those darkest of all days, when bolder and more aggressive men than he doubted and quailed. He was more hopeful and more confident than the most of us, because his faith was loftier and more boundless. And he ennobled the struggle and hallowed the cause of the Union by severing the last shackles of the bondsmen. He looms up to us over the vista of the passing years as the great spirit of that mighty whirlwind. God gave him to us to work out a great problem in the moral world. His task was Godlike. His life, his mission, and his death were those of a martyr. And he sanctified the Union to us and to our posterity for all time to come.

When can his glory fade?
Oh, the brave charge he made—
All the world wondered.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, unless there are some other Senators who desire to address the Chair on this day, I move, in commemoration of the day and as a mark of tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *February 12, 1918.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Ruler of the universe, Father of all souls, we give thanks for this broad, fair land that contains our homes, our country, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. We are grateful for every gain that has been made tending toward a fuller realization of human freedom, equality, and fraternity; for the line of men and women who from immemorial times have led onward, step by step, noble souls of high degree, irrespective of their origin, whether of the favored classes or of the common ranks, devoted to the good, the beautiful, the true, living or dying that the world might have life and have it more abundantly.

To-day we remember our Abraham Lincoln with praise in our minds and with surging thrills in our hearts. For his purity and simplicity, his ruggedness and gentleness, his firmness and kindness, his intellectual vigor and consecrated energy, his sorrowing winsomeness and lofty nationalism, his trust in God, and his love for humanity, we humbly thank Thee. May we be worthy of his life, his death, his memory. And because of his spirit, we thank Thee also, that to-day all sectional lines are fading—busy North and valiant South, the golden West and the storied East stand in the storm and pressure of world conflict as one, at the world's service, for the eternal right, Thy America. Make us all faithful to the best in our history and to the duties and sacrifices of the hour. Bless the living men who have followed Lincoln in the presidential office. We need the judicial mind of Taft. Deliver, we pray Thee, from his illness to further service Theodore Roosevelt. And God save our President Woodrow Wilson, statesman, spokesman, Chief in our own share of the huge world-task before us.

For our Nation as a whole, in memory of our saint and martyr Lincoln and in the spirit of Christians, we offer the prayer of the Hindu, Tagore, for his land:

"Let the earth and the water, the air and the fruits of my country be sweet, my God.

"Let the homes and marts, the forests and fields of my country be full, my God.

"Let the promises and hopes, the deeds and words of my country be true, my God.

"Let the lives and the hearts of the sons and daughters of my country be one, my God."

Thus "with malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," may we continue in domestic and inner peace and obtain blessedness from Thee. In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3299. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on February 11, 1918, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 3135. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona";

S. 3081. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri; and

S. 3006. An act to authorize and empower officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps to serve under the Government of the Dominican Republic, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3648. An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3689. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, at Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 3083. An act granting to the Lincoln Highway Association, incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan, a right of way through certain public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3299. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE TUSCANIA.

Mr. HICKS rose.

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

Mr. HICKS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for two minutes to read a Canadian comment on the sinking of the *Tuscania.*

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. I read:

[From the Toronto Globe.]

THE TORPEDOED TUSCANIA.

Canada grips the hand of her big neighbor ally in profound sympathy and understanding. The United States, even before its gallant Army had opportunity to win distinction and honor on the field of battle, has been called upon to pay a serious war toll in brave lives. The torpedoeing of the transport *Tuscania*—the first success of underseas German barbarism against trans-Atlantic troopships—brings home to the great American Republic the grim realities of the struggle upon which its people have righteously and resolutely embarked. It is part of the price to be paid by nations noble enough to consecrate their best to the cause of civilization, counting not the cost.

This Dominion drinks deep of the draught of sacrifice in the same struggle. It extends the sympathy of understanding. It shares the sorrow that comes to stricken homes. It feels the same profound pride in the heroism of its sons. Canadians respond to the spirit of their stalwart cousin. They glory that in his grief his eye is clear, his mouth firm, and his jaw set. They know that Teuton terrorism has once more gone wrong in its cruel choice of would-be victims. They realize that this "fresh challenge to civilization" will tighten the determination of a strong and resolute people to carry on until the Thing is crushed and conquered.

[Applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SIMS rose.

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

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seeing if we can make a unanimous-consent agreement as to taking up the railroad-control bill, and I submit the following request: That the bill be taken up on Thursday, that general debate be limited to the subject matter of the bill and not to extend beyond Friday, and that upon the expiration of the general debate the bill be taken up under the five-minute rule and concluded if possible by Saturday night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had better leave off that last end of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I shall be compelled, Mr. Speaker, to object to that, for the reason that already I have secured unanimous consent for the consideration of the anti-profiteering rent bill on the day next following the conclusion of the bill now under consideration, Calendar Wednesday excepted, and that brings us up to Thursday.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky how long it will probably take on that bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The detailed consideration of the bill can not be had until the general debate is over, and unless the general debate is limited I do not know how long it will take. I would be very glad to see general debate on it limited to two or three hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee had better make his request in the light of what the gentleman from Kentucky has just said.

Mr. SIMS. I will modify my request to that extent, Mr. Speaker, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

Mr. GILLETT. I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. GILLETT. I am willing that we shall meet at any time for general debate, but not for the regular business of the House.

Mr. SIMS. I suppose if the bill that the gentleman from Kentucky refers to is completed on Thursday he would not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We can not go to the anti-profiteering rent bill to-day except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the housing bill will take not less than to-day. I do not think you can calculate on less than to-day for that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am willing that we should use a part of to-day and part of Thursday.

Mr. GILLETT. First, there come to-day the Lincoln speeches, and then other business. That will finish to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think we could have general debate begin when the Lincoln speeches are finished.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will resume the consideration of the housing bill after the Lincoln speeches to-day.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to facilitate business, but I do not see any hope of taking up any legislation before Friday, except what is already provided for.

The SPEAKER. Why not have this railroad bill follow the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky, if the Chair may submit a suggestion?

Mr. SIMS. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Kentucky may have something to say on that.

Mr. SIMS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the railroad-control bill be taken up for consideration immediately following the bill for which the gentleman from Kentucky already has unanimous consent, and that the House continue consideration of said railroad-control bill until it is finished.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to be accommodating, but the Committee on Appropriations is ready, whenever the House is ready to receive it, to present a deficiency bill, amounting to nearly a billion of dollars. It involves items that affect every department of this Government. There is no bill that can be more important, and therefore no order ought to be made that will seriously interfere with its consideration. If I can have assurance that on Monday, no matter what happens, this deficiency bill shall be taken up and continued until completed, I shall not object to any of these other arrangements; but I think we make very grave mistakes in tying up the House by special orders without proper vision touching what is coming afterwards, and from this time on I hope we will have very few special orders.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request.

Mr. KITCHIN. One minute. We all want to facilitate the business of the House. Could we make this arrangement, to let consideration of the railroad bill begin on Thursday?

Mr. GILLETT. The District bill comes on Thursday.

Mr. KITCHIN. I mean on Friday, and on Friday, Saturday, and Monday, and then let the deficiency bill follow on Tuesday morning?

Mr. GILLETT. Why not take up the deficiency bill on Friday and finish that first?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, how long he thinks it will take to pass the deficiency bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to put it through in two days. The bill will contain about 60 or 70 pages, and, as I say, it is a bill that carries about a billion dollars.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is one of those deficiencies the necessity of which we all recognize, of course, but it will not take any long debate.

Mr. GILLETT. The debate on it will be a good deal shorter than that on the railroad bill.

Mr. NORTON. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations relative to an item in the urgent deficiency bill for the support of Indian schools. There are a number of Indian schools which will be closed unless that bill is passed within a very few days. I expected the bill would be taken up and passed before this time. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs spoke to me about it several days ago. I hope it can be taken up and passed at the earliest possible time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I trust so, too; but if we could get some information from the Indian Department, it would expedite the consideration of these items more than anything I know of.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will have the urgent deficiency bill ready to take up in the House on Friday?

Mr. SHERLEY. The urgent deficiency bill has gone to the printer now. It can be presented to the full committee to-morrow, and can be put on the floor by Friday.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I make this suggestion to the leader of the majority, that unanimous consent be asked by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] to take up the railroad bill immediately following the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. MADDEN. No; let us not make any agreement on that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why not?

Mr. MADDEN. There may be something else in the way.

Mr. KITCHIN. What else of more importance could be taken up?

Mr. SIMS. The railroad-control bill itself carries an appropriation of $500,000,000, and it provides for the most important legislation that has been before this House since I have been a Member of it. After the committee has put in five weeks of hard work to get that bill ready, it does seem to me it should not be set aside by every bill that may come up, even though important. Of course, the deficiency bill is an important bill, but it is not as important as this one. Now, I submit a request for unanimous consent that we begin the consideration of the railroad-control bill on Monday next and continue it until finished.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman means, of course, after the completion of the urgent deficiency bill, does he not?

Mr. SIMS. Then I will submit the request amended in this way, that the railroad-control bill be taken up for consideration upon the completion of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, whether that be Saturday or Monday, or any other day.

Mr. GILLETT. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of all parties to the fact that next Monday is suspension day and Unanimous Consent Calendar day.

Mr. KITCHIN. This unanimous consent would displace that, if entered into.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman does not mean to displace Calendar Wednesday, of course?

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. SIMS. Do you mean to-morrow?

Mr. GILLETT. No; next week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] asks unanimous consent that his railroad bill shall follow immediately after the conclusion of the deficiency bill, of course not to interfere with conference reports or privileged matters or anything of that sort.

Mr. SIMS. Or Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MADDEN. Or any other calendar day, unless set aside.

The SPEAKER. Or the Monday calendar.

Mr. SIMS. I hope that will not be insisted upon.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it will be.

Mr. SIMS. On unanimous-consent day you can dispose of every bill by objecting. Now, which is the more important, a few unanimous-consent bills or action on this great railroad-control bill? We can agree to substitute some other day for unanimous consent.

Mr. MADDEN. Get your unanimous consent to consider the bill first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. Under the rule, of course, the House was entitled to Monday for District day. Under the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] the House agreed to give the District Committee the day following the completion of this pending bill. If that bill is completed during the middle of the afternoon, and the District bill is taken up, will that constitute the day for the District Committee?

The SPEAKER. Oh, the Chair thinks not. The order says the day following. Now, if Judge ALEXANDER gets through with his grist to-day, why, then the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] comes in with his appropriation bill the day after to-morrow.

Mr. MAPES. The bill will not then be taken up to-day.

Mr. KITCHIN. It can not be taken up to-day.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent the House can take up the Johnson bill immediately after this bill, but under the order it has made it could not take it up to-day, and to-morrow does not count, being Calendar Wednesday.

RELIEF OF MAIL CONTRACTOR.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 3689, authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, at Kansas City, Mo., and consider the same in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 3689 and consider it in the House. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the bill should first be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That should the Postmaster General find as a fact that the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, of Kansas City, Mo., was entered into prior to the entrance of the United States into the war with Germany, and that the prices agreed to be paid in said contract are at the present time inequitable and unjust by reason of the increase in the cost of materials and labor employed in the performance of such contract, the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the said H. H. Hogan and his bondsmen, to cancel the same or to readjust the terms of said contract in such manner as to relieve the contractor from the hardships being by him suffered on account of such increased costs and expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has given any consideration to a bill of similar purport.

Mr. MOON. The House committee has reported to the House a bill which contains a section that would cover this very question, but this particular contractor, by reason of the low rate at which he contracted for the service, is in very great distress and is losing a large amount of money every day. I am advised that before we can get the bill, to which the gentleman refers, passed he will have lost all he has unless some adjustment can be made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the Postmaster General reported to the committee on this bill?

Mr. MOON. This bill was reported to the Senate, and the Senate passed the bill unanimously.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not answer my question as to whether the Postmaster General has reported upon it.

Mr. MOON. The Postmaster General made no report; we have made no inquiry of the Postmaster General about it. This bill provides that the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, adjust the contract if the facts are such that, in his judgment, it is proper to adjust it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Another question: Whether the Postmaster General recommended the provision that is incorporated in section 4 in the omnibus Post Office bill authorizing him to readjust contracts on the star routes and for screen-wagon service.

Mr. MOON. Yes; the Postmaster General has all along suggested that for the relief of people that are in trouble. As a matter of fact, there is a law now in existence which gives him limited power to make adjustments of star routes.

Mr. STAFFORD. On yesterday a letter from the Postmaster General was submitted to me, in connection with this private bill, in which he states that this bill is not subject to as much criticism, as I recall the letter, as is the section that has been incorporated in the Post Office omnibus bill. I assumed from that letter that was written to Senator REED that he was opposed to this provision in the omnibus Post Office bill.

Mr. MOON. I did not know that the Postmaster General had ever been consulted—he has not by me—in regard to the provision in the omnibus bill. But I know as a matter of fact that the Postmaster General has favored all along the giving of discretion to the department to adjust the equities of parties in distress on account of conditions that could not be foreseen.

Mr. STAFFORD. It occurred to me that in giving special consideration to a private bill which has never been passed upon by the House committee that if we allow this bill to be considered under these circumstances we will be plagued by any number of similar bills that will be presented to us from day to day.

Mr. MOON. I do not think the apprehensions of the gentleman from Wisconsin are well founded, because there are not a great many instances where distress exists as in this case. This is a sort of an emergency proposition. We do not want to break the man.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I could have the assurance of the chairman of the committee that he will not present any further private bills of similar tenor until the general legislation is enacted, I would withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, is this a request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I object.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. MOON. This contractor lives in the district of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and he knows the facts, and I would like for him to present them to the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I presume that this contractor is entitled to readjustment of his contract; but the gentleman from Tennessee is aware of the fact that there are hundreds of contracts which were entered into prior to the beginning of the war where the contractor is suffering great loss and hardship owing to the increased cost of everything. What is there in this particular case that so differentiates it from all other cases that it is necessary to take it up now and give relief in this one particular case?

Mr. MOON. I fully agree with the gentleman from Wyoming that if there are a number of these cases they ought to be adjusted. The Government of the United States, under the peculiar conditions that have arisen since the war began, I take it, does not want to press too hardly upon any of these people. We want to relieve your folks and anybody else. It is the desire of the committee to do that; and in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], I do not think there will be any other legislation that is special; at least, I shall not favor any, because I want to press through the general measure at once. I understand from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], in whose district this man lives, that there are peculiar equities in his behalf, and I feel that it is a matter of justice that this measure, which has passed the Senate, should be considered now. If this man is losing money by delay, we do not want the delay to occur. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, we want this man to go ahead with his contract while he is still solvent. If this lasts much longer the man will become insolvent, and while he is still solvent the fair thing to do is to readjust the contract and let him go on with it. It is an important thing to Kansas City.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the pneumatic-tube service which was introduced for the relief of post offices like this in Kansas City was put out of business by the screen-wagon service because it was supposed to be cheaper than the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. BORLAND. I could not say about that. We have never had the pneumatic-tube service in Kansas City.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the screen-wagon contractors have now got the pneumatic-tube service people down and that their property is practically confiscated; and if so, does it not come with bad grace to ask for relief from contracts which they can not perform?

Mr. BORLAND. I think there is no conflict there. We never have had the pneumatic-tube service in Kansas City.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The screen-wagon man has put the pneumatic-tube man out, and now, finding he can not keep his contract, asks relief.

Mr. BORLAND. This man never put anybody out.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall have to object unless the chairman of the committee can assure me that this whole business is confined to Kansas City, Mo., and does not enter Kansas City, Kans. Does this contract reach into Kansas City, Kans., or is it confined to Missouri?

Mr. MOON. It is confined to the contractor there, who is suffering under peculiar conditions.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman does not get me. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is from Kansas City, Mo., and he is not able to give me the positive information. There are two towns side by side there—Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo. If this contract is only for Kansas City, Mo., it is not my purpose to object. I may not object, anyway, but I want to know more about it if it concerns Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. MOON. My information is that that is so, but I could not be positive.

Mr. LITTLE. I should have to object until I know whether it applies to the city that I represent or I learn more about it.

Mr. BORLAND. If it affects the gentleman's district, it would affect it favorably.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.] How did the gentleman from Missouri get the floor?

Mr. LITTLE. I am asking a question.

The SPEAKER. Or anyone else? [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. I would be glad to yield, but I do not want to prolong the discussion.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The Government, through the Post Office Department, every four years enters into a contract for the supply of envelopes. About two years ago, when envelopes were comparatively cheap, it entered into a contract, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars, for all the envelopes of the United States. I am told that these envelopes sold to the Government to-day under that contract cost the contractor over $100,000 a year of actual loss. Does the gentleman intend to bring in bills to relieve people from actual loss in cases like that?

Mr. MOON. We hope to be able to do so, and I think the bill now pending, while it does not cover that exact question, can and ought to be amended so as to cover it.

Mr. GOOD. Does not the gentleman think we ought to bring in a general bill to include all of these items? If he is going to release one concern from a contract he ought to release all.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. MOON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I request that this bill be sent to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 92, to defer first payments upon homestead entries for lands in the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider Senate joint resolution 92, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 92.

Resolved, etc., That all first payments upon homestead entries heretofore made for lands within the boundaries of the south half of the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington be, and they are hereby, deferred for the period of one year from the date upon which such payments become due.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to kindly withdraw that for the present.

Mr. DILL. Very well, I will withdraw it for the present.

PRESENTATION OF SERVICE FLAG TO THE SPEAKER.

Mr. EMERSON rose.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this beautiful silk service flag which I hold in my hand was sent to me by some admirers of the Speaker of this House, in Cleveland, Ohio, with the request that I present it to him. His only son is in the service of the United States, and I assure you that it affords me very great pleasure to present this flag to the Speaker of this House. [Prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House, I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Ohio and the people of his city for presenting me with this flag. It is dear to the hearts of all of us, and the prayer of 110,000,000 free people is that it will never be lowered or trailed in the dust. [Applause.]

A large part of this day is set aside for memorializing Abraham Lincoln. He was born in the district of the Hon. BEN JOHNSON, of Kentucky, who so ably represents that old district, and the Chair will ask him to preside during these ceremonies. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until Friday to present the minority views on the railroad bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] asks unanimous consent that he shall have three days in which to present the minority views of the committee on the railroad bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this birthday of Abraham Lincoln I think we ought to have a full attendance of the House, and I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

Almon	Godwin, N. C.	Kiess, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.
Austin	Goodall	LaGuardia	Scott, Pa.
Beakes	Gould	Lea, Cal.	Scully
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Lesher	Sherley
Caldwell	Gray, Ala.	McClintic	Sisson
Capstick	Gray, N. J.	McCormick	Sloan
Carter, Mass.	Gregg	McFadden	Smith, T. F.
Cary	Griest	Magee	Snyder
Chandler, N. Y.	Hamill	Maher	Sterling, Ill.
Chandler, Okla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mann	Sterling, Pa.
Crago	Haskell	Mason	Strong
Crosser	Hastings	Meeker	Sullivan
Curry, Cal.	Heaton	Miller, Minn.	Swift
Davidson	Heintz	Montague	Templeton
Dewalt	Helvering	Moores, Ind.	Tilson
Dooling	Hollingsworth	Nicholls, S. C.	Tinkham
Doremus	Hood	Nichols, Mich.	Treadway
Drukker	Humphreys	Olney	Vare
Dyer	Husted	Platt	Ward
Eagle	Hutchinson	Polk	Watson, Pa.
Estopinal	James	Powers	Weaver
Fairchild, B. L.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ragsdale	Webb
Fairchild, G. W.	Jones, Tex.	Riordan	White, Ohio
Flynn	Kahn	Rodenberg	Wilson, La.
Focht	Kelley, Mich.	Rose	Young, N. Dak.
Gallagher	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowland	
Glass	Key, Ohio	Sanders, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 322 Members, a quorum, answered to their names.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agred to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. ASHBROOK was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of attendance of Assay Commission at Philadelphia.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1918.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on War Claims.

Very respectfully,
W. B. WALTON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized to read Lincoln's Gettysburg address. [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL (reading)—

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate

a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. [Applause.]

