be postmaster at Freedom, Pa., in place of H. G. Schleiter. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1918.

Edward M. Dailey to be postmaster at Dushmore, Pa., in place of E. M. Dailey. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles L. Fox to be postmaster at Daisytown, Pa., in place of C. L. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Josephine R. Callan to be postmaster at Cresson, Pa., in place of J. R. Callan. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

John T. Butler to be postmaster at Coraopolis, Pa., in place of J. T. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Adam F. Hess to be postmaster at Clarion, Pa., in place of A. F. Hess. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William H. Nelson to be postmaster at Chester, Pa., in place of W. H. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Thomas P. Delaney to be postmaster at Castle Shannon, Pa., in place of T. P. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

James G. Paul to be postmaster at Bradford, Pa., in place of J. G. Paul. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Jacob H. Maust to be postmaster at Bloomsburg, Pa., in place of J. H. Maust. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

William H. Hartman to be postmaster at Bentleyville, Pa., in place of W. H. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Ray J. Crowthers to be postmaster at West Elizabeth, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frances H. Diven to be postmaster at West Bridgewater, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George Althouse to be postmaster at Radnor, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles E. Dusenberry to be postmaster at Newell, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

James J. Hanlon to be postmaster at Kulpmont, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Emma McNamee to be postmaster at Imperial, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edna E. Snably to be postmaster at Hollsopple, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Gertrude Griffith to be postmaster at Hellwood, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mary L. Simons to be postmaster at Harmony, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

David J. Bonsall to be postmaster at Grampian, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

John L. Goss to be postmaster at Expedit, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mabel E. Nye to be postmaster at Enon Valley, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Charles W. Blose to be postmaster at Delmont, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George H. Houck to be postmaster at Cairnbrook, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas V. Formey to be postmaster at Arnot, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Archie W. Leech to be postmaster at Beaverdale, Pa., in place of Casper S. Burtnett, resigned.

Pearl C. Zittle to be postmaster at East Downingtown, Pa., in place of Levi A. Moore, resigned.

Everett C. Davis to be postmaster at Nanty Glo, Pa., in place of Patrick J. Mash, resigned.

Alfred A. Ziegenfus to be postmaster at Palmerton, Pa., in place of William H. Gruber, deceased.

Clarence L. Kamerer to be postmaster at West Newton, Pa., in place of Frederick E. Obley, resigned.

John B. Kean to be postmaster at Alexandria, Pa., in place of Charles C. Roseborough, resigned.

PORTO RICO.

George P. DePass to be postmaster at Mayaguez, P. R., in place of G. P. DePass. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas F. Cavanaugh to be postmaster at Woonsocket, R. I., in place of T. F. Cavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

James Mangan to be postmaster at Greystone, R. I., in place of J. Mangan. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

John W. Page to be postmaster at Fort Greble, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Almira G. Blake to be postmaster at Ashaway, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Alfred Benoit to be postmaster at Anthony, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas F. Lenihan to be postmaster at Westerly, R. I., in place of John A. Farrell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Thomas P. McLeod to be postmaster at Hartsville, S. C., in place of T. P. McLeod. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

James A. Parler to be postmaster at Elloree, S. C., in place of J. A. Parler. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Loka W. Rigby to be postmaster at Moncks Corner, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Estella S. Herndon to be postmaster at Eutawville, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

David H. Taylor to be postmaster at Cameron, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Howard A. Littlejohn to be postmaster at Belton, S. C., in place of W. C. Clinkscales, resigned.

Zella D. Abercrombie to be postmaster at McCormick, S. C., in place of Andrew A. Stuart, resigned.

Stella R. Nelson to be postmaster at Ridgeway, S. C., in place of Inez H. Whitlock, not commissioned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Martin M. Judge to be postmaster at Webster, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Judge. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Demetrious S. Billington to be postmaster at Spearfish, S. Dak., in place of D. S. Billington. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William Lowe to be postmaster at Madison, S. Dak., in place of W. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Anton Koch to be postmaster at Isabel, S. Dak., in place of A. Koch. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Anthony J. Littig to be postmaster at Flandreau, S. Dak., in place of A. J. Littig. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Edward H. White to be postmaster at Castlewood, S. Dak., in place of E. H. White. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

George M. Barnett to be postmaster at Carthage, S. Dak., in place of G. M. Barnett. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1918.

Rhoda S. Owen to be postmaster at Vienna, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Calista M. Hall to be postmaster at Harrold, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hattie L. Meyer to be postmaster at Florence, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John D. Evans to be postmaster at Alpena, S. Dak., in place of Henry H. Hatch, resigned.