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 109 years ago to-day one of the world's greatest characters was born. A little shanty in the backwoods of Kentucky was his birthplace. Want was his godmother. Obscurity was his by inheritance. No pride and ceremony attended his humble birth. The lonely voices of the wilderness sang his only lullaby. The little family and the great outdoors and the mystic heart of nature, and that was all—and so was born Abraham Lincoln. Back toward antiquity stretches the path that mankind has followed. Here and there along the course stand mileposts to mark the way. Such an one was Abraham Lincoln. No other man of our race has so left his impress upon the world as he. No other man of our people has been so much of an inspiration to fairness and justice and national morality. Universal reverence attends his memory, an affectionate reverence shared, I may say, by many who remember with heartfelt pride and affection their fathers who fought against him in the conflict. [Applause.] He came of a stalwart race. He was descended from one of those stiff-necked English breeds that fled to the American wilds because they would not submit to an odious and hateful Government. The blood that was in him was the blood of the pioneer and the freethinker. His humble surroundings, the poverty and meagerness of his childhood days, his struggles with adversity, were the contributing causes that led to a firm and resolute character. The mighty forests, as yet unaltered by the woodman's ax, the untracked wilderness of the prairies, the sweeping currents of mighty rivers as they flowed through the virgin country to the sea, bred constancy and devotion and humanity and good common sense.

The times were ripe for a character of heroic mold. For 40 years this people had been trying to avoid the issue. Compromise and artifice and subterfuge had delayed the coming of the decision. Every statesman of the period had exercised his talent and wisdom to contrive some way the trial by fire might not be necessary. Washington and Jefferson dimly saw the crisis ahead of them. Jackson sensed it. Henry Clay saw its ominous shadow and by his talents avoided it for the time. Daniel Webster foresaw it. Stephen A. Douglas attempted again to postpone it. But it was coming, as every moral issue will come to a people in its time. A postponement, a palliation, simply brings in the end a greater weight of misery and catastrophe. Abraham Lincoln grew up in this atmosphere. The blood that was in him, the training of his early life, had inclined him to follow not the beaten paths of thought, but, with logic and directness, to press forward directly to the object to be attained. Thus out of the welter and maze of political thought and the shifting scenes of the times suddenly he stepped out as the champion of a strong, indissoluble Federal union, a nationalist, and became at once, as has been so aptly said of him by Henry Watterson, "the incarnation of the brain and soul of the Union." In a driving storm of political controversies, with the columns of the temple already toppling about him, he was chosen by the people as their Chief Magistrate.

The labors that confronted Abraham Lincoln were Herculean. The problems that had to be solved were problems that had never before been propounded nor had solution. He must create an army and navy out of nothing; he must rehabilitate the credit of the country and finance a war while the Treasury was empty and the people divided.

We of the present generation are engaged in the greatest war in history. Back through the dusty chronicles of the human race we read of the death and desolation of a thousand wars. Painfully and slowly, through blood and treasure and tears, has our race ascended from savagery. But in all the annals of man, there never before has been a contest when all the world was whelmed in the conflict. We have taken our stand in this struggle. We stand for right and justice and human liberty. As one man we take up our weapons and bare our breasts for the struggle that we would forbear, if we could, and yet, in the sight of God, and for the rights of free peoples, we dare not. We speak as one man. We have no divided counsels among us. The giant is girding on his armor; at the ruddy forge he shapes his sword. Woe to tyrants when he strikes! [Applause.]

But how different was the position of Abraham Lincoln. Solitary and alone he stood; the confederation of our fathers, the Union of States, was about to dissolve into its constituent elements. There was a great sentiment in the country favorable to his ideas, but he must consolidate and crystallize it and make of it a concrete force. He was denounced and upbraided in the House of Representatives. He was besieged by hordes of office-seekers, caring not so much for the preservation of the Union as for political perquisites. He was made the butt of every cartoonist. He was maligned and slandered by a thousand papers, not alone in the South but in the North as well. Horace Greeley, in the New York Tribune, thundered, "On to Richmond! On to Richmond!" and forced the catastrophe of Bull Run. "Let the erring sisters depart in peace," cried Greeley in every home in the North. "Save our boys; let us have peace, peace at any price," came from all sides. A storm of criticism descended upon him at every failure, at every check, and at every new sacrifice. Viewing the matter from the perspective of over half a century, we know how unjust such criticism is. Criticism should never be offered in time of war, unless it be constructive criticism, and such as may aid in the contest with the common enemy. By all this, the great, gentle spirit of Lincoln was troubled, but not shaken. He had but one goal ahead of him, and that the preservation of the Union. With unremitting zeal and serene confidence he went forward with his eyes upon this goal.

There were many who assailed his acts as unconstitutional. The calls for volunteers, the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, the draft, and almost every other Executive act were denounced as violations of the fundamental law of the land. A profound believer in the maintenance of constitutional forms, he yet had ever before his eyes a higher object—the maintenance of the Union. If the Union were in danger, the constitutional forms must yield to the higher necessity. And so it should ever be. Constitutions are but the machinery men create to preserve established government, and if by human error the Constitution will not provide safety for a free people in extremity, then surely the safety of the people must be first provided for, and the people may be trusted to correct the constitutional error when the storm is passed and the State secure. Abraham Lincoln no doubt thought, when this storm of criticism broke about him—and I commend this thought to those critics to-day who continually decry the unconstitutionality of the measures we are taking for the Nation's safety—that it is better to have a country without a Constitution than to have a Constitution without a country. [Applause.]

When Abraham Lincoln took his seat he was confronted by chaos. The Treasury was bankrupt. On four occasions between Lincoln's election and his inauguration President Buchanan negotiated loans to pay the running expenses of the Government. The Regular Army consisted only of about 18,000 men, poorly equipped, scattered over the country. There were few munitions and supplies for an army in the country. The Southern States were in arms, led by resolute and talented leaders. A considerable element in the North was openly hostile to him. France and England were unfriendly. Of temporal power he had none. There was but one thing he could do, and he did it. With simple confidence in the cause he espoused, with serene faith and unfaltering trust he cried out to his people, "Come and help me, the Union must be preserved." [Applause.] And then they came, from the farm, from the forge, from the pulpit, and from the plow, the mighty Volunteer Army of 1860 to 1865. And just across the line the martial drum was calling, calling to the men of the Southland. And out of the North and up from the South came the flower of youth and chivalry and strength. There were the waving of bright flags, and the show of brave men, and the pomp and panoply of war; and then four cruel, bloody, desolate years; back and forth across the continent struggled the lines of blue and the lines of gray. Four sad and bitter years. But at the end there came a day when the roll of drums was dead and the clash of arms and tumult died as a storm that fades in the far-off sky. Then a breeze came from the sea, and it shook out the folds of one flag and it waved over all the land, a symbol of the Union of a mighty people, which, please God, shall endure. [Applause.]

This contest called for the best blood of our land. Each State gave the best it had. I know I may be pardoned if I allude, with

just pride, to the illustrious sons of my beloved Illinois—Palmer, and Logan, and Ulysses S. Grant. And some States gave to both. Virginia, the mother of Presidents, gave to the lost cause Robert E. Lee, the plumed knight of the Confederacy, and Jackson, he that stood like a stone wall; and to the Union she gave Scott and Samuel Phillips Lee, he who led the line with his ship, when Farragut roared from the rigging, "Never mind the torpedoes, go ahead," and Thomas, the Rock of Chickamauga. To-day, as with high emprise we strike for democracy and the right to live and be free, God grant that among our men under the Nation's flag, over there across the seas, there is another Grant, another Lee, another Thomas, another Stonewall Jackson. [Applause.] In this day of days, O Ruler of the destinies of nations, give us great leaders, for our cause is just, and must prevail! [Applause.]

In these latter days we are apt to forget our experiences and our necessities caused by the Civil War. President Lincoln freely asked and freely received great powers from Congress. He was authorized to use the Army and Navy as he thought fit; ample sums were voted to him to expend at his pleasure. He was authorized to take possession of and operate all the railroad and telegraph lines of the country, to impress their employees into the military service, to fix the compensation of the owners through a commission appointed by himself, and retain them as long as necessary. Under this act he did take possession of and operate 2,105 miles of railroad, located in 11 States, and built 641 miles of new road. He was authorized to call from the States all men between the ages of 18 and 45 as militia when he chose and to suspend the writ of habeas corpus whenever and wherever he desired. A draft act was passed giving broader powers than our present selective-draft act does. Thirteen loans were authorized by Congress at his suggestion, totaling approximately $2,500,000,000.

To me the most remarkable phase of Abraham Lincoln's life was the constructive side. He was a builder. Even in times of greatest stress, when the continuance of our institutions was being tried before the supreme court of the people, he was building for the future. In the very beginning of his administration he called to his side the strongest men and best counselors he might obtain in the land, irrespective of political complexion. To illustrate this, Edwin M. Stanton was in Washington criticizing the conduct of the war with fury and scorn and condemning the President as an "imbecile" when he was called to the Cabinet as Secretary of War. This was the same man who stood with bowed head and tear-wet face as the great spirit went out, and said in his anguish, "Now he is with the ages." The great war President called these men around him for constructive purposes, that, while destructive forces for the time held sway, they might not be permitted to disturb the foundations of national prosperity, greatness, and strength after that struggle was concluded. War is a degenerating process, and that nation is doubly wise that looks ahead to the period when the war shall end and shields and protects and defends its economic strength for that day. Abraham Lincoln did this thing. He had vision. He could see, through rifts in the clouds of war, the sun of prosperity shining and an era of economical and moral greatness dawning for the reunited Nation. A casual inspection of the legislation enacted during the Civil War illustrates this. A system of high and protective import tariffs was devised, a system that produced great revenues and developed the industrial resources of the country; the building of railroads across the country was induced by favorable land grants; the great homestead laws were enacted that developed the West and made an empire west of the Mississippi; national banks and banking were inaugurated. These and many other constructive measures were enacted and put into operation. While the war had been an immense drain upon the resources of the country, the constructive statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln and his Cabinet had so conducted the affairs of the Nation that at the close of the struggle this Nation stood on the firmest and most secure economic and financial foundation that it had occupied since the formation of the Government.

A war that teaches a people efficiency and economy and nationalism may not be an unmixed evil, but a war that destroys industry and tears down the foundations of economic greatness is a disaster. If anything is to be concluded from the history of the legislation I have briefly detailed, it is that while it is axiomatic that in times of peace we should prepare for war, it is doubly true that in times of war we should prepare for peace. [Applause.]

The war of the States passed, like an ugly dream. Then the Nation turned to bind up its wounds and prepare for the hopeful future. To those who pressed him for vengeance and punishment Abraham Lincoln turned smilingly and said in his homely phrase: "Let them come home." Had he lived, there would have been no reconstruction days, no Ku-Klux Klans. [Applause.] When the hand of a crazed and misguided fanatic struck him down, there died at once the savior of the Union and one of the best friends the South ever had. [Applause.]

A sorrowing people bore him home and buried him in the great prairies of his own Illinois, to rest there until the trump shall sound and time shall end. And his very ashes, so lying there, are a constant inspiration to every son of Illinois, aye, to every son of America, as the years go by, to stand for truth and justice and humanity. A thousand years may come and go; the snows of a thousand winters may fall upon his lowly resting place; the summer sun may awaken into smiling gladness the flowers that spring by his grave as the centuries pass; the stately granite above him may crumble and decay, but while men live and go their way Abraham Lincoln lives; his great, kindly, sympathetic heart finds answering throbs in the breasts of his beloved people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the nineteenth century is widely and properly known as the wonderful century. In all the sweep of human experience within the entire compass of the world's achievement no other century witnessed so great an advance in the diffusion of knowledge, the accumulation of wealth, the multiplication of mechanical inventions and scientific discoveries, the refinements of literature, or the expansion and acceptance of the principles of human liberty among the political governments of the world.

In that century of marvelous things and marvelous men no single year gave birth to so distinguished a list of men of genius and renown as did the year 1809. It may well be doubted whether any single year in history can record so impressive a group. In that year were born Chopin, the delicate, subtle, perfect artist, and Mendelssohn, whose melodies have soothed and inspired the hearts of men and women for three-quarters of a century.

Among this notable galaxy is Edgar Allan Poe, the unfortunate, gloomy poet whose verse is so free from the touch of commercialism and the vulgar worship of material success; and Oliver Wendell Holmes, whose refreshing wit and kindly philosophy never drained life of its faith in itself. In this year Lord Tennyson was born, destined to be freely acknowledged as the true Victorian poet of English literature.

In this celebrated company belongs also the name of Charles Darwin, the fearless and undaunted seeker after truth, whose intellectual searchlight, whatever our opinions of what it claimed to reveal, penetrated far into the hitherto unexplored recesses of scientific research.

In the realm of public life in the nineteenth century two great names stand out before the English-speaking world as stars of the first magnitude, both of whom were born in this same year 1809. One was William E. Gladstone, of England; the other, Abraham Lincoln, of America. Rich as it was in statesmanship, England produced no personality of greater gift or purity than Gladstone; and in America no man appeared above the political horizon more masterful in knowledge of his countrymen or more sagacious in the direction of great movements of the people than Mr. Lincoln.

It would be difficult to imagine a greater contrast in circumstance or human environment than that which gave form and vigor to the careers of these two marvelous men. Gladstone was born in the most fortunate and advantageous circumstances, in an old and cultivated society, with ample means of personal enrichment, and amid avenues of culture and refinement to which he had easy access. He was a student at Oxford at a time when great teachers deeply moved its staid conservatism. He entered public life on the eve of great national expansion. He was called again and again to the leadership of profound movements for the liberation of humanity. Bitterly assailed, fiercely opposed and denounced, he was nevertheless recognized as a great and unique personality, eager, enthusiastic, impetuous, and ardent alike in the pursuit of knowledge and the advancement of the welfare of his fellow man.

The life and work of Lincoln are commemorated in all parts of this continent with such sincere emotions of admiration and sympathy that I need not do more than recall by contrast the bleak surroundings of his childhood, the cramped and narrow circumstances of his youth, the absence of educational advantages or other conditions making success easy, his almost marvelous self-education, and the mysterious transformation of the self-taught circuit rider of the old frontier into one of the heroes of humanity.

On January 27, 1837, when only 28 years of age, Lincoln delivered an address upon the subject of "Ambition," in the course of which he used the following passage:

Towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored. It sees no distinction in adding story to story upon the monuments of fame erected to the memory of others. It denies that it is glory enough to serve under any chief. It scorns to tread in the footsteps of any predecessor, however illustrious.

Among the able and distinguished group of men whom I have named, none came so close to the fulfillment of this description of the force and power of genius as did Mr. Lincoln himself.

No man, Mr. Speaker, can trace the pedigree of genius. It will not submit to analysis. It is as mysterious and illusive as the hidden forces of nature. Its light seems now and then to fade and disappear, only to reappear again after the lapse of generations, to illuminate the visions of groping and bewildered men. It was thus with Lincoln. No man need stop to explain the alchemy which transformed this backwoods, frontier boy into a cherished historical figure. It belongs to the phenomena of human experience.

And yet, much as has been said and written concerning his lowly origin, we must not therefore conclude that in his veins there was no heritage of heroic blood. We must not forget that through him and Daniel Boone, the frontier hero of the Kentucky wilderness, the same blood coursed from equally stout and dauntless hearts, for they were cousins. Lincoln was born of the stuff of which are made men of fiber and originality. For generations in his family there had been close contact with the soil as well as with the privations and dangers of pioneer life in Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois. His own life was spent upon the skirmish line of advancing civilization. He dwelt amidst the rustic philosophy of a new land and a new day, and from its inexhaustible storehouse he gathered around himself a homely wisdom which served alike to guide his neighbors and his country.

It is not strange that around his career there clusters so much of romance. It is not strange that young men and old, rich and poor, wise and ignorant, have sought to recover the broken threads of tradition out of which to weave the story of his life. It is not strange that books without number have attempted to trace and fathom the depth and meaning of his eventful life and the source of its inspiration. It is not strange that with increasing years we still hang upon the recital of each new story and the repetition of those that are old.

We know that he was an orator. We know that he moved hearts, and intellects he persuaded by the force of his own integrity. But where did he obtain his clear, facile speech? Where did he acquire that power of orderly and logical expression which made his speeches models of pure diction? Surely not from an extensive reading of many books. Not in the intellectual atmosphere of colleges or universities. We are told that he had rarely attended school, and that his early reading consisted mainly of the Bible, Æsop's Fables, Robinson Crusoe, Pilgrim's Progress, and Parson Weems's Life of Washington, which, however, had made a lasting impression upon his youthful mind. We are informed by one of his biographers that in his home he had practically no library, except a few books placed upon the center table, perhaps by Mrs. Lincoln herself, for ornamental purposes. But his passion for knowledge had driven him to invade every library within his reach, and with the accumulation of knowledge gathered from every book he mastered he combined also the power of expression. His speech was wonderfully clear, simple, and forceful, abounding in epigram, maxims, figures of speech, and telling illustration. To his earlier reading he added an intimate knowledge of Burns and Shakespeare, many of whose passage he knew from memory.

While he was himself an orator, he appreciated oratory in others and was frequently touched by the tenderness and pathos of other speeches. On February 2, 1848, Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, delivered a speech in the House of Representatives on the War with Mexico. After listening to this speech, Mr. Lincoln, who was likewise a Member of the House, wrote as follows to his partner, William H. Herndon:

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, a little, slim, pale-faced, consumptive man, with a voice like Logan's, has just concluded the very best speech of an hour's length I ever heard. My old, withered, dry eyes are full of tears yet. If he writes it out anything like he delivered it, our people shall see a good many copies of it.

He likewise read the great speeches made by others and the thoughts they expressed were frequently so caught up by the force of his genius that he redressed them in his own simpler language, and the people heard more readily and understood.

From what source also did he derive his great sympathy for and his unfailing knowledge of the people? Not from books. Not from an assumed superiority, though he was not unaware of his own great gifts. Not from the seclusive company of the intellectual aristocrats of his day. Not from all of these, but rather from his closeness to the heart of the world. He could not persuade himself to forget nor appear to overlook the humble and honest pioneers who were the companions of his youth. This noble spirit stands out in clear relief in his loyalty and sympathy in the defense of "Duff" Armstrong, whose father had been Lincoln's wrestling companion in the old days at New Salem. He was a distinguished exception to that sometimes erroneous maxim that "familiarity breeds contempt." He believed in the people, and from them he drew strength and courage because, with them, he kept his feet upon the earth.

So, Mr. Speaker, scanning the record of the majestic sweep of this prodigy of the wilderness from Nolins Creek to the Presidency of the greatest of the world's Republics, we pay tribute to the honesty, the courage, and the vision of Abraham Lincoln. We pay tribute to him in his childhood, so full of sadness and hard privation; in his youth, so buoyant and cheerful, so expressive of the ambitions and seemingly unattainable longings of a boy's heart; in his manhood, which grew out of the experience of circumstances so grim and unpromising. We pay tribute to his loyal friendship and to his public and private magnanimity of heart.

Men may differ, now as heretofore, over the degree of his greatness as a lawyer, but few there are who can not acknowledge his devotion to his matured conceptions of justice, for even sometimes in his pursuit of the jealous mistress of the law he "disdained the beaten path and sought regions hitherto unexplored" in his intensity of effort to bring into play the fundamentals of justice in the affairs of men.

It is easy to accommodate those who have flattered us and inflated our opinions of ourselves. It is expected that we shall repay in some measure the compliments and generosities of our friends; but it is hard for men in their weakness, jealousy, and egotism to forgive or favor those who deliberately injure or insult them through a presumption of superior social or intellectual attainments. To possess the quality of magnanimity is one of the sublime attributes of mind and heart.

The pages of history are filled largely with the records of selfishness, prejudice, ambition, cruelty, bigotry, intolerance, hatred, despotism, and tyranny which too often have marred the activities of men of great ability and responsibility. But we may search in vain the written page to find a sublimer example of magnanimity than that which characterized many of Lincoln's dealings with friend and foe. Some of these manifestations of broadness and lack of the spirit of revenge are so unusual as to have set him apart from among the commonplaces of his generation.

There is a story which has been told many times, but which will bear repetition here, which typifies his true spirit of magnanimity. It occurred in connection with his activities as a lawyer. There had been a famous lawsuit brought in the United States circuit court at Chicago, being the famous case of McCormick against Manny, for the infringement of a patent right. The case had been transferred for trial at Cincinnati as being more convenient for the judge who was expected to preside. The plaintiff, McCormick, was represented by the famous Baltimore lawyer, Reverdy Johnson, and E. N. Dickerson. The defendant had employed as his counsel George Harding, of Philadelphia, Edwin M. Stanton, and Abraham Lincoln. While Lincoln had acquired a State-wide reputation in Illinois as a lawyer, he had never seen either Harding or Stanton. He had undergone great preparation for the trial of this case, because not only the importance of the case, but distinguished counsel on both sides he regarded as worthy of his best efforts. Stanton and Harding were both in Cincinnati when Lincoln arrived and had taken rooms at the Burnett House, then a leading hotel in that city. When Lincoln arrived at the hotel Stanton and Harding were out and Lincoln awaited their return. He stationed himself at the entrance of the hotel where Stanton and Harding soon approached, greeted Lincoln with indifference, and passed on to their room. Upon reaching the room Stanton insisted that it would never do to let a man of Lincoln's type make an argument in the case. Mr. Harding described Lincoln as awkward and ungainly in appearance, his clothing entirely devoid of the tailor's art and in no particular suitable to his long, angular frame. He wore heavy boots and his appearance was very much like that of the average western farmer of that period.

Having determined that Lincoln should not be allowed to make a speech in the case, Stanton and Harding sought a method to break the news to Mr. Lincoln. Lincoln was finally sent for and informed that as there were only two lawyers on the other side of the case, they had determined that there could only be two speeches on their side, and that those two would be made by

Harding and Stanton. Mr. Lincoln replied, "Very well, gentlemen; I have here some suggestions which I had intended to use in my argument, which you are at liberty to use if you see fit," taking, as he spoke, a manuscript from his pocket and handing it to Harding. Mr. Lincoln soon left the room, and as soon as he was out Harding threw the manuscript into the waste basket unopened. Stanton referred to him as "A long, lank creature from Illinois, wearing a dirty linen ulster for a coat, on the back of which the perspiration had splotched wide stains that resembled a map of the continent." It is beyond doubt that this contemptuous treatment stung Lincoln. But he made no complaint, and notwithstanding he could not have forgotten it, he had the unparalleled magnanimity, soon after he became President, to make this man his Secretary of War. If any man can find a parallel to this in the history of any other great man in this or any other country, he will have made a discovery that is beyond my knowledge. It should be said to his credit that Stanton became the true, loyal, and devoted friend of Lincoln, was at his side when he crossed the river which separated him from the Great Beyond and gave utterance to the historic sentence, "Now he belongs to the ages."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the qualities which make his memory sacred to the Nation. These are the qualities which receive full praise from friend and foe alike. These are the qualities which illuminate his pathway through the stirring times in which he dwelt, and these are the qualities which, if he had lived, would have aided him in binding up the Nation's wounds and saved it from the orgy of corruption and outrage which it suffered at the hands of less skillful and less scrupulous men.

In reading the history of that period I have been many times unable to conceive the possibility of such patience as Lincoln exhibited in the face of clamor, jealousy, contempt, scorn, ridicule, and venality which were thrown into his face by those who were disconsolate over any management but their own. Vituperation, slander, vulgar invective, and the ingenuity of corrupt politics all connived at his downfall and sought to destroy the confidence of the people in his sincerity of purpose and in his ability to execute his purposes. He was referred to by widely known public men as "The baboon in the White House," and "The idiot at the other end of the Avenue." He was accused of treason and disloyalty, of incompetence, and lack of vision. With some he was too weak, with others too strong. He was even accused of having "ceased to function." The politicians became impatient and flaunted their distemper to seek a cheap notoriety. Senator Grimes wrote to Fessenden, "We are going to destruction as fast as imbecility, corruption, and the wheels of time can carry us." Even Stanton had written of "The painful imbecility of Lincoln." Then, as now, there were too many ununiformed majors and field marshals in Congress. Then, as now, there were too many self-seeking, ambitious men disgruntled because they were not in charge of the Government. Then, as now, there were too many smokeless military heroes who bemoaned, in characteristic fashion, the desolate fate of a Nation so benighted as not to recognize them as divinely anointed deliverers. Then, as will happen now, these marplots were confounded and the firm hand and patient spirit into whose keeping God had placed the destiny of a Nation stepped out into the full illumination of a world figure. [Applause.]

Three and fifty years have passed since the assassin's bullet prevented him from doing more than look, like Moses, into the peaceful realms of the "Promised Land." I have often tried to speculate upon the course of our history if this unhappy event had never happened. But speculation is as dangerous as prophecy, and I shall venture neither, except to voice the belief that the same patience and lofty conceptions of justice which guided his course in relation to other great problems would have determined his course in the process of binding up the Nation's wounds, of which he spoke in the second inaugural address.

Twice since the close of the Civil War our Nation has unfurled its flag and unsheathed its sword in behalf of human liberty. Twice a reunited Nation, rebaptized in the spirit of the fathers, has advanced in the pathway of the hordes of oppression, and as we look to-day upon our own fair land and other fair lands, threatened by spoliation, outrage, and slavery, we realize that our problems differ only in degree from those which confronted the founders and preservers of our national life and institutions. They kindled the light of liberty. It was theirs to fan and strengthen its flickering blaze until it could burn of its own force. Ours is the duty to prevent its being blown out entirely by the storms of organized rapacity and military despotism now seeking to overwhelm it. Not only is it our duty to see that what our forefathers fought and died to establish and preserve shall not be swallowed up in the gloom of eternal night on the shores of America, but as a part of the social and political fabric of the world, recognizing and ready to perform our share of the service and sacrifice, we must offer a ready and effective arm to those who are fighting for the things which we hold dear, some of whom helped us establish the liberty for which we now propose to fight.

It is fortunate that since the healing of the wounds and the elimination of the misunderstandings of the Civil War, one of whose central figures we recall to-day, we have been able to accumulate the forces necessary for the conflict. It is fortunate that in wealth we have outstripped other nations; that in morality and religion we have been leaders of modern thought and activity; that in education we have recognized the duty of the citizen and the State in their mutual relations; that we have coined our brain into the instruments of peace; and, since the conflict has come, that we have the ingenuity which will coin that brain into the agencies by which organized militarism and brutal autocracy shall be unhorsed and the great institutions of the world set again upon their feet.

It is therefore under circumstances like these that we pause for a while to-day, not in jollification, not in light-hearted festivity, but rather in a spirit of solemn consecration for the duties that press upon us and for the successful accomplishment of the things to which we all have set our hands. We had hoped that we might be permitted to run our course unhindered and unthreatened by the ambitions of European monarchs. We had hoped that we would not be compelled to draw the sword in defense of principles dear to the heart of all free people. But it could not be. Seeing our institutions and the inalienable rights of humanity threatened with annihilation, seeing the political structure which our forefathers had through bloodshed and hardship erected for us threatened with violation, we entered the conflict upon the only side where we could have felt at home, namely, the side of democracy and the rights of mankind; upon the side where Washington and Franklin and Jefferson and Jackson, Lafayette and Kosciusko would be; where Lincoln and Davis would be found if they were here to guide and counsel us. Yea, if I might recount the heroes and martyrs to human freedom throughout all the past, I would not fear to assert that our alignment in behalf of the preservation of human rights against the unscrupulous edicts and methods of a barbarism worthy of the Middle Ages would receive their approval and benediction.

It is in such a cause that we are to become the servants of humanity, the soldiers of liberty. As such we stand by Washington's side, partake of the glories of Old Hickory Jackson, and our faces shall brighten with the spirit of Lincoln, Grant, Davis, and Lee. As such may we resolve that the banner which Dewey left at Manila shall bring peace and hope to the bleeding hearts of humanity everywhere, and God grant that this banner may return to our shores as the unstained and unconquered emblem of a free and happy people.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us who are charged in these solemn days with the performance of high public duty remember that patriotism is something more than mere admiration for the beauties of the flag. Patriotism sinks into the soul and stirs it with a celestial emotion. It looks beyond the folds and colors and sees the hardship and heroic sacrifices which gave them birth and meaning. Patriotism is patient with the cries of the oppressed, but intolerant of the oppressor. Patriotism does not end where the lips begin, but yields up freely the devotions of the heart. For it countless millions have offered themselves upon the altar of their country, and it would not call in vain for the manhood of our times nor die for lack of true response.

If it be true that the spirits of the departed take note of the movements and emotions of living men, may we not believe that the great souls of Lincoln and Davis rejoice together in Paradise because the children of those who followed them now stand arm in arm and shoulder to shoulder under the sacred banner of a single allegiance, forgetting the misconceptions of past years, rejoicing alike in a common ancestry and in a common determination to make sure that the land which their children shall inherit shall be as courageous and as free as that which from their fathers came to them; and as we recall with swelling hearts their imperishable glory upon the battle ground of freedom, so shall those who follow us recount by the fireside's cheerful glow the unselfish devotion of the men of this day who keep burning and fan into brighter blaze the fires of human liberty.

Then let us put aside our littleness, our prejudice, our selfish ambitions, our lack of faith in the ultimate triumph of God's righteous purposes, remembering that impartial history will deal justly with those who serve and those who hinder. Let us upon whom has been bestowed the faith and confidence of

the people expand our souls and absorb the spirit of Abraham Lincoln when, in his second inaugural address, he said:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

In conclusion, may I paraphrase and apply to him the eulogy which he so beautifully and so fittingly accorded to Washington:

To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Lincoln is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked, deathless splendor leave it shining on.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on Lincoln as a world force.

This Republic is very little understood by other countries, notwithstanding the fact that the most scholarly and the most authoritative works on American political institutions have been written by foreigners, such as De Tocqueville's Democracy in America; Goldwin Smith's The United States, an Outline of Political History; Bryce's American Commonwealth; Von Holst's Constitutional History of the United States; Ostrogorski's Democracy and the Party System in the United States, and similar works.

In European works on America emphasis is always laid on its great industrial development, on its factories, skyscrapers, and railroads. Statistical tables are presented, as if the greatness of America consisted in its bigness only. They fail to speak of the grandeur of America's soul, of America's inextinguishable love of liberty. They fail to speak of the great men to whom American life has given birth. They fail to see the America of the ideal, America the glorious, America the inspiring, America that has given martyrs and heroes to the world. And because the American people have always been in a fight against some wrong, and are in a fight to-day against the powers of evil outside of the country and inside of the country, men who do not know assume that the forces of evil have undisputed sway over the land.

I intend to present to you a short document which has been overlooked by many biographers of Lincoln, an address sent to Abraham Lincoln by the International Workingmen's Association. This was an association organized in England in 1863. It was the first serious effort to unite the working class of the various countries of the world. The moving spirit of the association was Karl Marx. As we read this declaration of the newly born international body we see that the American struggle for the emancipation of the slave found a response among all the liberty-loving elements of Europe. The address reads as follows. It must have been translated from some other language, because the English bears the evidence of translation. It is dated November 29, 1864:

To ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
President of the United States of America.

SIR: We congratulate the American people upon your reelection by a large majority. If resistance to the slave power was the watchword of your first election, the triumphal war cry of your reelection is death to slavery.

From the commencement of the titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the Star-Spangled Banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the Territories which opened the dire epopee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labor of the immigrant or be prostituted by the tramp of the slave driver?

When an oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders dared to inscribe for the first time in the annals of the world "Slavery" on the banner of armed revolt, when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the rights of man was issued and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century, when on those very spots counter-revolution, with systematic thoroughness, gloried in rescinding the "ideas entertained at the time of the formation of the old Constitution" and maintained "slavery to be a beneficial institution," indeed, the only solution of the great problem of the "relation of capital to labor," and cynically proclaimed property in man "the cornerstone of the new edifice," then the working classes of Europe understood at once, even before the fanatic partisanship of the upper classes, for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy war of property against labor, and that for the men of labor, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore therefore patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis, opposed enthusiastically the proslavery intervention—importunities of their letters—and from most parts of Europe contributed their quota of blood to the good of the cause.

While the workingmen, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to defile their own Republic, while before the negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned laborer to sell himself and choose his own master, they were unable to attain the true freedom of labor or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation; but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of civil war.

The workingmen of Europe felt sure that, as the American war for independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American antislavery war will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest sign of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of the enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

Signed on behalf of the International Workingmen's Association, the Central Council:

Longmaid, Worley, Whitlock, Blackmore, Hartwell, Pidgeon, Lucraft, Weston, Dell, Nicars, Shaw, Lake, Buckley, Osborne, Howell, Carter, Wheeler, Starnsby, Morgan, Grossmith, Dick, Denoual, Jourdain, Morissot, Lerou, Bordage, Bosquet, Talandier, Dupont, L. Wolf, Aldrovandi, Lama, Solustri, Nuspert, Eccarius, Wolf, Lessner, Pfander, Lochner, Taub, Balliter, Rypcrynski, Hansen, Schanzenbeck, Smales, Cornelius, Peterson, Otto, Bagnagatti, Setocri; George Odgers, president of the council; P. V. Lubez, corresponding secretary for France; Karl Marx, corresponding secretary for Germany; C. P. Fontana, corresponding secretary for Italy; J. E. Holtrop, corresponding secretary for Poland; H. F. Jung, corresponding secretary for Switzerland; William Cremer, honorable general secretary, 18 Greek Street, Soho, London W.

In this message the representatives of the working class of the various European countries congratulate Lincoln upon his reelection, declare him to be the true representative of the working class, and express their confidence that with the abolition of chattel slavery there would be no hindrance to the genuine progress of labor.

They denounce the slaveholders, rejoice in the saving of the Republic, and point with pride to the fact that they had cheerfully accepted all the hardships caused by the cotton crisis, while some of the ruling interests of their own countries were suggesting intervention in favor of the slaveholders. They express the hope that with the elimination of chattel slavery the working class would be able to attain "the true freedom of labor."

I am not a hero worshiper. The heroes that history records represent an accumulation. They represent the efforts of the thousands and tens of thousands who preceded them. Lincoln would have been impossible without a Wendell Phillips, without a William Lloyd Garrison, without a Henry Ward Beecher, without a John Brown. In estimating the past it is hard to judge how much credit for the progress of mankind belongs to the fanatic, to the man with a single idea, and how much shall be apportioned to the credit of the statesman moderator, and how much of progress is due to the reactionary who by rejecting the very law of growth and by refusing to listen to a fresh voice stimulates the forward-looking man to renewed effort. It is impossible to determine, to separate, to conceive the parts that men play in the making of the world and in shaping its destiny. And when I present to my own mind the name and the form of Lincoln it is not so much because of the individual, because of the man who showed himself to be so tender, so loving, so free from prejudice. It is Lincoln, the embodiment of the ideals of a people, that means so much to me. And what a brilliant orator he was. His speeches are free from those long, interminable periods. He never used a polysyllable where a monosyllable will do. Genuine oratory is the telling of the truth in the simplest possible words, so that there shall be no veil of phrases between the speaker and the listener; and that was the oratory of Lincoln.

The oppressive conditions under which he grew up made it impossible for him to unfold into a great literary genius. The part he played in the history of the world will never be forgotten as long as men love liberty. Every people has the heroes it deserves. By idealizing our great men we but give expression to what we would like to be.

If one wants to understand the soul of the American people, let him study the heroes of America. And it is because of this that I join in paying tribute to one whose name will be associated forever with the struggle for liberty, with the struggle for the preservation of the Republic. Just imagine the state of affairs if we had two republics and two flags. Divided by a geographical line, each side with its own patriotism, each with its own prejudices against the other, each claiming that it was the better and it was the best, each fearing the other and arming against the other.

It was the saving of the Union, the emancipation of the chattel slave, that stirred all liberty-loving minds throughout the world into new action for liberty, and that struggle will go on forever. Mankind will never reach an ideal state, but shall ever strive for it. There is no finality in human effort, except perhaps in the grave. That is the only place where there is finality, and many believe that even there new life begins. To strive is to live. To live is to strive. Let us hold dear the name of Lincoln, for he represents the ideal of a great people. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—POSTAL CLERKS IN FRANCE.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster General correcting a statement I made the other day on the floor of the House as to the number of postal clerks we have in France.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to correct his own speech. [Laughter.] Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSING FOR EMPLOYEES OF SHIPYARDS.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Alexander bill, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] will take the Chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3389) to authorize and empower the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to purchase, lease, requisition, or otherwise acquire improved or unimproved land, houses, buildings, and for other purposes, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3389. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(d) To make loans to persons, firms, or corporations in such manner and upon such terms as it may determine from time to time to provide houses for the employees of such shipyards.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion which we had yesterday the bill which is before the House was very thoroughly explained. But there are just a few thoughts which I want to present to the committee in connection with shipping.

In the first place, at the beginning of the war in Europe in 1914 the world had in all kinds of shipping about 49,000,000 tons. In 1917, according to the last report we had from Lloyds, made in June, 1917, the world had about 45,000,000 tons of all kinds of shipping. In other words, in the two and one-half years the world had lost 4,000,000 tons, or about 8 per cent, of its shipping.

Now, prior to the starting of the war in Europe, in 1914, the world had been increasing its tonnage at the rate of about 5 per cent per annum, covering a period of 10 or 15 years. If that rate had continued, we would have 8,000,000 more tons of shipping added to what we had at the beginning of the war, so that there would have been about 57,000,000 tons of shipping in the world. That 8,000,000 tons, added to the 4,000,000 tons of actual loss, means a loss to the world at the present time of over 12,000,000 tons.

Now, prior to this war, to carry a given amount of freight between Europe and America, where the load was almost equally balanced, a certain amount of tonnage was required. In other words, the ship that left the United States or South America loaded for Europe returned from Europe to this country or to some South American port with an equal load. It required but a certain amount of tonnage to do that work.

Now, gentlemen, we have another situation. The freight is going but one way now. In other words, the ships leave the United States and South America loaded; they come back empty or almost empty. It takes twice as much tonnage to do the work with a one-way load.

Last year the shipping under the United States flag was about 6,000,000 tons and under the flag of England about 21,000,000 tons. In other words, our two nations had about two-thirds of the tonnage of the world.

The Shipping Board has let some contracts. Under the Denman administration contracts for about 252 wooden ships were let, and for 58 composite ships—partly wood and partly steel—and 70 ships of steel; and since Mr. Hurley became chairman of the Shipping Board they have let contracts for about 155 steel vessels. This total tonnage of ships in course of construction under the Shipping Board is about 3,123,000. It may possibly be 100,000 more at this present moment. The ships are in course of construction. Some will be finished this year, some will be finished next year.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman wish to convey to the House the information that the 3,000,000 tons of ships for which contracts have been let will be only partially finished this year and that part of them will have to go over until next year without being finished?

Mr. ROWE. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. So that instead of building 6,000,000 tons of ships, as the Shipping Board has announced to the American people, we will build, as I assume from the gentleman's statement, only about 1,500,000 tons this year?

Mr. ROWE. I think it will be something more than that.

Mr. MADDEN. How much more than that?

Mr. ROWE. I should say we are going to build three or four million tons of ships.

Mr. MADDEN. When?

Mr. ROWE. This coming year.

Mr. MADDEN. You mean this year?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that part of the 3,000,000 tons of ships which are under contract would not be completed until 1919.

Mr. ROWE. That is correct. That is true, because many of these contracts are let 20 or more to one company, and only half or a third of that number is now in course of construction. We are apt to think, when we hear that a contract is let, that the construction of the ships is going on. It does not necessarily mean that.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I know that. I was rather surprised to hear the gentleman make two statements as to what we are going to do; one to the effect that we have let contracts for 3,000,000 tons, part of which will not be completed until 1919, and another statement that we would be able to build close on to 4,000,000 tons in 1918. I wish the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. ROWE. Not all the ships now contracted for will be completed during 1918, but others I hope will be contracted for that will be completed during 1918.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman intend to cover the probable amount of shipping that will be built by England?