Leroy A. Gage to be postmaster at Bryant, S. Dak., in place of E. J. Dunn, resigned.

Herman F. Mettler to be postmaster at Colome, S. Dak., in place of C. W. Marley, resigned.

Alma J. McCormack to be postmaster at Faith, S. Dak., in place of Charles S. Engler, resigned.

Mabel H. Godron to be postmaster at Gary, S. Dak., in place of Julius Palmer, resigned.

Clarence E. Archer to be postmaster at Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of John T. Doyle, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

John L. Nowlin to be postmaster at Sparta, Tenn., in place of J. L. Nowlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Mamie E. Perkins to be postmaster at Selmer, Tenn., in place of M. E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 29, 1918.

Robert B. Schoolfield to be postmaster at Pikeville, Tenn., in place of R. B. Schoolfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1917.

Yancey Q. Caldwell to be postmaster at Paris, Tenn., in place of Y. Q. Caldwell. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1918.

Benjamin F. Grisham to be postmaster at Newbern, Tenn., in place of B. F. Grisham. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

William P. Chandler to be postmaster at Knoxville, Tenn., in place of W. P. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Kate Penn to be postmaster at Kenton, Tenn., in place of K. Penn. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Samuel W. McKinney to be postmaster at Etowah, Tenn., in place of S. W. McKinney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

George P. Atchison to be postmaster at Erin, Tenn., in place of G. P. Atchison. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Johnathan L. Haynes to be postmaster at Decherd, Tenn., in place of J. L. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1918.

John B. Dow to be postmaster at Cookeville, Tenn., in place of J. B. Dow. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Cobey D. Carmack to be postmaster at Columbia, Tenn., in place of E. W. Carmack. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

Perry L. Harned to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tenn., in place of P. L. Harned. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Florie W. Landress to be postmaster at Signal Mountain, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Walter S. Thompson to be postmaster at Ruskin, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Hugh G. Haworth to be postmaster at New Market, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

James J. Darnell to be postmaster at Morrison, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Isaac R. Barnes to be postmaster at Cowan, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Fannie J. Branch to be postmaster at Collierville, Tenn., in place of R. L. Strong, resigned.

Ulysses S. Rose to be postmaster at Crossville, Tenn., in place of W. A. Hamby, resigned.

James R. Jetton to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in place of Margaret G. Elliott, deceased.

James E. Nelms to be postmaster at Kingsport, Tenn., in place of William D. Kyle, resigned.

TEXAS.

Annie H. Hughes to be postmaster at Woodville, Tex., in place of A. Stryker. Name changed by marriage.

Ernest G. Keese to be postmaster at Stamford, Tex., in place of E. G. Keese. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William T. Jackman to be postmaster at San Marcos, Tex., in place of W. T. Jackman. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Myrtle C. Holcombe to be postmaster at Roxton, Tex., in place of M. C. Bradshaw. Name changed by marriage.

Augustus G. Hubbard to be postmaster at Paris, Tex., in place of A. G. Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1918.

Bessie L. Rorex to be postmaster at Panhandle, Tex., in place of B. L. Rorex. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Hattie M. Culpepper to be postmaster at Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Jerry N. Worsham to be postmaster at Laredo, Tex., in place of J. N. Worsham. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles T. McConnico to be postmaster at Kerens, Tex., in place of C. T. McConnico. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

John R. Folkes to be postmaster at Giddings, Tex., in place of J. R. Folkes. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Samuel H. Bell to be postmaster at Deport, Tex., in place of S. H. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Jefferson A. Davis to be postmaster at Dawson, Tex., in place of J. A. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Charles J. Debenport to be postmaster at Commerce, Tex., in place of C. J. Debenport. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Thomas A. Boothe to be postmaster at Cleveland, Tex., in place of T. A. Boothe. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

Ransom A. St. John to be postmaster at Cisco, Tex., in place of R. A. St. John. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

A. Burton Reagan to be postmaster at Brady, Tex., in place of A. B. Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1918.

Edwin Forrest, jr., to be postmaster at Blum, Tex., in place of E. Forrest, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Robert E. Rankin to be postmaster at Abilene, Tex., in place of R. E. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Tom W. Shank to be postmaster at Winona, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Pearl L. Ward to be postmaster at Roaring Springs, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Green B. Taylor to be postmaster at Pecan Gap, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Hugh R. Park to be postmaster at Krum, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Robert N. McMullen to be postmaster at Huntington, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William F. Miller to be postmaster at Happy, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Lonnie Childs to be postmaster at Fairfield, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

May E. Perry to be postmaster at Carlsbad, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

James E. Davis to be postmaster at Bullard, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Edith M. Dudley to be postmaster at Brackettville, Tex., in place of Joseph R. DeWitt, resigned.