Mr. ROWE. No; I do not.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman have any data on the amount of shipbuilding being done in England?

Mr. ROWE. The English people have speeded up very much in the construction of merchant vessels. When the war broke out between England and Germany in 1914 they turned nearly all their attention to naval vessels, and kept that up for a time, but during the past year they have made a desperate effort toward the construction of a merchant marine.

Mr. WINGO. Has the gentleman information showing the amount of new shipping constructed by England this year and that which is in process of construction that will be finished this year?

Mr. ROWE. No; I have no data here. It will be under 3,000,000 tons, and will probably not much more than take care of the losses which they will incur during the coming year.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman believe they will make good their losses?

Mr. ROWE. I hope they will make good their losses.

Mr. LONGWORTH. When the gentleman says "build a ship," does he mean actual completion?

Mr. ROWE. I mean the completion, ready for service.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. In reference to the amount of tonnage lost, I understood the gentleman to say about 4,000,000 tons.

Mr. ROWE. Yes; the net loss between 1914 and June, 1917, was about 4,000,000 tons. The actual loss was much greater than that. There were destroyed something like 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 tons, but there was constructed tonnage enough so that the actual shortage was about 4,000,000 tons.

Mr. FESS. Do the gentleman's figures give the amount of loss since the ruthless submarine campaign started about a year ago?

Mr. ROWE. No; I have not the figures here.

Mr. FESS. I wish to get at just what progress Germany's submarine campaign is making. They claimed they would sink a million tons a month, which would be 12,000,000 tons in a year. They have fallen away below that, and this loss of 4,000,000 tons, as I understand, takes in all since the war began.

Mr. ROWE. That is about what the net loss has been.

Mr. FESS. In the opinion of the gentleman, is the submarine still a serious danger that we are confronting?

Mr. ROWE. The submarine will not stop commerce, but submarine warfare is a serious danger. The submarines will probably destroy as much tonnage as England can construct in the coming year.

I would like to go just a little further with what I was saying about the tonnage that is in course of construction and that has been taken over by our own country. We have requisitioned in the neighborhood of 458 vessels. Practically all of these were in course of construction for England. They amounted in tonnage to 2,871,000 tons. This does not add one ton to the shipping of the world. Had England remained the owner of these vessels, they would have gone into the commerce of the world as much as they will in the possession of the United States. We have commandeered about 400 vessels, about half of which were in the course of construction, and that tonnage amounts to 2,500,000 tons. We have taken possession of 117 German and Austrian vessels, amounting to about 700,000 tons. So that we have now taken possession of completed vessels or have vessels in the course of construction amounting to about 9,000,000 tons of shipping.

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

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. What proportion of the 9,000,000 tons is in actual service and what proportion is in course of construction? That has some bearing on the question involved in this bill, I should think. At any rate it has some bearing on the attitude of the American people.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Let me answer this question first. I can not answer it absolutely, but it is in the neighborhood of about 3,000,000 tons.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have now under the American flag in the over-seas trade between 3,750,000 and 4,000,000 tons of shipping.

Mr. ROWE. But that is not all under the Shipping Board.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is under the American flag, doing service for ourselves and our allies.

Mr. ROWE. We have about three and one-half million tons all told in the over-seas trade.

Mr. MADDEN. So that of the 9,000,000 tons to which the gentleman refers there are 5,000,000 tons to be accounted for?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. That are not able to go to sea yet?

Mr. ROWE. Yes. The Shipping Board recently said they hoped to produce 6,000,000 tons this year. According to Admiral Bowles, we have or did have 180,000 men on the 1st of January working upon shipping. Possibly we may have now 190,000 or 200,000 men. No one can tell how much shipping 200,000 men will produce. In the old time they frequently spoke of a man producing a ton a month of shipping. Conditions have very much changed, especially in steel construction, and now it would be much higher than that if the men were capable men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HICKS. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I have information from expert shipbuilders which leads me to the conclusion that to build 6,000,000 tons of ships in a year would require 480,000 men.

Mr. ROWE. That is about the proportion.

Mr. MADDEN. So if we have only 180,000 men, it can be readily seen that we are not going to come anywhere near 6,000,000 tons.

Mr. HICKS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. HICKS. Is the gentleman prepared to state how many seamen are in training to man the ships launched in 1918?

Mr. ROWE. I am not prepared to state. I know we have schools in some parts of the country, but not near enough, I think, to provide the proper number of seamen.

Mr. HICKS. Does the gentleman care to say whether the crews should be naval crews or civilian crews?

Mr. ROWE. No; I am not quite prepared to take that position yet.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I will.

Mr. FARR. They are mobilizing an army of 250,000 men now in addition to those already in employment.

Mr. ROWE. That brings me to the thought that it is very easy to sit here in the House and talk about mobilizing shipbuilders. There are only a limited number of men that you can call shipbuilders. It is not like England and Scotland, where every man working on a ship is born and bred to the business; his father, grandfather, and great grandfather were shipbuilders, and there are an army of men in Great Britain who have served five years learning the trade and are ready to go to the work at any moment.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I will.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask the gentleman whether he wants to go into this particular phase of the matter. Recently we had a statement in one of the papers at Washington, purporting to be a comment by an officer in charge over in foreign waters, that so many of our sailors were of German extraction and German sympathy, and made some startling statements about how the appearance of a submarine was greeted, and so on. Does the gentleman have any desire to go into that thing? I would like to ask the question of somebody who is willing to make a statement.

Mr. ROWE. I should very much prefer not to go into that now, as it would take up all of my time. I should say that the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], could answer that question.

Now, as I said, 180,000 men, or suppose there are now 200,000 men at this time, can not possibly produce more than 2,400,000 tons of ships. If we want more, if the men of this House and people of the Nation want more, we must go out and get these men. There are people in this country who say that they can not be had, but you must remember that shipping conditions have changed in this country. We have a body of men that are just fitted to build fabricated steel vessels. They are the structural steel workers of this country. They are the bridge builders of our Nation, and in that line, gentlemen, we have the men. I have seen a statement, on good authority, that the United States had a body of steel and iron structural workers equal to all of the rest of the structural iron workers of the world.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I will.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not a fact that the shipbuilding, under this idea of fabricated vessels—that is, parts being assembled elsewhere—is rapidly undergoing a revolution, and that with the use of structural steel builders and this new method of building ships the production of ships may be greatly expedited?

Mr. ROWE. I hope the gentleman is correct. Not only have we the men who can do this work if we call them to it but we should stop building elevated railroads, subways, and bridges where not absolutely necessary to carry on the war.

Mr. FARR. What does the gentleman think of concrete ships and their possibilities?

Mr. ROWE. That has not been tried to any great extent, and do not let us make any change. We have made a change in the machine guns in this country with a great loss in time. We know what we can do with steel vessels; we know that we can construct them, and we have the mechanics to do the work. It is no time for experimenting

Mr. FARR. I meant concrete ships in addition to steel.

Mr. ROWE. Well, we must construct all we can. I want to call attention to the fact that while it is possible that we can get the men it will take time to get proper men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman have five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Admiral Bowles when asked the question said:

> I should say we ought to get along with in the neighborhood of 300,000 men, but, of course, a good deal depends on the individual efficiency of the men, and if that continues the way it is going now—if that continues the way it is going along now—I do not know how many we will need.

The fact is, gentlemen, we have attempted to build ships rapidly, and we have rushed men to the yards. Some of them are good men, many of them are very inferior, and some of no use. They must be sorted. We want only the best men. If in a yard where we have a thousand men four or five hundred of those men are inefficient you will not get the work you could get out of half the number of thoroughly competent men.

Mr. MADDEN. In other words, the standard of efficiency will be based on the efficiency of the man of least ability?

Mr. ROWE. That is true. Now, I am in favor of the bill that is before the House. I am a conservative. I never dreamed, prior to going into this war, that I could favor a measure of this kind, purely paternal, but we need the homes for the men and we should build them at once.

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

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

Mr. ROWE. I yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I assume the gentleman is more or less familiar with the actual facts as they relate to shipbuilding, and I desire to preface the question that I wish to ask by saying this: Some time ago, in the course of conversation, a shipbuilder stated to me that in his opinion quite a number of vessels were delayed because, first, the Government contracted for ships at a set price and later contracted for ships on a cost-plus basis, with the result that a number of ships that were contracted for on a set or fixed-price basis are partially completed but can not be fully completed because the contractors are unable to secure the materials to complete them, due to the fact that the cost-plus contractor has come in and is paying as much as $20 and $30 a ton more for the steel, and from $20 to $30 a thousand more for the lumber, and from $1 to $5 a day more for the labor. The result is that the contractor on a fixed-price basis is practically helpless, because the man having the lumber is going to ship it to the one who pays from $20 to $30 per thousand more for it, and the man having the steel will ship it to him also because he gets from $20 to $40 per ton more. The result is a number of partially completed ships, a tying up of shipbuilding facilities. Does the gentleman know whether this is a fact?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman verify his own statement, and put it up to the Shipping Board? That would be the common sense way to get at it.

Mr. KREIDER. I think I can, but I wanted to know whether the gentleman from New York knows anything about it.

Mr. ROWE. I am not familiar enough with conditions to answer that question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this question of housing and the question of labor go along together. We want 500,000 skilled laborers, and, with skilled laborers and machinists required in every kind of work, it is going to be very hard to get them—harder, even, to train them. I desire to relate to the House some personal experience that I have just had in that regard when I visited the shipbuilding yards on the Clyde, near Glasgow, where I found that at least half of the workers were women. They were so short of machinery in this skilled iron trade that very many of the machines came from my own home town—from Gould & Eberhardt and other machine toolmakers—and many from other parts of the United States; but in those yards, where they are making iron ships, they have trained women to manage the lathe, to manage the plane, to manage the punch, to manage the big cranes that move the material from one end of the yard to the other, and women were doing all except the actual heavy man work of putting material together after it was made.

Mr. SANFORD. Were they doing it well?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They were doing it well; and I will say, for the benefit of those who talk about unskilled labor bringing down the amount done, that the work in those yards was all done by piecework. The old rule had been day labor, but in the stress of war the laborers of Scotland had patriotically agreed that they would do the fighting and that the older men would do the work, and that the old rules of the union should give way to the introduction of women into the work. It is a nation at war, and this is only one of the signs of its existence. They tell me that there are 2,000,000 more women in profitable employment in England now than there were before the war. I have not verified those figures. I have seen the cordite works at another place, 12 miles long, with three different factories, manufacturing that high explosive in its various stages, beginning with the manufacture of sulphuric and nitric acid as well as guncotton, from the raw materials, from cotton from Chilian niter and from sulphur that is burned in the furnaces—I shall not go into the details—bringing out at the other end cordite in little strings that look like brown vermicelli. This was by day labor. The work is too dangerous to allow haste. Thirteen thousand of the 20,000 people employed were women. That brings us to the problem in this bill. If we are going to put the Nation into the war in that way, whole families in certain cases will have to be housed in family apartments.

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

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. In a moment. Thousands and thousands of young girls have to be taken care of. It was a treat to find that that factory had been organized not by the old-fashioned military and naval authorities, but by mining engineers who had experience in America, in Chile, in Hindustan, in Australia, and South Africa, who had come there and seen the problem before them, as mining engineers do, who devised new means, and that, with respect to the girls, was this: There was established in front on the street a house of one story——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. In the front was the matron's room. The next room was the kitchen and the next room behind was the meeting and dining room. Back of that house and reached by short, covered walks extended three one-story dormitories, we will say, about 25 by 100 feet. I do not know the exact size, but they were large enough to give room on each side for 16 small cubicles or half shut-off rooms, 6 by 8, or so, where the girl had her bed and what little furniture she needed, and had decorated it as her own. There under this matron those 96 girls were taken care of. They were under strict discipline, though it was a smiling discipline, because they could not stay unless they obeyed orders. There was in that town a theater, a moving-picture place, and a hall and all that. There was a central kitchen that furnished 20,000 full meals a day, and 5,000 others, and supplied raw food to the whole host of those that did their own cooking, and the food was sent them on a small narrow-gauge railroad. This plant was a perfect *Great Eastern* in itself, except that it cared for 20,000, all under one control. If we get to this sort of work where we have to employ the unskilled and train them in that way in our shipyard towns and factories, or wherever it may be, we will have to employ the same talent to get the same results and have the same special sort of houses. Therefore I am in favor of this bill. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman this question. In reading the hearings on this bill from Admiral Bowles, it seems he opposes the idea of working treble shifts, at least he is opposed to the idea of working at night. What were they doing over in England when the gentleman was there? Were they working in several shifts or working after night in the shipyards?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am not quite able to answer that question, for I was not there after nightfall, but I am inclined to think that in some parts they were, but I am not sure. I am only saying that is the mass of workers that they were getting, and if you have enough room there you can employ all during the daytime and do not need work but one shift. However, I do not know.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman—it strikes me that we should do something with this labor problem. I see by this morning's press dispatches that they are on strike in the city of New York again, demanding an increase from $4.60, I think, a day to something like $6 a day. Does not the gentleman think something ought to be done somewhere at some place along the line of stabilizing the price of this labor?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am only telling what I have seen. I have no opinion to give, except to say that I know from the newspapers only what was published, that there are strikes in some parts of England. But I know also that in those places which had the organizations I have seen there was not only no strike, but the workmen, men and women, were willing to do their work by the piece. Gentlemen, I thank you.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Are we to understand from the facts the gentleman has given that we would espouse the plan of working the women of the country in these shipyards?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have no desire that any such thing should be done at all. I am only speaking of the hard necessities of war. When your men have gone to war and you need workmen for your trades you must take them from the patriotism of this country wherever you can find it. I hope that necessity will not fall upon us; if it does, I hope and know that America will respond. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are to be some amendments offered to these paragraphs, and I ask the Clerk to read the next paragraph, so we can get on.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this paragraph pending.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Let us vote on it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Let it be read. I would like to make some progress with the bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. I asked for recognition before, but could not get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 21, after the word "houses," insert the words "or furnish or aid in furnishing transportation facilities."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, this bill in the first subdivision (a) proposes to authorize the purchase or lease or acquisition of land improved and unimproved. In (b) it proposes to authorize the construction of houses on the land, and in paragraph (c) it proposes to authorize the acquisition or lease of houses or buildings, and in this paragraph it proposes to make loans to firms or corporations wishing to construct these houses. Now, last summer I made a journey from Philadelphia to Essington, where the Navy has established a hydroplane station; that is some 10 miles down the Delaware River, and I saw that the whole of the land along the river is taken up with buildings or factories of one sort and another. There are three lines of communication between this section and the city of Philadelphia—the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and the street car line, and there is another, the Delaware River. I found these workmen employed in these manufactories journeying up and down to this point by these means——

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to say the Reading Railroad, also.

Mr. ROBBINS. The Philadelphia & Reading Railroad had a branch; I did not know it carried passengers. Now, here is a proposition contained in this bill which is to erect houses to accommodate these workmen who are to be employed at Government shipbuilding plants and at the private plants located at Chester, Bristol, and Hog Island, which are owned by private companies. Now, it is going to cost the Government a lot of money to build these houses, and it is known all over the world that the city of Philadelphia is a city of homes, where the mechanics, working people, trades people, and people engaged in the great industries own their own homes. The laws of Pennsylvania have fostered and encouraged the building and loan associations so that it has been made possible for those people to acquire their homes upon monthly payments. Now, they live in the city of Philadelphia. They are attached to their schools, their churches, and neighborhoods, and what I propose by this amendment is to authorize this emergency corporation, to whom we are giving these large powers, to have one additional power—that is, to help the street railroads and the railroads and the river navigation, if necessary, by double-tracking those roads and increasing their facilities of the transportation of people down there to work in these industries, in which case I see no necessity for building these houses, because most of these men now own their own homes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. In just a moment. Because if we build these houses, it is going to take all summer, and we have learned in this debate that if there is any scarcity greater than another it is the scarcity of building material. Therefore the proposition I propose in this amendment is not to spend money on houses and incur the great delay incident thereto, but to improve the existing transportation facilities and take the men from the houses they already have in Philadelphia, from that great reservoir of skilled labor, the greatest in the world, and carry them down to these shipyards.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman, in a sense, proposes to commandeer the transportation facilities, does he not?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; I do not propose to commandeer them. I propose to allow the Government to double track that little street railway that I went down on, that gave service every 20 minutes on that hot July afternoon, and put on there a service every minute in the morning and evening, with trailers, so the workmen can go down there to work. Take the railroads that are running a few trains per day now and aid and improve their tracks to carry part of these men down there by railroad, and the Government would have not only security for every dollar it invests by liens on this railroad but would not waste money on houses of a temporary character.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman make any provision in his amendment for the return of the money advanced for the improvement of transportation facilities?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; I do not; because that is a business proposition. The money is to be a loan to these companies only. This Emergency Fleet Corporation has power in this bill to sell houses, to exchange, lease, and condemn, and it certainly would have the right to improve the tracks of these railroads or to put a boat on the river.

Mr. MADDEN. Would it still have the right to sell the tracks after it built them?

Mr. ROBBINS. It has the right to sell the real estate.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes. In the paragraph last above it has the right to purchase, exchange, sell, and lease land, fixtures, buildings, or furnishings. What broader power can any company have than that?

Mr. LENROOT. That refers to houses only.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Your amendment authorizes the shipbuilding corporation to lend money to trolley companies or other transportation companies?

Mr. ROBBINS. Aid them in furnishing transportation, yes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Now, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, as a matter of fact, is negotiating in various parts where they have yards for improved transportation facilities. Now, I ask the gentleman this question: What prospect would the Emergency Fleet Corporation have to induce a transportation corporation to improve is facilities if the corporation knows that the Shipping Board is authorized to lend it the money to do it? Would there be any development on the part of the corporation itself, or would they sit still and say, "You give us the money"?

Mr. ROBBINS. No. I am speaking about a situation with which I am personally familiar. I am told there are 22 new corporations along the Delaware River below Philadelphia that have gone into various activities largely devoted to material for this war. There is the great Westinghouse plant, right near Essington, and there are these three shipyards, the Baldwin plant, and many others.

Now, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], with that great population gathered there, while it is true it is devoted to war now, these people will always live there, and the Government investing money in these transportation systems will be investing money in aid of enterprises every dollar of which it is sure to get back into the Treasury of the United States. And in the debate all through this bill and in the report of the committee on this bill, I appeal to you as a business proposition, it is asserted and stated that the money that will be put in these temporary houses will be wasted, because after the war is over there will not be any value to them, or they will be of such a temporary nature that in a few years they will be gone, inasmuch as they may be built of stucco or of lumber, like these cantonments. The proposition here is to aid the Shipbuilding Board in the very thing it wants to do, namely, putting the workmen down at these shipbuilding plants quickly and accomplish the construction of the ships.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will permit, I think that the great difficulty would be in getting the cars to put on these railways. You may establish a schedule, but you will have to have the cars to carry the people. The Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Railroad, on which they established Camp Meade, is willing to pay any price for cars, but they can not purchase them.

Mr. ROBBINS. If you can not get a few railroad cars, how can you build houses?

Mr. LINTHICUM. You can get a house quicker than you can get a railway car—a whole heap quicker.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania made any inquiry as to whether the present interurban railway, operating to the south of Philadelphia along the Delaware River, has any difficulty in acquiring additional funds to increase its rolling stock and trackage?

Mr. ROBBINS. I have made no inquiry about that. I traveled over the road, and can say this, that the facilities were exceedingly meager.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman further advice in regard to the territory south of Philadelphia, as to whether the interurban company at different points is at present making permanent improvements with the purpose of widening the roadway

so as to give better accommodations to that rapidly growing section?

Mr. ROBBINS. At the time I was there the service was both irregular and at long intervals.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman that I have traveled on occasions between Philadelphia and Washington, and I have noticed the improvements going on in the way of concrete bridges and the like between Wilmington and Philadelphia, for the purpose of widening the trackage and giving, I assume, additional conveniences in interurban communication.

Mr. BUTLER. Where did the gentleman see this? From the car windows?

Mr. STAFFORD. I did.

Mr. BUTLER. I can measure the ground for you. That is where I live.

Mr. ROBBINS. I got on this car in the subway at the Broad Street Station and traveled down to Essington. I did not notice any such improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order has been reserved on this amendment, and I think unquestionably the point of order is good. If the gentleman from Wisconsin intends to insist upon it——

Mr. STAFFORD. I do so intend.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes on it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say this to the gentleman from Maryland, that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries had this whole question under consideration, and we concluded that if it is desirable to give the board the power to purchase cars or otherwise to improve the transportation facilities it ought to be done in the proper and comprehensive way; and after considering the question the committee concluded it ought to be considered in a separate bill. For that reason the provision was not incorporated here.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it being treated separately?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will say to the gentleman that there is a bill pending on the Senate Calendar now on that very question, and it may come to us at any day.

Mr. BUTLER. It is coming to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. I know it will have careful attention if it comes to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If it comes to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries it will receive proper care and attention.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin withhold for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I will withhold the point of order for a moment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I may add that Admiral Bowles, in a telegram to me on Saturday, emphasized the necessity for legislation giving the Emergency Fleet Corporation power to commandeer these transportation facilities where they could not secure proper arrangements with the lines, and also to supply additional transportation facilities. When I received that telegram I took the matter up with Senator FLETCHER, chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate, and urged him to have that bill passed through the Senate as speedily as possible. Since then I have received advices from Admiral Bowles stating that he had also wired Senator FLETCHER, urging the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, of course, I know this country quite well; it is where I live. And, if my word is worth anything at all, I state it here that some better accommodations will have to be furnished to workmen in this vicinity. I do hope the measure will come before the committee of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] is the chairman. Unless some help will come from some source as big and strong as the Government, we will not be able to move our people there or away from there. Soon there will be no shelter for them. It is impossible now, with the small facilities we have, to move the workmen back and forth.

Mr. COX. What will be required, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. BUTLER. More railroads—more steam roads, more electric roads.

Mr. COX. Which would be the better?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not tell you that. But it is impossible to move the people without better facilities.

Mr. COX. How far is it?

Mr. BUTLER. Why, gentlemen, it is one continuous plant from Philadelphia 12 or 15 miles down the river. The steam railroads can not furnish the necessary facilities. I believe that most of the accommodations will have to come from electric roads. Assistance will have to come from some direction, and that very soon.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I hold in my hand a provision which, if enacted into law, would give the desired relief.

Mr. COX. If they had better transportation facilities, such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has outlined here—better railroads—would that obviate the necessity of building these homes?

Mr. BUTLER. No. We should have them both. You can hardly conceive of the transformation, you might say, on the face of that part of the country. Some one spoke of the enormous factories that have been established there recently. There are 14,000 men employed in one concern alone, and that is the Remington Arms Co.; and alongside of it the Baldwin Locomotive Works is employing 20,000 men. I recall five years ago, when there was no place provided where workmen could live. I think of this busy community working in a factory nearly 20 miles in length fighting to reach their work and struggling to reach their homes in the evening.

Mr. COX. Where do they live now?

Mr. BUTLER. In my direction—up and down the river. There is the Westinghouse plant, about to employ 15,000 or 20,000 men. We do not know where the workmen are to live and how they are to reach the place or even bring with them the commodities of life. But I must not ask the time of this committee to describe the development of this part of our country. We all know of it. Nowhere on the earth's surface has there gathered so many industrial giants. The force and activities of a hundred thousand men will soon be employed here.

The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has made his promise, and I believe that promise will be made good and that the facilities will be supplied, and that this section of our country will have the attention of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the need of transportation facilities everywhere, and particularly in that great industrial belt to the south of Philadelphia, down as far as Wilmington. I am not acquainted with what is being done by the Pennsylvania Railroad to relieve those conditions, but we know that the Pennsylvania Railroad has equipped electrically some of its lines leading out to the suburbs west and northwest of Philadelphia, but whether it has made provision for such interurban traffic to the south I am not advised. I am not particularly advised as to whether river accommodations by means of the Wilson Boat Line, plying between Philadelphia and Wilmington, with their 22-knot steamers, will meet the difficulty in the solution of this question, but I am convinced that this is too important a subject to be thrown into this bill without the deliberate consideration of the committee, and therefore I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I will reserve it for a moment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In support of what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, and this is also supporting the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] as well, I desire to say that the Emergency Fleet Corporation does have plans covering the question of transportation. I have a letter from Mr. Piez, the general manager, on that point. He says:

> It is our intention to materially improve the transportation facilities.

One reason why he does not go into the plans is that legislation is necessary to enable them to fully announce their plans. They do not care to give out, in advance of legislation and congressional authority, these particular details. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS], my colleague, in his statement yesterday, said what is the fact that the city of Philadelphia is cooperating in this matter and large amounts of money will be given in behalf of the city to develop these improvements. They will include water supply, sewerage, and municipal improvements of other kinds.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the purpose of this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask the gentleman to withhold his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite germane to the purposes of this bill. That is the point the gentleman raises; that it is not germane to the purposes of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the only point that can be raised.

Mr. BUTLER. Read the title of the bill.

Mr. ROBBINS. That would be all right in Pennsylvania, but the title of the bill is no criterion to what a bill here in Congress contains.

The amendment that is offered is to enable this Emergency Fleet Corporation to assist in furnishing transportation for these workmen. In the bill it is provided that this corporation is authorized and empowered to do as follows:

(a) To purchase, lease, requisition, or acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, any improved or unimproved land or any interest therein suitable for the construction thereon of houses for the use of employees of shipyards in which ships are being constructed for the United States.

(b) To construct on such land houses and all other necessary or convenient facilities, upon such conditions and at such price as may be determined, and to sell, lease, or exchange such houses, land, and facilities upon such terms and conditions as it may determine.

(c) To purchase, lease, requisition, or acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, any houses or other buildings, together with the land on which the same are erected, or any interest therein, and all necessary and proper fixtures and furnishings therefor; to manage, repair, sell, lease, or exchange such lands, houses, buildings, fixtures, and furnishings upon such terms and conditions as it may determine to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) To make loans to persons, firms, or corporations in such manner and upon such terms as it may determine, from time to time, to provide houses for the employees of such shipyards.

Now, it is true that these various provisions seem to refer to houses and lands and the acquisition of houses and lands; but the purpose of this bill is to aid in the acquisition of these houses and lands by purchase, requisition, or condemnation, we have heard all through this debate; that is, for the purpose of furnishing housing for the men who work in the shipyards. That is the ultimate purpose of the bill. We must take a broad view of it and look at what it is to accomplish. It is not a criminal statute that must be construed strictly. We are to construe it within the meaning and spirit of the law and the evil that is to be remedied, viz, lack of workmen. Now, one of the things we want, and the purpose is, to get men for these shipyards. If the transporting of these men will get them there as well as the housing of the men at the plants, then any means of taking them there would be as pertinent to the purpose of this bill as the building of a house at the plant. That is the purpose of this amendment; it is to authorize this Shipping Board either to house the men there or to bring them there by the aid of transportation lines.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). This bill is a housing bill. First: It authorizes the Emergency Fleet Corporation to acquire land by purchase, condemnation or otherwise. It contemplates the acquisition of land and the erection of structures on the land so acquired, whether by purchase, or condemnation: Second: It authorizes the disposition by the Fleet Corporation to lease, or sell on agreed terms to the shipwrights, or workers in the yards, the property that this act authorizes the corporation to acquire. It seems to me it must be manifest that an amendment which contemplates aid to, or the possible construction of railroads, is not germane to the manifest purposes of this bill, which are confined to affording certain definite housing facilities to the men who are to work in the shipyards. The Chair thinks the amendment is clearly out of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LENROOT: Page 4, line 19, after the word "loan," insert "upon adequate security."

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not care to debate it if it can be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I can realize very well how in order to be able to construct ships which we need for the work we have to do we must construct the vessels where it is possible to move them to the sea; but I can conceive of a condition that might easily be worked out by those in administrative authority, so far as the letting of contracts for other purposes is concerned, so that all the congestion that we hear about might be avoided and no additional transportation facilities become necessary and no additional housing facilities be needed. It seems to me if the men who sit up the Avenue and have the power to determine to whom contracts shall be let would make a survey of the country, and as a result of that survey obtain information which would lead them to let contracts throughout the country, instead of two or three States of this country, all the difficulty that we are called upon to overcome would be met and vast sums of money would be saved to the Treasury. In addition to that we would have an efficiency 50 per cent greater than we have to-day. Our output could be largely increased in all lines. Contracts could be let for less money. The employment of men would be distributed all over the United States. Factories would not be depleted of the men they have now employed because of the necessity of bringing them to a central point somewhere. The industrial activities of the country would be conserved. Men would be enabled to work where they have been accustomed to work in all the great industrial centers of the country. As it is to-day contracts are let to only a few men in a few places. I do not suppose anything I say will have any weight with those who are charged with the responsibility of letting contracts. I wish I might be able to do something that would have weight with them. I think they ought to use their brains in the study of the question, rather than use their influence to favor friends, more of which I fear is being done than ought to be done for the good of the country. We are supposed to be fighting a war in which every American is engaged, but it is only a few of those Americans to whom favors are being granted. There ought not to be any favors granted to anybody. The burden ought to rest upon all alike, and the Treasury of the United States should be given some consideration by these men who are sitting in executive places with power to let contracts. We have a number of States in which it is possible to manufacture everything that is needed for the war. Many of these States have not been given any contracts at all, yet they are all called upon to pay the taxes. While the contracts are being let to a few people in a small area the people in other sections of the country are looking for employment. It is not right; it is not just to the war; it is not just to America; it is not just to the men who have volunteered to fight at the battle front. There ought not to be any discrimination anywhere. The attitude of the administration, or of those who speak for the administration in every activity, ought to be such as to be beyond criticism.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, a newspaper article has just come to my hand that is so pertinent to the subject matter under discussion that I want to read into the RECORD a few paragraphs from it. It is from the pen of L. C. Bateman, one of the veteran newspaper men of Maine. It appeared in the Lewiston Evening Journal of my home city and deals with the shipbuilding conditions in the city of Bath. Here are located the yards of Kelly & Spear, Percy & Small, the Texas Steamship Co., the Bath Iron Works, and other plants, all working to their present capacity, all capable of greatly increased productivity, all needing men and further housing facilities. I read as follows:

If "ships, more ships" is the cry from England and France it is reechoed in this little city by the sea.

And to this is added the cry of "homes, more homes."

What to do with the people now working in her yards has become a burning issue in Bath. And more and more men are wanted, but where, O where, can they be housed? Already every house in the city for rent is taken and the cry is for more. The Texas Co. has already built nearly 60 houses for their workmen and will soon build many more. These are taken as quick as they can be finished, but apparently the demand is not lessened. It is an evergrowing problem for which, as yet, there is no complete solution.

Nobly the citizens of Bath are rising to the occasion. Homes of the rich are being opened to the common laborer and in this way the owners are doing their bit for the country.

Bath itself is the center of an area rich in ship lore and tradition. Only a few miles from this city was launched the first vessel built in an American yard to cross the Atlantic. A few miles eastward is the village of Damariscotta, the home of the *Flying Scud*, a sailing vessel maintaining for 24 hours a speed of more than 19 knots an hour, holding to-day, and in my judgment for all time, the blue ribbon of the sea. In Bath in 1762 was built the *Earl of Jute*, the first vessel of her class launched in the United States. Here in this same city there took the water the first American vessel sent to her grave by the wanton hand of Germany. For a century and a half the skill of her builders, the courage and the resourcefulness of her sailors and her skippers have carried the name and the fame of this little city by the sea to the four corners of the earth.

Her past, and her busy present, make a call to me for the enactment of this legislation, which I could not fail to hear even if I would. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago there appeared in the papers of Washington an interview with one of the officials of the Shipping Board criticizing the labor situation. I will not read all the criticism, but ask to insert it in the RECORD:

SHIPBUILDING SUCCESS DEPENDS ON UNITED STATES WORKERS, PIEZ ASSERTS IN APPEAL.

Responsibility for the success or failure of the Government's shipbuilding program was put on labor to-day by Charles Piez, vice president and general manager of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, in an appeal for shipyard workers.

"The Shipping Board has the necessary yards, the materials, and the money," he said. "All that is lacking is a spirit in the Nation that will send a quarter of a million American mechanics into the yards to give the best and most efficient work."

The fact that shipyards are working only one shift six days a week was characterized by Mr. Piez as "monstrous."

"If we are to keep ahead of the submarine campaign," said he, "we must run three shifts a day 52 weeks in the year." Mr. Piez's statement follows:

"Within 60 days huge Government yards will be completed, and soon thereafter more than 60,000 workmen will be required to furnish for them the three eight-hour shifts necessary if these yards are to turn out their ships according to schedule.

HAS 716 SHIPWAYS.

"The Shipping Board now has 716 shipways, 302 are for wooden ships and 414 are for steel construction.

"The yards in which they are established are working only one eight-hour shift per day, six days a week. This is monstrous. If we are to keep ahead of the submarine, we must run three shifts per day 52 weeks in the year.

"Our program calls for the construction in 1918 of eight times the tonnage delivered in 1916, at a cost of more than a billion dollars. The Shipping Board has the necessary yards, the materials, and the money. All that is lacking is a spirit in the Nation that will send a quarter of a million American mechanics into the yards to give their best and most efficient work.

"I am sorry to say at the present time the native-born American workman is not the mainstay of the shipyard, for he is there only to the extent of 35 per cent of the men employed, and to the extent of 65 per cent we are forced to depend on foreign-born labor.

"We all honor the men in uniform and the same honor must be given to the men who go to work in the yards. Just as the Navy is the first line of the British Empire, and just as Germany depends upon her submarines, so must America depend for victory upon the shipbuilders in the American yards. To the women of America I say: 'Send your men to the shipyard, for they will be doing there no less a service than in the Army or the Navy, and they will be returned to you safe and well paid, after having performed a duty that is a primal necessity of this war.'"

The interview, it will be observed, concludes with a statement that cast a reflection on the patriotism of the workingmen of America. Mr. Piez has only recently become a member of the board. I do not believe he knew the facts, for if he did he would not have made that statement. He is too big and too fair for that. Last summer when the building of some of the cantonments was completed, and one to which I have reference at Camp Dodge in Des Moines was finished, there were a great many carpenters thrown out of employment. I received, as did other Members of the House from my State, a great many requests from such laborers for work in shipyards, because newspapers had carried notices that the Shipping Board required a great many ship carpenters. On making inquiry I was referred to the Bureau of Labor, and the Bureau of Labor referred me to its office at St. Louis. I wrote the director there, and I have a letter written by the acting director at St. Louis, written to a man for whom I made some inquiry, in which he says, "You are informed that Mr. A. Pelsang, Miami, Fla., wants two ship carpenters at 50 cents an hour; the Miami Yacht & Machine Works, same place, wants six ship carpenters at 62½ cents per hour; George J. Pilkington, same place, wants six ship carpenters at 62½ cents an hour. You should first correspond with these gentlemen before proceeding to the work."

Now, it is monstrous that this board has but one shift per day in February, when on the 20th day of November from the bureau of the Government intrusted to find these men it only knew of 14 places in the United States where ship carpenters were wanted.

That is not all; I tried to follow the thing up a little further and secure work for these carpenters, and I wrote to Mr. King, who is in charge of the Department of Labor Employment Bureau. He wrote under the date of November 20. His letter is very illuminating and a part is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *November 20, 1917.*

Hon. JAMES W. GOOD, M. C.,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, in which, speaking of the matter of employment in the Government shipyards for ship carpenters, you state:

"Carpenters in this part of the country will be glad to accept employment if some reliable information can be furnished. I must confess that the information that has come from your office is not of the character that would warrant a laboring man to accept employment through your agency."

I must say that I, too, am not at all satisfied with the very meager information I have been able to obtain with regard to employment for ship carpenters. Almost daily I see notices or items in the newspapers to the effect that the building of ships is being greatly hampered by the scarcity of labor of one kind or another, and this office is using its best endeavor to get some definite information in the premises. To that end several weeks ago I addressed the following circular letter to the officers in charge of the United States Employment Service at every point in the United States where I understood shipbuilding to be in progress or is supposed to be in progress:

"From time to time the newspapers contain items to the effect that the building of wooden ships is being badly hampered by reason of the shortage of ship and other carpenters. Now, this office has a list of 52 ship carpenters and another of more than 1,400 house and general carpenters. If such are needed in your zone, and you will give me information as to the cities where needed, the approximate number of men required, the persons or firms to whom application for employment should be made, wages offered, price of board and lodging, whether or not transportation will be refunded, probable length of the job, and any other information that you think may be of interest to prospective applicants, I will undertake to pass the information to these carpenters. Information of a general character that is not specific, and especially that which does not indicate the wages to be paid, will be of but little value, as men can not afford to leave jobs that pay fairly well without knowing that they will get something that will justify the change."

In response to the above, we are just now getting a little information which is of a more definite character, as noted below:

Our office at Jacksonville, Fla., reports that for various reasons only a few ship carpenters can be used in that district at this time, specifying the builders to whom applications may be made, the number each can use, with pay per hour.

The office at Mobile, Ala., reports that it is awaiting information from the various shipyards in the district as to just what labor they will need, and as soon as the information is obtained, which will be within the next 10 days or 2 weeks, the matter will be taken up again and we will be advised just how far we can assist in furnishing the help required.

The office at Baltimore, Md., reports that only a very small number of ship carpenters can be placed at this time in Baltimore and vicinity, that transportation will not be advanced, and that it would not recommend any men coming to that point now, but adds there are two concerns which will need a large number of men in the course of the next 90 days, just as soon as their yards are completed, at which time the St. Louis office will be advised.

The Philadelphia office reports having all the ship or other carpenters needed in that district at the present time.

The Galveston office reports that a number of men of various trades are coming into that district from the different cantonments which have been completed, and that, while there is some demand for ship carpenters, carpenters, calkers, riggers, etc., labor troubles are anticipated, so that it will not be well to direct men to that district for a while.

The San Francisco office reports opportunities for less than 100 ship carpenters and some 200 boat builders, but say it is difficult to secure accommodations in the shipbuilding district, especially for men with families; also that advance authority should be secured before men proceed to that point for work.

The reports we have from other offices are of a similar character, all tending to show that there is not just at this time nearly so great a scarcity of labor as is indicated by the newspaper items. It is the experience of this office that in every case where reasonably good wages are offered, conditions being normal, there is no trouble whatever in getting a sufficient number of men to fill the plants.

Mr. King concludes from his investigation that the Shipping Board does not need any ship carpenters. The trouble is there was no teamwork between the Shipping Board, that wanted men, and the Department of Labor, that was intrusted to secure these men.

And now to show that there was no coordination at all between the Department of Labor and the United States Shipping Board I have but to read from the letter of Chairman Hurley, addressed to me under the date of November 20, in which he says:

There is now being developed a special shipyard employment service in connection with the Department of Labor and the Shipping Board. * * * There is a very great need for skilled mechanics—

and I am referred to another governmental agency by the chairman of the Shipping Board.

Why, think of it. Here is an officer of this organization now claiming that they have only enough men for one shift of eight hours a day and need enough for three shifts, and that it is monstrous because they can not get the labor. During all this time the Shipping Board had intrusted to the Department of Labor, for which we make large appropriations, the matter of securing labor for them. The Labor Department as late as the 20th day of November last had not received from the Shipping Board any request for ship carpenters at all. The situation is this: The Shipping Board greatly needs a large number of ship carpenters. The Department of Labor is given the task of getting the men. The Department of Labor says there is no demand for ship carpenters. The Shipping Board says ship carpenters are greatly needed and that it is monstrous that they do not respond.