Andrew B. Corder to be postmaster at Electra, Tex., in place of Rufus Womach Riddels, resigned.

Vincent V. Urban to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of Searcy B. Boulware, removed.

Oscar W. Gallman to be postmaster at Longview, Tex., in place of R. G. Brown, sr., deceased.

Talmage A. Smith to be postmaster at Mesquite, Tex., in place of E. P. Shands, resigned.

George A. Barnett to be postmaster at Post, Tex., in place of Mark Hardin, resigned.

Nathan E. Porter to be postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., in place of Johnnie V. Bradley, resigned.

J. Philomel Cox to be postmaster at Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of Emma M. Love, deceased.

UTAH.

George A. Zabriskie to be postmaster at Springville, Utah, in place of G. A. Zabriskie. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

James F. Day to be postmaster at Fillmore, Utah, in place of La Vieve K. Day, removed.

VERMONT.

Rodger Dwyer to be postmaster at West Rutland, Vt., in place of R. Dwyer. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

George E. Randall to be postmaster at Wells River, Vt., in place of G. E. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1918.

John H. Wood to be postmaster at Wallingford, Vt., in place of J. H. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Moses E. Leary to be postmaster at Richmond, Vt., in place of M. E. Leary. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

George W. Pierce to be postmaster at Lyndonville, Vt., in place of G. W. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Edward Dunn to be postmaster at Castleton, Vt., in place of E. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

VIRGINIA.

James W. Sibert to be postmaster at Winchester, Va., in place of J. W. Sibert. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Alexander S. Hamilton to be postmaster at Warrenton, Va., in place of A. S. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1918.

William H. Maffett to be postmaster at Vienna, Va., in place of W. H. Maffett. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Samuel M. Donald to be postmaster at Staunton, Va., in place of S. M. Donald. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Robert J. Northington to be postmaster at South Hill, Va., in place of R. J. Northington. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Henry C. Humphrey to be postmaster at Remington, Va., in place of H. C. Humphrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1919.

Jasper W. H. Lawford to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Va., in place of J. W. H. Lawford. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John W. Anderson to be postmaster at Pennington Gap, Va., in place of J. W. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles C. King to be postmaster at Pearisburg, Va., in place of C. C. King. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Leslie N. Ligon to be postmaster at Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Charlie F. Kitts to be postmaster at North Tazewell, Va., in place of C. F. Kitts. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Laura L. Keeler to be postmaster at Middleburg, Va., in place of L. L. Keeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1919.

George J. Russell to be postmaster at Marshall, Va., in place of G. J. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

George C. Carter to be postmaster at Leesburg, Va., in place of G. C. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Asa A. Ferguson to be postmaster at Lebanon, Va., in place of A. A. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Aut B. Dye to be postmaster at Honaker, Va., in place of A. B. Dye. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles F. Ratliff to be postmaster at Floyd, Va., in place of C. F. Ratliff. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Frederick A. Lewis to be postmaster at Emporia, Va., in place of F. A. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Albert N. Cocks to be postmaster at Disputanta, Va., in place of A. N. Cocks. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1918.

Gordon E. Gilly to be postmaster at Big Stone Gap, Va., in place of G. E. Gilly. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Samuel S. Brooks to be postmaster at Appalachia, Va., in place of S. S. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Charles F. Cummins to be postmaster at Fairfax, Va., in place of Claude E. Wiley, resigned.

Eugene A. Hyde to be postmaster at Saltville, Va., in place of J. B. Perfater, resigned.

WASHINGTON.

George W. Reed to be postmaster at Pullman, Wash., in place of G. W. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Talleyrand Bratton to be postmaster at Goldendale, Wash., in place of Talleyrand Bratton. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

Mae C. Cook to be postmaster at Fort Flagler, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William A. Lancaster to be postmaster at Fort Casey, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Louis H. Gurnsey to be postmaster at Addy, Wash., in place of Paul L. Paulsen, resigned.

Elizabeth M. Collins to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of Henry C. Dahlby, resigned.

Vanira Chamberlin to be postmaster at Riverside, Wash., in place of H. T. Jones, resigned.

Fred B. Goldsworthy to be postmaster at Rosalia, Wash., in place of R. P. Turnley, jr., deceased.