Now, I have no sympathy at all for these men who are organizing to strike at this time under prices paid in these yards. Neither have I any sympathy for that department of the Government, or for an organization in the Government that seems to have been asleep for eight months and that has not attempted to secure its employees through the agency that it selected—has not attempted to secure the men which it claims to need, and now comes in after eight months and lays all the blame of its own dereliction upon the carpenters of the United States. I say it is unfair, and it ill becomes the Shipping Board to make these charges in the public press when the real dereliction is found in the Shipping Board itself.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa has gone far afield to criticize the Shipping Board. As I read that interview the other day the only fact in it that impressed me was the claim on the part of the person interviewed that we did not have enough men in the shipyards to work three shifts a day. Admiral Bowles, when he appeared before the committee, said it is not practicable to work three shifts a day in building ships. You can work three shifts in a factory where the engines are built and you may work three shifts where fabricated parts are made, but in the construction of the ship itself—the riveting of the plates, and so forth—he

says that the work is too hazardous to be done in the nighttime, no matter how good the artificial light may be. He gave it as his opinion that it would not be practicable to work men three shifts a day in that department of ship construction. This criticism has been made as applied to labor: On account of a large increase in the price paid for labor, the increase in the wage, there is a disinclination on the part of the men to work six days in the week, and there is a disposition not to work as hard as they might during the hours of labor. In other words, there is a disposition to get more men on the job and do less work, and they—contractors or builders—are not able to develop that high degree of efficiency that is desirable if we are going to speed up our shipbuilding program and turn out as many ships as we might if every man on the job does his best. How far that is true, I would not undertake to say; but the attitude of labor in this country, speaking of labor as a whole, has been patriotic, and I think as time goes on the workmen in these different plants, whether shipbuilding or munitions or other plants, will realize the necessity for intense individual efforts to speed up and to develop the highest degree of efficiency, and they can not express their patriotism in a more wholesome or practical way than by every man doing everything in his power during the hours of labor, for the wage he is getting, to give the Government the best possible service and do his part to turn out as many tons of ships as is possible. Now, answering the criticism of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], I may say comparatively few carpenters are used in constructing steel ships. The labor situation on the Pacific coast and in the South, where large numbers of wooden ships are being constructed, is not so acute as in the steel-ship industry, if I understand the facts right. I am glad to know it, if it is a fact, that there are enough carpenters for all purposes in the building of steel ships and the building of wooden ships, but I do not see where we are going to get by this carping criticism of every activity of the Government.

That certainly will not help us along. I do not think the Shipping Board is subject to this criticism. I am sure that Chairman Hurley is doing everything in his power possible to speed up this shipbuilding program, and Members of Congress can do much to help him if they will go to Mr. Hurley and state to him the facts within their knowledge, and if there are abuses, if there are defects in administration, if there is waste, I think you will find him ready in every possible way to correct the abuses, remedy the faults in administration, and to correct the waste. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would state to the committee what particular plans have been formulated for securing the labor of the fabricated steel workers in the United States? That is the branch of the labor most needed, and I would like to have the gentleman state, if he can give us the information, what steps are being taken to secure that labor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman has read the papers in the last few days, I think he will have noticed that in different centers employment agencies are at work engaging volunteers for this work. But we have not the facilities yet, the housing facilities, and we can not care for the labor. The Emergency Fleet Corporation is trying to locate it. The men can not be called into the governmental employ now, but the labor is being located with a view to calling it into the service of the Government just as soon as we can take care of the men by providing adequate housing. The house-building industry throughout the country is not active now, especially steel construction.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and therefore it ought to be comparatively easy to secure these men if we can locate them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is true.

Mr. TOWNER. Has there been some sort of investigation carried on by the Emergency Corporation for the purpose of locating these structural steel workers?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; and they are being enrolled all over the country, according to my information.

Mr. TOWNER. Is that being systematically done by the corporation?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I hope so.

Mr. TOWNER. It seems to me that that is absolutely essential.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would state to my colleague that the letter of Chairman Hurley addressed to me under date of November 20 last states:

> There is now being developed a special shipyard employment service in connection with the Department of Labor.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is conceded throughout this debate that there is a shortage of labor in the United States. It is equally plain that we are not going to obtain until 1919 the shipping which we figured on having in 1918. There is to be a labor shortage here much greater and much more disastrous than any to which the preceding speakers have referred. The spring is just opening. The commencement of farming is at hand. When I was home a few days ago and saw the men coming in from the farms, every man said to me that, in the county of Niagara, in the State of New York, one of the richest counties in the United States, where land is high priced, where the products are numerous and valuable, where the farmers have great incomes, there will be farm after farm in the richest towns which will go unplanted, and with this shortage of ships we will have the farmers looking into the camps and seeing about 1,200,000 men carried from 1918 to 1919, or, rather, from 1917 to 1919, in an unnecessarily prolonged period of training, with the farms unplanted, and later as the crops come on we will see them uncultivated, and later and most disastrous of all, when the rich fruitage of the farms which are planted comes in the fall we will see the harvest go to waste for want of men to gather it. Is there no remedy? Can anything be done to better this situation? It seems to me that there can be.

We are not going to be able to transport these 1,200,000 men across the sea this year and maintain them there with ammunition and guns, with supplies of all the various kinds which they would need. What can we do? The time of planting comes at various times in the United States. We can give these men short furloughs, beginning now for the extreme South and running along from time to time, as the season opens in the sections farther north, and we can send them for the planting times throughout the United States. We do not need to denude the camps at any time. There will always be one-half or one-third of the men there, enough to employ the officers who are in command, and then as the planting time ceases throughout the United States the camps will resume their full activities, and continue full and active until the harvest season comes.

And then again from the South and the North we can grant short furloughs to send these men in the full vigor of life, when one man can do the work of two, back to the harvest to help garner these rich crops to feed us and our allies.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks, although I am very much in sympathy with his idea, that the soldier on furlough, occupying the new status that he does, with the halo of romance around him, would go back home and volunteer to make a profitable laborer on the farm for a short vacation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I believe the soldier on furlough would be of twice the value of the ordinary man. I went to a military boarding school when I was 11 years of age. I went back to the farm in the summer for the seven years I was in the school. I was always ready, during the vacation, to do my part upon the farm. I believe that a man who returns from a camp will return revivified and strengthened by his military training, it will be like a vacation to him, and he will be ready, it seems to me, to do not only the work that he used to do but a great deal more work than he was doing before he left for military service.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman think the important thing to do is for the men who are in civil life to go and put every bit of energy they have got into that endeavor and not expect us to call back our Army to do the work that ought to be done at home?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not believe the labor shortage will be settled for a year yet. I believe there will be a shortage in all branches. I believe in a year we will call in enough help from the women of the land, enough from the younger people of the land, so that we will do as they have done abroad not alone what we did before the war began, but I believe we will do it more efficiently, we will do more and we will do it better in every way. That is the experience in England and that is the experience in France. Labor there to-day is more efficient, happier, and more contented than it has ever been in the history of those countries, and we are going to find that here. I am suggesting simply that during the period when we are unable to send these soldiers abroad, when they remain in camp for a longer period than is necessary for their complete efficiency and training, when they can be spared for a few weeks during the planting season, and again for another few weeks during the harvest season, that they be permitted to be furloughed to return to this natural and useful avocation, which will be, next to fighting at the front, the most that any man can do to win this great world's war in which we are now engaged. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do.

Mr. FESS. I think there has been a general sentiment throughout the country that that may be done, that the furlough system will be used, and I have many letters on the subject, that they are expecting their own sons to be furloughed to be brought back to the farm. In case we can do that it would be especially effective on the farm, but that probably can not be done.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That could be done in cases where men have been sent, as it seems to me in all cases they should have been sent, to the camp which is the natural camp to which to send them, that which is relatively nearer the home as compared with other camps.

Mr. FESS. However, if the soldier had gone on to France he could not be furloughed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; we can not furlough a man abroad, and we do not want to furlough him.

Mr. FESS. This is likely to produce dissatisfaction on the part of the farmer who thinks his own son is coming back.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You will have some dissatisfaction with any course of conduct.

Mr. FESS. I agree that the gentleman's position is good.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But we have to do the best that can be done to obtain the greatest percentage of good and the smallest percentage of evil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman having the floor may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The views that the gentleman has just expressed, while they do not seem to be particularly relative to the bill under consideration, meet my very hearty approbation. I have done a good deal of thinking along that line myself, but has the gentleman ever tried to get the military authorities to agree on such a proposition?

Mr. FESS. I have.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Did he generally meet with great success?

Mr. FESS. No; I had a letter to-day refusing.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Perhaps the gentleman from New York has worked out these ideas he has expressed in relation to furloughing these men.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will tell the gentleman what occurred to me, if the gentleman will pardon me, as I have thought about this subject, as I have seen the Shipping Board lose a great deal of valuable time—and I am not saying that in a spirit of criticism, because I do not want to criticize—but I have seen, at any rate, that the expectation of the country that we would have enough shipping to send this one and a half million men across the water was going to be disappointed, and as I looked forward to the future and saw men at these camps serving a totally unnecessary time in preparation there——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is what I think.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Then I said there will grow throughout the country a sentiment which will demand that which I now advocate, and all I say now is that we accelerate that sentiment and bring it to bear upon those who have authority to grant the furloughs.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Now I want to get at that. How does the gentleman propose to accelerate that sentiment? I have tried to accelerate a little of that sentiment with the military people and had a very small success along that line.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I should suppose, for instance, that gentlemen of this Congress would be able to influence the public press of their vicinity to advocate this idea in such a way that it would create a public sentiment in advance of the planting season, which would be so strong and so overwhelming that those who are in supreme command will feel constrained to order the furloughs to be granted.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The very moment you start anything of that sort you will be met with the charge that you are interfering with a military system that you know nothing about or that you are disloyal. The military people would not do anything of that kind. I have in mind a young man from my district who is a shipwright and was in the service. How are you going to get him to be utilized for the purpose of shipbuilding? You apply to the military authority to get him out and see what will happen to him.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Shipping Board will ask for him, the Army will release him, for I have had that experience.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then I will come and confer with the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In the first place, I do not believe we should indulge in undue criticism. I believe that we should take an optimistic view of conditions; that we should hope, not criticize. I do not believe the time has come in this country when free speech, when free expression of opinion, when it is meant to be constructive, when it is meant to be helpful, should not be indulged in. I do not believe that time has come, and I do not believe it will ever come.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have this case—and every Member has hundreds of them who has an agricultural district—of a farmer that has three sons. He owns a little farm. The farmer has an old wife, and they are 65 or 70 years old. All three of those sons are in one camp, and the farmer wants one of them to come home. But you make application to the department with an excuse of that sort and see what will happen. I want to know what the gentleman would do.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The individual case is a very different case from the collective one. The individual example is a totally different thing from trying to release soldiers for a specific duty which the whole country can see is necessary not alone for ourselves but for our allies. I believe that all that is necessary is the creation of a proper public sentiment. That will secure the result we all wish for from the generals who command our armies.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I wish you would do that. I would like to take advantage of it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have found them very considerate and willing to do all they properly could do.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. They are very agreeable, but they never do anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, it is now 4 o'clock and we ought to finish the consideration of this bill to-day. We all agree it is an emergency measure of the greatest importance, and while it is very instructive to discuss these other questions that are entirely foreign, yet I must insist that hereafter the discussion be confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There are several other amendments to be considered. After we get through considering the bill and the amendments that may be offered, I have no objection to discussing everything under the sun. I suggest that we proceed to the discussion of this bill and amendments now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 4, line 19, after the word "corporation" insert: "But for no longer term than five years."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph vests this great authority in the Shipping Board to loan all or part of this $50,000,000 to any person, firm, or corporation without any limit whatsoever as to the length of term in which it is to be repaid. The framers of the bill admit that this is a very absolute power to be vested at any time, even in war time. I am in full sympathy with the policy of the committee that this money may be loaned to subsidiary corporations, but I am placing myself in the attitude of a director of one of these subsidiary corporations which is in need of money for the building of homes and can not get that money from private banks and wishes to have these buildings erected. They should be willing, as I view it, to accept the money for this purpose on the understanding that it should be repaid within five years. The argument may be made that they would wish to loan this money for a longer term so as to permit the workmen to pay it out during longer periods; but any corporation that really wishes to improve the facilities of its plant by having these houses erected, knowing that they can obtain this loan for five years, can arrange at the end of five years to obtain loans from private sources whereby the money can be returned to the Treasury.

There is this danger in all this legislation, that in these war times we will load down the Government with burdens that will haunt us for years and years to come. There should be some good ground advanced why the terms should be lengthened away beyond the period when the war is at an end. We should endeavor in every way possible to bring these paternalistic schemes to a close at a certain time after the conclusion of the war. The amendment does not limit it too drastically by making it a short period. I merely say five years, and certainly any corporation or any partnership which obtains the money for a five-year term can look forward to the time when that period comes to an end and make other arrangements to take up that loan—

that is all it is, in substance—rather than allowing the Shipping Board full freedom to make a loan for 15 or 20 or any other number of years. Some limit should be placed on this power in the Shipping Board to make these loans.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Cuthell at the hearings outlining the plan the Emergency Fleet Corporation has under consideration. It is not simply the question of loaning money to a corporation. The Emergency Fleet Corporation may lend to a corporation or a firm or an individual. But at the same time we want to get that money back. We want to loan it in such form as will save the Government possible loss.

Mr. Cuthell said:

Of course our first direction to them is that they shall not make any money out of this housing business, and we shall use all of our ingenuities to see that they do not make any money out of this housing business, because this is a war measure, and we are putting money in in an unusual way, and we want to provide houses for these employees and not for the profit of any land development company. There will be no salaried officers nor directors; there will be no commissions allowed in any way. The shipbuilding company will be allowed to have a 6 per cent return on its actual investment at cost that they can show by an actual audit of their books to us, and that is all.

And then there are very interesting pay-off provisions of the mortgage that we will have.

I wish to call your attention to this further statement of Mr. Cuthell's:

We propose to lend the money to these subsidiary companies at 4 per cent interest for 15 years, and beginning with the fourth or fifth year that they shall pay off 3 per cent on the principal. Now, bear in mind that it is a separate little company that is making this arrangement with us. We control the arrangement; we control the sale prices. We hope that all of these houses will be sold to the shipyard employees, and it is our intention to make the documents in such form as to facilitate sales. For instance, we mean to take a blanket mortgage for all our advance, and that blanket mortgage will have a schedule of release values annexed to it, so as to each particular plat of land and house in that development there will be an ascribed value. We plan to replace that blanket mortgage if an employee comes along and wants to buy and to take a separate mortgage on that particular tract, so that the employee will get the benefit of a 4 per cent mortgage. He can not get it now at 6 or more per cent, and it will aid him to that extent in financing his own home. There will be practically a trivial amount of cash required for a man to acquire a house in any one of these developments, and we intend to see that they are sold off to employees just as fast as possible.

Now, speaking further about it, Mr. Cuthell figures that to build at this time will cost from 30 to 40 or 45 per cent more than it would cost in peace times, and hence to require an employee to buy, or to expect him to buy, a house on the present basis of cost, and not give him the time in which to pay his debt at the lowest rate of interest, would not only be unjust to the employee but would defeat the very purpose, which is to sell these houses to the employees on long time, on some amortization plan, in the hope that ultimately they will pay for them and provide themselves homes.

Hence the suggestion is made by Mr. Cuthell that this money should be loaned for 15 years. To loan it for five years would defeat its purpose and would make it impracticable, in the view of the attorney, Mr. Cuthell, and Mr. Flannery, the director of housing, to dispose of these houses to the employees at the different shipping plants.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not expect that these houses that are proposed to be built will be only for temporary use? It is not to be supposed that all this shipbuilding activity is to continue after the war. That is not the intention.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is not intended to build houses only of temporary kind. That would depend on the locality. In some of the communities it is not the intention to build houses of a temporary character.

Mr. HAYES. To what use are the houses to be put after the war?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Take, for instance, the yard at Hog Island, there are many other industries in the neighborhood, and the demand for these houses will continue after the war.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; of course.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In a community like that it would not be wise for the Emergency Fleet Corporation to build temporary structures, because in that event they would be a total loss.

Mr. HAYES. Are all these places situated similarly to Hog Island?

Mr. ALEXANDER. They are not. In some instances they must be of a temporary kind, and after the war is over they may not have any value.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I supposed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Hence, the reason for not placing any limitation upon the Emergency Fleet Corporation or the director of housing, so that they can meet the conditions in the several communities in a reasonable way, with a view not only to providing for housing but to protect the Government and to ultimately save as much as possible from loss we give them great latitude.

Mr. HAYES. But does not the gentleman think that after the Government has carried it for five years and it has been sold—one house to one workingman—there are plenty of building associations and other organizations where such a workman can get in and have his investment taken care of, without involving the United States for 15 years? Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, the Government has its money in the property.

Mr. HAYES. Surely.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The point is how to get the money out, and if that condition exists at the end of five years, I presume the Government will be glad to get its money out as quickly as it can. But for us to place a limitation in the law such as proposed may defeat the very purpose we have in view, and the result will be a large loss if the Government is forced to call in the loans at the end of five years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman care to give the committee his idea whether the Government will entirely abandon that great big shipping plant there after the termination of this war?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I sincerely hope not. I hope we will build up a great American merchant marine.

Mr. BUTLER. I am afraid by the gentleman's answer to the question of the gentleman from California he might be misunderstood.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I hope the industry will continue.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to see an American merchant marine built up as much as anybody. I live on the Pacific coast. We are busy there now. But it is hardly to be expected that we will continue to manufacture ships after the war as rapidly as now. We can not do it. Therefore many of these houses must be of a temporary character.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is true; but there are communities where the shipbuilding plants will be permanent in character, and the activities will go on after the war. Take the case of Hog Island. The shipbuilding industry is not the only industry in that immediate locality, and hence the Fleet Corporation may well consider that fact and provide for improvements permanent in their nature.

Mr. STAFFORD. What would prevent the individual owner from going to private sources and getting money at the end of five years? Those are subsidiary corporations, capitalized to-day for millions of dollars, and you are proposing to load down the Government for 15 years, not to be paid at any time before that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no limit on the authority.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; the gentleman's amendment is an unwise one, in my judgment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Business men on this side think it is eminently fair. My limit is five years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think if we want to save the Government money, and in view of the plan outlined by Mr. Flannery, the director of buildings, and Mr. Cuthell it will be unwise for us to place any limitation in the law. The Committee on the Merchant Marine, just like the committee here, were anxious to know just what the plans are, how they proposed to carry them out, and how they were going to undertake to protect the interests of the Government with the view to making the losses as small as possible, and we did not think it wise to hamper them too much. We all realize that there will be losses.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman, I believe, from his statement, realizes the need of some limitation. Would he have any objection to an amendment, say, fixing the time at 10 years? I believe 5 years is ample for the purposes of all who wish to borrow this money; but say 10 years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Make it 15.

Mr. MADDEN. I think 10 years is more than it ought to be, but it certainly ought not to be over 10 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment and make it 10 years. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Clerk will read the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 4, line 19, after the word "corporation," insert "but for no longer a term than 10 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by the Chairman) there were—ayes 24, noes 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whenever said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall acquire by requisition or condemnation such property, or any interest therein, it shall determine and make just compensation therefor, and if the amount so determined is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined, and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as added to such 75 per cent will make such an amount as will be just compensation for the property so taken, in the manner provided by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 5, line 7, after the word "property," insert "or interest therein."

Mr. ALEXANDER. We accept that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is merely to make it a little clearer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not understand the provisions of this section of the bill. I want the chairman of the committee to explain why it is drawn in this way. It provides in the body of it here that when this property is taken 75 per cent of the compensation, as determined by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, shall be paid to the owner of the property and the remainder shall be recovered by a suit brought under section 24, paragraph 20, of the Judicial Code.

By referring to section 24 of paragraph 20 of the Judicial Code, as I find it on page 19 of the code, it provides this—and if the chairman of the committee is interested in this I would like to have him listen to this, because I think it is very important to get the bill right. I am in entire good faith, for I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman is addressing his attention to me, I will say that this provision has been enacted by this Congress in several bills relating to the condemnation of property for public use.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think probably you could improve this section. Section 24 of paragraph 20 of the Judicial Code provides that the Court of Claims shall have concurrent jurisdiction in all claims not exceeding $10,000. There may be many claims that will exceed $10,000, and in such cases this act will not apply. It says, and I read:

founded upon the Constitution of the United States or any law of Congress, or upon any regulation of an executive department, or upon any contract, express or implied, with the Government of the United States, or for damages, liquidated or unliquidated, in cases not sounding in tort, in respect to which claims the party would be entitled to redress against the United States, either in a court of law, equity, or admiralty.

Evidently that law is dealing with the Court of Claims. Then, here follows this provision, that, I think, makes this section absolutely unconstitutional. It does in Pennsylvania, and we have three shipyards that I hope will enjoy the benefits of this act, if it is passed, so I want it to be in such shape that it will work in Pennsylvania. This act provides at the close—

All suits brought and tried under the provisions of this paragraph shall be tried by the court without a jury.

Now, you are setting up a new method of adjudicating questions of damages. You are depriving the litigant of the right of trial by jury. You can not do that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and you can not do it generally in the other States of the Union.

Now, let us turn to the other provision. Why it should refer to two provisions of the Judicial Code, if one is good enough, I do not understand. But after referring to section 24, paragraph 20, it says, "and section 145 of the Judicial Code." We find that section on page 86 of the code, and that starts out as follows:

The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the following matters:

First. All claims (except for pensions) founded upon the Constitution of the United States or any law of Congress, upon any regulation of an executive department, upon any contract, expressed or implied, with the Government of the United States, or for damages, liquidated or unliquidated, in cases not sounding in tort, in respect of which claims the party would be entitled to redress against the United States either in a court of law, equity, or admiralty if the United States were suable.

How are you going to apply that statute in this case? This relates to the Court of Claims, and as a practical proposition, as the jurisdiction is given in this section of the judicial code, you have got to come to Washington to try the cases in the Court of Claims, and this means to drag men out of their home jurisdiction, in Pennsylvania, or Virginia at the Norfolk Navy Yard, or at the navy yard up in Boston, Mass., or wherever these houses are to be built. The owners of the property will have to come here to Washington to try their cases in the Court of Claims. Now, that is contrary to all legal procedure, and burdensome and expensive, and there is no necessity for it.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Is it not true that without this provision the claimant would have no place where he could bring a suit against the Government of the United States?

Mr. ROBBINS. I say the whole theory of this method of obtaining damages is wrong.

Mr. GOOD. It may be wrong, but what I want to direct the attention of the gentleman to is that it would not be unconstitutional, because at the present time the litigant would have no right to go into any court.

Mr. ROBBINS. He would have a right to go into the United States district court in the place where he lived. If he was a Hog Island man he could go to the district court in the city of Philadelphia, or if he was a Norfolk man he could go to the district court at Norfolk, Va., and try his case, and have a jury, and have the question of damages determined as it ought to be determined. That is the only way it can be determined.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his colleague have five minutes additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBBINS. I think this is a good objection to this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. In the last Congress we dealt very largely with this question, occupying nearly one-half day of this House, and they finally determined that this was the method by which damages should be recovered when property was taken from an individual without his consent. In the case of the armor-plate factory it was discussed.

Mr. ROBBINS. If you want to try a case relating to Hog Island or Bristol, why should you not be allowed to do so in the United States district court at Philadelphia, near by.

Mr. BUTLER. I contended then, as the gentleman does here, that the method we should adopt was the one that we have in Pennsylvania; but this House, by a large majority, decided otherwise and adopted this provision.

Mr. ROBBINS. Just let me finish this. There is a general act of Congress providing for the condemnation of real estate, the act of February 9, 1887. Therein it is provided—

that in every case in which the Secretary of the Treasury or any other officer of the Government has been, or hereafter shall be, authorized to procure real estate for the erection of a public building or for other public uses, he shall be, and is hereby, authorized to acquire the same for the United States by condemnation under judicial process whenever in his opinion it is necessary or advantageous to the Government to do so, and the United States circuit or district court of the district wherein such real estate is located shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for condemnation.

There is clearly a defined general statute providing for cases of this kind, and why go back and put it under two sections referring to the Court of Claims, one of which deprives the litigant of the right of trial by jury?

I want to call attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this committee to this matter. You say you are going to provide housing facilities for the workmen employed at the navy yards located at Bristol, Chester, and Hog Island, all in Pennsylvania. If there is an owner of land located on the territory you are going to acquire by condemnation, you can not do it, because the constitution of Pennsylvania protects the right of such landowner. This is the constitution of my State:

SEC. 8. Municipal and other corporations and individuals invested with the privilege of taking private property for public use shall make just compensation for property taken, injured, or destroyed by the construction or enlargement of their work, highways, or improvements, which compensation shall be paid or secured before such taking, injury, or destruction. The general assembly is hereby prohibited from depriving any person of an appeal from any preliminary assessment of

damages against any such corporation or individual made by brewers or otherwise. And the amount of such damages in all cases of appeal shall, on the demand of either party, be determined by jury according to the courts of the common law.

Now, if it is your purpose to prevent the three shipyards in Pennsylvania from getting any improvement under this act, you have handsomely provided for it in this bill, because the only clause in the bill under which you can proceed in a local court is one which says that you must determine it without the aid of a jury. The constitution of Pennsylvania steps in and says that you can not deprive a man of his property without the intervention of a jury.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does the gentleman maintain that under the Constitution of the United States it is necessary to have a jury in respect to the ascertainment of damages in land condemnation?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; I do. I say you can not take land away from a man without a jury trial if he demands it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman refer us to the section that supports that contention?

Mr. ROBBINS. In the Constitution of the United States is the general provision—article 5 of the amendments adopted when the Constitution was adopted:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We are all agreed on that.

Mr. ROBBINS. And under that there must be a trial by jury.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Can you cite me to the law providing that an ascertainment of land damages by the court in proceedings in condemnation is not due process of law?

Mr. ROBBINS. That is the adjudication in the cases under this section of the Constitution.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. My friend can not maintain that proposition.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield? Does the gentleman from Virginia maintain that due process of law would not include a trial by jury?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. But there may be due process of law without trial by jury.

Mr. HAYES. Not where there is a demand for a jury trial.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, yes; in every case where the Constitution or statute or common law does not give the right to a jury.

Mr. HAYES. I would like to know where.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In Virginia, for instance, and in many other States.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBBINS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why he did not adopt language that would put these condemnation proceedings under the act of the 9th of February, 1887, instead of this one in the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The provisions cited here do not relate to condemnation proceedings alone. The provisions of section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code, refer to the court or courts in which the suit may be brought for damages. Section 24, paragraph 20, provides that the United States district courts and the Court of Claims may have concurrent jurisdiction of claims of $10,000 or less. If the amount is in excess of $10,000 the suit must be brought in the Court of Claims. That is all that is involved in the statute referred to. First, the owner of the land and the agents of the Government undertake to agree on the value of the land. If they agree the total amount of the purchase price or the damage is paid direct. If they do not agree, then it is made the duty of the Government to pay to the owner 75 per cent of the sum and remit him to the courts to sue for the excess. The argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] it seems to me has no force or relevancy to the situation we are undertaking to deal with in this bill. We are not proceeding under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania; we are proceeding or will proceed under an act of Congress, if this bill becomes a law, and that too with due respect to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States that private property may not be taken for a public use without just compensation. This act provides a method by which that compensation may be ascertained, first, if possible, by agreement, and failing on agreement, then the Government may tender to the owner 75 per cent of the amount regarded by the agent of the Government as just compensation. The party then is remitted to his remedy in the district court of the United States if the amount be $10,000 or less, and if it be in excess of $10,000 he is remitted to his remedy in the Court of Claims. It will not do to say that his property has been taken without due process of law. Every step is provided for. His rights are safeguarded. The ascertainment of the damages, the method by which they may be ascertained may be different in the Federal court under this statute from the method in the State courts, but it will nevertheless be due process of law. A similar provision was written into the naval appropriation bill of 1915, under which the Government was authorized to commandeer great steel plants or munition plants and other great industries in this country in the event the Navy Department or the officers of these different industries were not able to agree upon what would be a reasonable price for their output, and I am told by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the provision in the naval appropriation bill was framed by the Department of Justice, presumably by the Attorney General.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; by the Attorney General.

The Clerk read as follows:

That whenever the said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall requisition any property or rights, or upon the filing of a petition for condemnation hereunder, immediate possession may be taken by it of such land, houses, or other property, rights, and facilities, to the extent of the interests to be acquired therein, and the same may be immediately occupied and used, and the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, providing that no public money shall be expended upon such land until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land is located has been given, shall be, and the same are hereby, suspended as to all land acquired hereunder.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 16, after the word "used," insert the following:
"*Provided*, That said corporation shall have authority to institute and conduct proceedings under the power of eminent domain in any State to acquire title to real estate located in such State, whenever necessary."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order. It is certainly not germane to this section.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to acquire, by condemnation, lands that are located near shipyards, among others, which yards are not owned by the National Government, and the clause of the Constitution of the United States that confers the right of eminent domain seems to me to limit it to public buildings, works, and forts over which the United States has jurisdiction. This right to condemn that is vested by this act seems to extend it to other propery not owned by the National Government, and I think that in such case, in order to give this act strength, we should make it optional with the corporation to proceed in Pennsylvania—if the land involved be in Pennsylvania—or Virginia or Maryland in connection with the improvement that is to be erected. I do not think the Government under this bill as it is here worded has the right of eminent domain to condemn property that is not located in connection with shipyards owned by the National Government. It is a well-known principle that this right of eminent domain is one that rests upon statute. For instance, this is the fundamental principle which underlies that right:

One of the most firmly established principles of the law of eminent domain is that the burden is on the party seeking to exercise such power to show an express warrant from the legislature. The power of eminent domain will never pass by implication, and even when the power has been expressly granted the grant will be construed strictly against the grantee, and he will not be allowed to take the lands of another unless he acts clearly and unmistakably within the limits of his authority.

I cite this from Nichols on Eminent Domain. Where is there any authority in the Constitution of the United States to condemn, as is proposed in this act, lands for housing dissociated and disconnected with any other improvement that the National Government owns? I concede, and I believe the National Government would have, the right to condemn houses in connection with a shipyard that it owns, to extend and take ground to provide for that shipyard, but that is not this proposition.

That is not the kind of taking we are dealing with. We are dealing with a statute to which is applied the strictest construction known to the law, on the civil side of the court at least.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman conceives that the Government of the United States would have no right to exercise the power of eminent domain to condemn property and build houses for cantonments for the temporary use or permanent use of its soldiers, having no other property in the neighborhood?

Mr. ROBBINS. That would be a complete unit, a unit in itself, for the military power, and that would be under the case of ex parte Milligan an exercise of the war power.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not simply condemning property for the use of the Government?

Mr. ROBBINS. Oh, no. There is the property as a whole that the United States would take under the war-making power which would be to complete a part of the armament and equipment for the national defense. Such are its cantonments. We propose here to do a different thing. You propose here to build houses alongside privately owned shipyards. Where is the power to do it? You have got to put your finger upon the statute, and you have not got the power. There is no implication of the right to condemn here.

Mr. ALEXANDER. When we enact this law——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does the gentleman think that the necessary power has not already been given to the Emergency Fleet Corporation?

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, you must show in the Constitution the right upon which you can found this act of Congress, because we are acting under delegated powers conferred on us by the States. We derive our power entirely from the Constitution.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. All that the gentleman's amendment will do will be to give this corporation authority to institute condemnation proceedings, is it not?

Mr. ROBBINS. In the State courts where the land is located. There is no question about it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why should the corporation not proceed in the Federal courts? That is the appropriate and customery tribunal for proceedings by or against the Government.

Mr. ROBBINS. Because we have not got the right to do it, as I am trying to explain. It is a power which is outside and beyond the limit of the Federal Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARDY. Under this amendment which the gentleman proposes, whereby the corporation would have to proceed in the State courts with methodical and long-drawn-out litigation for the condemnation of this property, it seems to me the gentleman brings about this situation: First, that we could not take immediate possession at all——

Mr. ROBBINS. Let me correct the gentleman right there.

Mr. HARDY. And therefore the immediate purposes of the act would be defeated. Second, the Constitution does not allow the condemnation unless it is to be used in connection with some property already owned by the Government, and therefore we could not condemn. So the State of Pennsylvania, according to the gentleman's contention, would have to do without any of these improvements.

Mr. ROBBINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Under condemnation proceedings in the State courts, as soon as notice is given to the owner of the land within five days thereafter the petitioner can file a bond which when approved by the court passes the title at once and vests it in the corporation taking the property, and possession is taken at once. The litigation afterwards relates entirely to damages to be recovered on the bond. Therefore the quick and speedy way to acquire this title is to institute condemnation proceedings in the State court by the corporation or petitioner desiring to acquire the title to the land.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask him this question, because we want to make an issue, and this we can not do unless we find out what we respectively stand for. Does the gentleman contend that in spite of this statute should it become a law, and in spite of our powers under the war power, that in the State of Pennsylvania the Fleet Corporation will not have the right to proceed by way of condemnation in the district courts of Pennsylvania to acquire the property desired? Is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes. They are up against private property owned by the people. It is not a complete unit. You are condemning houses there to be used by private corporations. The right of eminent domain does not give any such power as that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What does the gentleman refer to as a private corporation, the Fleet Corporation?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; to the shipyards. The shipyards at Bristol, Hog Island, Chester, are owned by private parties.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We are not giving a private corporation the right of condemnation. The right of condemnation is afforded only to the Fleet Corporation.

Mr. ROBBINS. The gentleman misunderstands me. But there are private shipyards alongside of which you propose to condemn ground and erect houses by the General Government.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, that is what I say.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. You understand, do you not, that it is proposed by this bill, to give the Fleet Corporation the power to condemn for war purposes, property related to the buildings that you have in mind?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But your contention is we can not do it unless we authorize them to proceed in the courts of your State?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; proceed in the courts of the State. And there they would have a right to do it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How can we give any greater right by authorizing the Fleet Corporation to proceed in the courts of your State, afford a greater right than we can give it the right to proceed in the Federal courts that are created by virtue of the Constitution and are part of the Federal system? Is it your idea that we will derive our powers from the State constitution?

Mr. ROBBINS. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That seems to be your contention.

Mr. ROBBINS. I suggest that the State court is the proper place in which to carry on the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. MONDELL. I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman, but I do not intend to discuss it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. But I do, and I think it is my duty to discuss it.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall want to follow.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would like to discuss it now, so that the two arguments may be together.

Mr. MONDELL. That is fairly satisfactory to me.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] labors under the impression that there is no other way to condemn property for a public use except as provided by the laws of Pennsylvania. The constitution of every State in the Union prescribes that property may not be taken for a public use without just compensation, and the method by which property may be condemned for a public use is different in practically every State in the Union. We are undertaking to condemn property for the use of the Federal Government and as a war measure. It is just as important, in providing for the national defense, to provide ships and the facilities to build them as to provide armies and equip them. The Constitution of the United States says that property may not be taken for Federal use except upon just compensation. We have undertaken, having respect to that provision of the Constitution, to provide a method by which that property may be condemned, a Federal statute under which the property may be condemned for Federal use. Now, it would be unfortunate, indeed, if in every instance where it is necessary to condemn property for a Federal use we would be remitted to the remedy or process provided in the State. But this paragraph of the bill that the gentleman seeks to amend refers to the section of the Federal statute the provisions or requirements of which we seek to suspend in order to facilitate the work by taking immediate possession of the property, whether purchased or condemned, and not wait for the opinion of the Attorney General as to the title.

Now, section 355, to which reference is made in the paragraph, and the provisions of which it is sought to suspend, is as follows:

No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, customhouse, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land or site may be to such purchase has been given. The district attorneys of the United States, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall furnish any assistance or information in their power in relation to the titles of the public property lying within their respective districts. And the Secretaries of the departments, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall procure any additional evidence of title which he may deem necessary, and which may not be in possession of

the officers of the Government, and the expense of procuring it shall be paid out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the departments, respectively.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know the gentleman has given a great study to this question. Can he state to the House the provisions of the statute which provides authorization to the National Government to condemn private property for the purposes of the Government?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have never had a general statute—I state that simply on information—under which the Government may condemn private property for public use. The Congress at all times has undertaken to reserve that power and confer it only when it was to be exercised with reference to a specific case, as we are undertaking to do here. I think you will find——

Mr. STAFFORD. Then under what procedure will the Government go ahead and take this private property for public purposes?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Under the provisions of this bill when enacted, which authorizes the condemnation of property and provides how it may be done in the event the parties can not agree on the price——

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; but where is the procedure? It does not say in what court they shall proceed. The bill provides that in case the individual declines to take the award you offer, then the procedure follows; but there is no procedure fixed in the statute or any procedure authorized in this bill to go ahead under condemnation proceedings.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman is mistaken. The bill does authorize and fix the procedure. If the amount involved is less than $10,000, the United States district court and the Court of Claims have concurrent jurisdiction.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to claims?

Mr. ALEXANDER. As to damages. If the gentleman ever tried a condemnation suit in his life he would know that the issue is one of damages.

Mr. STAFFORD. I grant that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Of course, if a railroad undertakes to condemn property for railroad purposes, they take the property first, and afterwards the amount of damages is ascertained.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there is a certain procedure laid down in that case. There is no procedure laid down here in the bill or under our statutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is just the same. I refer you to the paragraph following paragraph 5.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. All right.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not provided frequently in the statutes that the damages under condemnation proceedings shall be ascertained according to the laws of the State in which the condemnation proceedings were had? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] says that would be an anomaly. But I want to cite the case of United States against Jones, One hundred and ninth United States Reports.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will pardon me in that connection, that is not precisely what I said. I said it would be an anomaly for the Government to proceed in condemnation proceedings in a State court. The procedure in the Federal courts sitting in a State follows, as a rule, the procedure in that State, but the procedure of the State courts would not be paramount over procedure prescribed by Federal authority for the Federal courts.

Mr. ROBBINS. This case, the case of United States against Jones, arose in regard to taking a post-office site in the State of Alabama. That is in line with the amendment I suggested as being the provision which should be put into this bill. I quote from the opinion of the Supreme Court, on page 520:

> Whenever it became necessary to take private property, "the price to be paid shall be determined, and the title and jurisdiction procured, in the manner prescribed by the laws of the State of Alabama."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. You do not understand that that would require the Federal Government to proceed in the courts of Alabama?

Mr. ROBBINS. It makes it optional, and for this purpose. I have this decision before me. In the report of the committee which has been filed here, on pages 23 and 24, it is stated, when the chairman was asked whether he would use this power, that it is only to be resorted to as a power to prevent undue prices being put up by land speculators against the Government.

I want to make this bill clear as to their right to resort to condemnation proceedings in the State where the land is situated, or in the Federal court, so that this work will not be delayed, and it is in line with this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that I have just cited.

Mr SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say just a word or two with respect to the legal questions that have been raised, and to restate a little more precisely the position that I hold, and which I think is held by the committee.

Speaking for myself, I am not acquainted with any case in which the Federal Government proceeded to condemn property for its own purposes in the courts of the State where the property sought to be condemned was located. So far as I am acquainted with such matters, the proceedings are taken in a Federal court.

With respect to our power to do what is proposed to be done under this bill, I wish to say that the Congress is certainly clothed with the power to enact legislation for the common defense. Congress has the right to declare war, to provide a Navy, to provide for the common defense, and to make all the laws necessary and proper to carry these powers into execution, and all other powers vested in it by the Constitution. This is a measure for the common defense. We propose to do certain things immediately relating to agencies that are being operated in the interests of national defense, and it seems to me that the position can not be successfully maintained that, when we are so legislating and proceeding under the general war power at a time when we are actually in war, we lack the power to prescribe precisely, not only for the condemnation of property by the United States to make effectual the common defense, but the procedure as well by which that property is to be acquired. The rights of all parties concerned are provided for in this bill.