Lloyd E. Robinson to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of Gertrude Cosgrove, declined.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William N. Cole to be postmaster at Williamson, W. Va., in place of W. N. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

William W. Irwin to be postmaster at Wheeling, W. Va., in place of W. W. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles Lively to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of Charles Lively. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William G. Bayliss to be postmaster at Macdonald, W. Va., in place of W. G. Bayliss. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Owen J. King to be postmaster at Elkins, W. Va., in place of O. J. King. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1918.

Abner N. Harris to be postmaster at Thorpe, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1917.

William A. Stackpole to be postmaster at Pine Grove, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Hardin D. Carroll to be postmaster at Mason Town, W. Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

Edward P. Boggess to be postmaster at Lumberport, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

James B. Ballard to be postmaster at Dunbar, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Arthur J. Duncan to be postmaster at Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. D. Smith, jr., resigned.

Harry Brooke to be postmaster at Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of William M. Davis, resigned.

Walter E. Stout to be postmaster at Parkersburg, W. Va., in place of Simins Powell, removed.

WISCONSIN.

Marcus T. Syverson to be postmaster at Tomah, Wis., in place of M. T. Syverson. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

John Coppes to be postmaster at South Kaukauna, Wis., in place of J. Coppes. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Frank J. Haas to be postmaster at Richland Center, Wis., in place of F. J. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Francis H. Metcalf to be postmaster at Reedsburg, Wis., in place of F. H. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Levi Lane to be postmaster at Oconto Falls, Wis., in place of Levi Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Charles T. O'Brien to be postmaster at Necedah, Wis., in place of C. T. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Francis J. Eagan to be postmaster at Muscoda, Wis., in place of F. J. Eagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Asa H. Craig to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of A. H. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Nina M. Yeager to be postmaster at Montfort, Wis., in place of N. M. Frankland. Name changed by marriage.

George Crawford to be postmaster at Mineral Point, Wis., in place of George Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1919.

Thomas F. Powers to be postmaster at Mauston, Wis., in place of T. F. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Dorothea Devlin to be postmaster at Loyal, Wis., in place of Dorothea Devlin. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Michael J. Rice to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of M. J. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Jeremiah J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Janesville, Wis., in place of J. J. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Christian A. Hoeh to be postmaster at Edgerton, Wis., in place of C. A. Hoeh. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

John A. Kuypers to be postmaster at De Pere, Wis., in place of J. A. Kuypers. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John D. Burns to be postmaster at Colfax, Wis., in place of J. D. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Edward Cody to be postmaster at Antigo, Wis., in place of Edward Cody. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Carrie A. Anderson to be postmaster at Weyerhauser, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Albert A. Pagel to be postmaster at Schofield, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Carrie B. Carter to be postmaster at Lyndon Station, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas J. Bergen to be postmaster at Prairie du Chien, Wis., in place of A. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1917.

Libbie M. Bennett to be postmaster at Pewaukee, Wis., in place of Agnes Scholl, resigned.

Ivy R. Carman to be postmaster at Minocqua, Wis., in place of A. J. Bolger, removed.

Charles A. L. Varney to be postmaster at Greenwood, Wis., in place of K. W. Baker, resigned.

Carrie V. Richer to be postmaster at Delafield, Wis., in place of Annie W. Bartholomew, resigned.

Tracy M. Page to be postmaster at Bangor, Wis., in place of E. R. Peck, resigned.

WYOMING.

John McNamara to be postmaster at Kemmerer, Wyo., in place of J. McNamara. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

William A. Johnson to be postmaster at Green River, Wyo., in place of W. A. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Emma M. Spurgin to be postmaster at Lingle, Wyo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alvah J. Macy to be postmaster at Moorcroft, Wyo., in place of C. E. Russell, resigned.

Thomas H. Baxter to be postmaster at Jackson, Wyo., in place of Sara McKean, resigned.

Ruby E. Rimington to be postmaster at Guernsey, Wyo., in place of Ethel A. Berry, resigned.

Ira S. Bowker to be postmaster at Newcastle, Wyo., in place of George H. Greedy, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27, 1919.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Hugh Campbell Wallace to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Troy to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

Malcolm A. Franklin to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John E. Lynch to be United States marshal, eastern district of Missouri.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD.

The following-named third lieutenants to be second lieutenants in the Coast Guard:

Earl G. Rose,
Edward H. Smith,
Henry Coyle, and
Rae B. Hall.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 27, 1919.

POSTMASTER.

INDIANA.

Clarence B. Taylor to be postmaster at Howe, in the State of Indiana.