It is not proposed to strip anybody of any substantial rights, or to take something for nothing. We propose to pay for every square foot of property acquired by the procedure contemplated. In order to expedite action—and certainly this is a time when expedited action is of the essence—it is provided that when proceedings in condemnation are once instituted, possession may be taken at once of the property desired in order that there may be no delay which would hinder the successful prosecution of the war aims of the Government. But we have not taken from any man the right to recover the fair value of his property. We give him the right to sue the Government in a court of compensation for whatever balance he claims may be due him in excess of the 75 per cent which has been appropriately ascertained. We pay over to him 75 per cent, and give him the right to sue for any balance that he may claim. Not only have we given the right to the landowner to do this, but we have amply provided for the protection of the rights of every citizen of the United States who may be affected by this legislation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will withdraw the point of order and let the committee decide it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the expenditure of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized, and in executing the authority granted by this act the said United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall not expend or obligate the United States to expend more than the said sum.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GREEN of Iowa offers the following amendment:
> Page 6, line 17, after the word "sum," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "nor shall any part of said sum be paid upon any contract for construction which provides that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit, unless such contract shall also fix the reasonable cost of such construction as determined by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and provide that upon any increase in cost above the reasonable cost so fixed by such board the percentage of profit shall decrease as the cost increases, in accordance with a rate to be fixed by said board and expressed in the contract: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent said board from contracting for the payment of premiums or bonuses for the speedy completion of the work contracted for."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that this bill would contain some limitation upon the powers of this board with reference to contracts. Our experience has been so unfortunate, to say the least, when we have granted indefinite powers to boards and commissions to pay any sum that they wanted to pay, and to make any kind of contracts that they desired, that it is time some limitation was put upon their powers in this respect. I am unable to agree entirely with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], who said yesterday that the evils from which we were suffering grew out of the fact that we had appropriated lump sums. I believe that under circumstances like those we have now in hand it is necessary to make lump-sum appropriations, but I believe that if the boards and commissions themselves will not put some restrictions upon these contracts which will in some way limit the

profits that may be derived under them it is time that this Congress did so. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] who said yesterday that if we had a committee upon expenditures, as was proposed in the last session—and I might say in this connection proposed by myself—a number of these contracts of which so much complaint has been made never would have been thought of; but we have not got such a committee, and it is time that something was done to restrict these profiteers. Gentlemen yesterday related the waste and extravagance that had occurred in building our cantonments, and waste and extravagance have simply run riot in connection with the Hog Island project. The ground of that shipyard cost two or three times what it ought to have cost, two or three times what it could have been purchased for a short time before the contract for purchase was made. Men have been employed in connection with this Hog Island project at salaries two, three, four, and sometimes five times what they were receiving before. Publicity agents were employed at a total something like $20,000, as I remember, to exploit the great virtues of the splendid management under which these ships were to be built at this project. I am glad to say that my understanding is that Mr. Hurley has since dispensed with some of these publicity agents, with relation to whom I might say also at this time that some of them had no opportunity whatever to attend to publicity or anything else except their own business in which they were already fully employed.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman read this evening's Star?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I have not got that far. I suppose there is an addition to this story.

Mr. COX. There is, and it is very interesting. A colonel by the name of Black, a former graduate of West Point at the public expense, I presume, its seems, got hold of 500 acres of land where one of these shipyards is located and only got $2.000 an acre for it. It was land that had only been appraised and assessed at $100 an acre. Other land in that vicinity had been sold for $500 an acre, and yet this patriotic Col. Black, of New York, somehow got $2,000 an acre for 500 acres of land, amounting to $1,000,000. That is patriotism.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There are a large number of patriots mixed up in this Hog Island project. The great object seems to have been to hog everything in sight.

Mr. COX. This colonel has hogged his share of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have reached the point where we favor a change of name.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think the name ought to be changed. It is altogether appropriate. I will say this, that so many of these cost-plus contracts have been let that it simply put a premium on graft and waste and encouraged extravagance.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Would it not be wise in the amendment to empower the Emergency Fleet Corporation to fix the limit of cost and not allow the contractor any compensation when the figures go beyond that limit of cost?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The difficulty with that, as I understand the board, is that the cost is daily advancing, so that at the time of the contract it would be impossible to fix a price as the work proceeded.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have offered, instead of providing an inducement for graft, for waste, and for extravagance, offers an inducement to perform these contracts as cheaply as possible. It provides, in the first instance, that a reasonable cost be fixed and determined at the time of the contract by the Shipping Board.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. As I read the amendment, I am inclined to think that under the language the Shipping Board would be obliged to let the work in competitive bidding.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Under my amendment? No.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the way it reads to me.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The amendment provides that in any contract if let on a basis of compensation plus cost——

Mr. MADDEN. How does the gentleman construe this language?—

Nor shall any part of said sum be paid upon any contract for construction which provides that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit.

That language would seem to prevent the Shipping Board from doing this work on a basis of cost plus.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. "Unless," as the provision goes on to say——

Mr. MADDEN. Unless such contract shall fix a reasonable cost of such construction as determined by the United States Shipping Board Fleet Corporation.

Now, if the board could fix a reasonable cost in advance, they could only do that by stabilizing the cost of material and stabilizing the price of labor, and of course if they could do those two things then they could let the contract by competitive bids, but if they can not do either or both of the things it would be absolutely impossible to fix the price in advance. I am trying to get before the gentleman my view of the thing, so that he may explain it for the understanding of Members here.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The fixing of a reasonable price is in the option or in the discretion of the board. They can fix it at any sum, and it would be assumed that they would fix it at a reasonable price at the time the contract was made. It does not mean that they are to control prices, and would not have that meaning as a matter of law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Since the gentleman has obtained recognition and offered his amendment, I will not offer the 5 per cent amendment I had in mind. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the effect of his amendment would be to limit the discretion which seems to have existed heretofore to pay bonuses and increases of cost after work was commenced?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The amendment that I have offered would not eliminate that, but it would decrease the percentage of profit as the cost was raised, so there would be no inducement to increase the cost, but rather an inducement to decrease it, and it provides for fixing the reasonable cost at the time the contract is entered into.

Upon that a certain percentage could be paid under the provisions of my amendment. That is, that would be an absolute sum that the contractor would get in any event. If he exceeded that, his percentage would decrease in proportion to the increase of the cost.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The amendment cuts out the cost-plus percentage, as we now understand it, does it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It does not absolutely forbid such contracts; but my amendment is drawn upon the theory that such contracts may be found to be necessary at times, and it proposes to so modify them that instead of offering a temptation to waste and extravagance which is offered in the ordinary form of these cost-plus contracts, there will be an inducement to economy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, the amendment proposes to pay a premium to those who reduce the cost?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. It limits the profit; and under it a contract could be so drawn that if extravagance and waste were permitted it would be at the expense of the contractor. For example, the contract could provide that if the estimated price was exceeded by 5 per cent the contractor would receive 5 per cent on that extra cost; if it was exceeded 10 per cent, 1 per cent of the excess; if exceeded 15 per cent, one-half per cent, and so on. The higher the cost mounted the less the contractor would get; but it would not stop the making of contracts, because the contractor would get his per cent on the estimated reasonable cost in any event.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. I had in mind offering an amendment which absolutely forbid cost-plus contracts. I believe that such an amendment, if adopted, would not unduly hamper the Shipping Board in this construction, and I am of opinion that cost-plus contracts, if justified at any time, under any circumstances, are not necessary in connection with this work. But there seems to be some difference of opinion in regard to that, so I shall not at this time offer the amendment, but will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa provides that the Shipping Board shall make an estimate of cost as they do now in all these cases. Under that amendment they could enter into a cost-plus contract, but when the expenditure reached the estimated cost the percentage of profit would begin to decrease in such manner as might be provided for in the contract, taking away at least some of the temptations to increase the cost in order to secure added profits. I believe it would be a great improvement upon present methods.

We have had a very sad and unhappy experience under these cost-plus contracts. I think the first time they were suggested in the House in connection with an appropriation bill I expressed the opinion that we would have very great scandal under that kind of contract. I argued that it encouraged waste and extravagance and would lead to graft, and that it was very unwise to pursue such a policy. The outcome in the building of cantonments and particularly at the Hog Island shipbuilding plant, has certainly justified the fears I expressed when the matter was first considered in the House. Hog Island! What a prophetic soul was he who named it! Hog Island—a shipbuilding plant that was to cost $21,000,000 has cost $29,000,000 up to date and will cost $45,000,000, and not a keel laid, not a ship under way! Hog Island—where, according to the record so far, no one person has been able to get on the pay roll more than seven times or draw more than seven salaries! How many patriots have drawn more than seven salaries we do not know. We know that at least one man there has been so patriotic in his support of his Government that he has drawn seven salaries for his patriotic endeavors. Whether he did any work the record does not disclose—probably not, as it must have taken all his time to draw his seven salaries.

Mr. COX. What was the aggregate of the seven salaries?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know, but as even a water boy who drew less than $5 or $6 a day seems to have been considered a piker, it must have been a fairly good sum. Hog Island! When all the land lay under a fearful condition of freight congestion, and from all parts of the country there was a cry for empties, for cars to carry coal, when in this city 5,000 homes, according to official statements, were cold and cheerless, without fuel in zero weather, when all over the land there were countless families, women and children, suffering for want of coal, then, and under these conditions, Hog Island had an average of 1,300 loaded cars standing on sidetracks, on each of which your Uncle Samuel paid $5 per day demurrage—$6,500 per day paid at Hog Island out of the Federal Treasury for demurrage on cars that could have been unloaded any day! And as the patriotic, high-minded corporation that had the contract was, I understand, getting 10 per cent on all costs, it was on that basis drawing into its pocket from the National Treasury every day $650 as its rake-off on the $6,500 per day that the Government was paying on demurrage. It was testified at the hearing that at one time there were over 3,500 loaded cars, all paying demurrage, I presume, and adding to the graft. According to the sworn testimony before the Senate committee, while these cars were lying on sidetracks with their loads, a third of the men under pay were not working because the material was not unloaded. Hog Island! Where one piece of work, estimated to cost $50,000, cost $600,000. Hog Island! Where every device criminal ingenuity could invent was practiced to increase costs to the Government and profits to grafters. Hog Island! What a libel the Saturnalia of graft that flourishes there is on honest swine. Men have been shot for less traitorous doings in times of war. Is it any wonder that we seek to prevent such unbridled graft in the future?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I inserted a statement from Moody's Manual, edition of 1917, giving the names of the officers and directors of the American International Corporation, the agency selected by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to construct the shipbuilding plant at Hog Island and to build ships therein. They are men of national reputation in the financial world, and we might reasonably have expected under the present emergency, inspired by patriotism, they would have faithfully discharged their trust and protected the interests of the Government. I want to be just and say that I do not believe that Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, who is president of the board of officers of the American International Corporation, had personal knowledge of these conditions, and I am optimistic enough to believe that as soon as he and the other high officers of the corporation have their attention called to conditions at Hog Island they will cooperate with Admiral Bowles in cleaning out the Augean stables and giving the Government a square deal.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the reason that the president of that corporation, who lives in New York City, only 90 miles away from the shipyards, could not have been acquainted with conditions there and could not have gotten there in three hours?

Mr. ALEXANDER. As the gentleman knows, he is president of the National City Bank also.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He has been traveling all over the country in a private car. Why could not he have taken three hours to travel to that shipyard?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, he certainly has notice of the conditions at Hog Island now, and the duty devolves upon him and the other officers of the corporation to look into conditions and remedy them, and restore to the Government at least a part of this money which has been wastefully expended, and stop the graft that has become a scandal and a stench in the nostrils of honest men.

Now, I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], who offered the pending amendment. I would be reluctant to do anything or oppose any amendment the purpose of which would be to protect the Treasury against such waste as has been going on at Hog Island and the waste that has gone on in connection with building of cantonments.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question on that point?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman think any man ought to accept as responsible a position as the president of a great concern like that and not devote some personal attention to the management of the corporation and have some personal knowledge of what is going on?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Vanderlip, I imagine, is connected with so many corporations in a responsible capacity that it would be impossible for him to give his personal attention to the details of all of them, and I assume he thought the responsible agents of the corporation would give the Government a square deal.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am not acquainted with the president, and, of course, do not wish to attack him any more than the gentleman from Missouri, but does the gentleman from Missouri think it is part of his duty as chairman of this great committee to excuse in advance the officers of a corporation like that, who live within a few miles of it, practically all of them, and lay the blame upon their subordinates?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not want to excuse them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman did excuse them.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, I did not intend to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There has been in this country, if the gentleman will permit the suggestion, back for a generation or more, to my certain knowledge, too much of these excuses of men who are big and prominent, at the head of great corporations, and putting the blame on their subordinates. It is time the men who are in charge of corporations—the officers—should be held responsible for such outrageous doings as are going on at Hog Island.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I can understand why Mr. Vanderlip did not have knowledge of conditions up to this time, but I can not understand why he may not have knowledge of conditions now, and I am not disposed to excuse him unless he does his utmost to remedy them. And I do not say Mr. Vanderlip alone, but every officer and director of the American International Corporation as well.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in order to get the facts straight, is it not true that Mr. Vanderlip, who was president of the National City Bank, a very powerful New York corporation, recently resigned the presidency of that institution to enter the service of the Government at a dollar a year to sell war-savings stamps on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I did not understand he had resigned as president of the bank, but I do understand he has given a large part of his time, if not all of his time, to the purpose mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I recall having read recently that Mr. Vanderlip did resign as president of the National City Bank, and that he did so, stating that he had put all financial interests behind him; that he proposed to dedicate his services to the Government of the United States; that he felt that the sale of the war-savings stamps was a patriotic duty and that he desired to "do his bit" in that way. His services were accepted, as I understand it, by the Secretary of the Treasury, with whom he has been cooperating from that time to this.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, with reference to this amendment, it provides:

Nor shall any part of said sum be paid upon any contract for construction which provides that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit, unless such contract shall also fix a reasonable cost of such construction as determined by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Now, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who is unquestionably one of the best business men in this House, how is the board to ascertain the cost of construction? The great difficulty is to ascertain such cost. I do not suppose there is a man in any department of the Government that does not realize the vice in the cost-plus plan, but can you determine what the cost of the material will be? Can you determine the cost of labor when the labor cost is shifting and increasing from day to day? How are you going to ascertain what it will cost to build a house? Will any reasonable contractor, having regard to his own welfare, agree to build a house for $2,500 without reference to the probable increased cost of material or the increase in the cost of labor, without undertaking to protect himself against those contingencies? I wish it were so. I wish these costs were stabilized. It might be done in peace times, but under existing conditions when costs are increasing from day to day that is the problem confronting the Government.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows, of course, the Emergency Fleet Corporation now and the War Board now make an estimate of the cost of all of these contracts. They do that, and that estimate, if it is not a part of the contract, is presented with the contract. It is supposed to be a guide. Twenty-one million dollars was the esimated cost of Hog Island. Now, why is it not entirely feasible to enter into a contract with the provision that when that estimated cost is reached the profit shall decrease as the cost increases further? Does not that give the very leverage that is needed to discourage increasing the cost?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: Suppose the Emergency Fleet Corporation does estimate the cost. They must get a contractor. He may say, "That is not a reasonable cost; you can not figure on what will be a reasonable cost to-morrow; you can not figure on the cost of material to-morrow; you can not figure on the cost of labor to-morrow. Hence, I am not going to take that contract with the provision in it that my profit shall be 5 per cent in excess of your estimate, because the increased cost of labor and material to-morrow may entirely wipe out that 5 per cent, and there will be no inducement for me to take the contract. I can not afford to take the chances." Of course, the Emergency Fleet Corporation may say, "We will pay you 25 per cent and make the margin wide enough." He may say, "I will take it on a cost-plus basis, based on your estimate, but I want the per cent large enough to cover any possible increase in the cost." And under this amendment they make it 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 15 per cent, 20 per cent, or 25 per cent, to meet that condition. Hence, while the purpose of this amendment, it does not solve the difficulty.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then the remedy would fail. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. So far as the steel is concerned, used in that Hog Island yard, the Government of the United States fixed the price absolutely and arbitrarily at $65 a ton. I heard a witness testify to that not more than half an hour ago, and he was one of the contractors.

Mr. MADDEN. There will not be any steel used in these houses.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There will be some hardware in the houses, of course, but the houses will not be of steel construction.

I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of this amendment, but I do not believe that if written in the bill it would militate against carrying out the housing scheme, if it unduly hampers the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. The gentleman seems to think he is in sympathy with this amendment; at least, that it will work out. Does not the gentleman believe that it ought to go to conference, of which he will be a member, and be worked out there?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am in sympathy with the principle of the amendment, but I do not believe this amendment is drawn along the proper lines to meet the conditions.

Mr. COX. That may be; but we have all the confidence in the world in the gentleman, because he will be a member of that conference committee, and we think it ought to go there and let it be worked out. We will not be deceived in you at all.

Mr. HARDY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire recognition?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. I wish to make just a few observations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARDY. I do that. I believe that if any provision of this kind should be adopted, it should simply be a straight, unequivocal provision that there should be no cost-plus contracts. If that were done the corporations expected to be organized by the shipyards to carry out, at least in part, the purposes of this act would simply have to employ good superintendents who would go out into the market and hire labor and buy materials to construct these houses. The superintendent acting for the corporation which got the money from the Government would be paid a reasonable salary, and the only profit to anyone would be the salary of that superintendent. That, I think, would be the way I would build a house for myself at this time, since no contractor would perhaps make a bid to build for me without a wide and safe and more than safe margin to cover any fluctuation in prices of labor or material. Now, if any amendment is going to be adopted, I believe one ought to be adopted that would prohibit the cost-plus contracts.

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

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. HELM. We notice here in Washington blocks of houses that seem to be standardized to a type. Would it be possible for the persons connected with this board to agree upon a certain type of house?

Mr. HARDY. Unquestionably that is contemplated. They will have one type for this location and another for that location, suitable for the climatic conditions and the other conditions.

Mr. HELM. Then they could let a contract for a certain number of houses of a certain distinct type?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; that is true. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the chairman of the committee said a moment ago. No contractor will feel himself safe to contract for 50 houses, or whatever number it may be, at any given price per house, because he does not know what the rate of wages will be to-morrow, and he does not know what the price of lumber will be to-morrow, or the price of any other material. The fluctuation in the prices of everything that enters into the cost of construction is so great that you are either bound to rely on the honesty of your manager to give you fair measure for all you spend in construction or else you have got to pay a fixed sum for the completed job you want done, far in excess in all probability of its actual cost. If you had a good superintendent who could go out into the labor market and into the material market and honestly secure labor and materials as cheaply as he can get them, you would have to pay him a good salary, but that would result in the cheapest construction you could get. The cost-plus policy has demonstrated itself to be full of scandal and rottenness. [Applause and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, all of us desire, of course, that some system shall be devised by which we can stop the waste and extravagance that have been referred to. Those coming from the vicinity of Hog Island, I think, feel that way; but so much has been said about that place and its proximity to the city of Philadelphia, particularly by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that I feel a word or two should be said concerning the desire of the people there to have this work properly done.

We want ships. The people of Philadelphia and of Pennsylvania are intensely patriotic. They are shipbuilders. They have built ships systematically for more than a hundred years. They know how to build ships. The difficulty here was that people came in who had the reputation of "knowing how," but who up to the present time have succeeded largely in spending money. They have not built the ships. Now, we want the ships built.

That is the general feeling around about that vicinity. There is no disposition to keep up this continual scandal, due to waste and extravagance. There is every disposition to have that chapter closed, even if the Government has lost money through its contracts, whether made foolishly or otherwise. We want results that will be creditable to the Government as well as to the locality.

Of course there has been difficulty in getting labor to the point called Hog Island. It takes some time for a mechanic to go from Philadelphia 8 miles down to Hog Island or 8 miles up from Chester. It takes time for him to get over from Billingsport or Camden and get down to Hog Island and then get back home. That causes great loss of time and en-

ergy. To a certain extent it accounts for some of the confusion in the labor problem there. But the Shipping Board has taken notice of the complaints of citizens and of the critics of the present system, and it has taken the bit in its teeth recently. The exposures being made on the other side of the Capitol and the things said in this House may be doing good, but the Shipping Board has taken the bit in its teeth, as I have said, and promises better things. It has sent a competent, up-to-date shipbuilder to Hog Island to see that this wretched business is straightened out.

I am happy to say that Admiral Bowles is upon the ground now, and that one of the first things he has done—and he is proceeding up to date, without any flourish of trumpets—has been to dispense with the services of $10,000 a year advertising men who have aided, probably, in keeping facts from the public. I do not believe in press agencies that suppress the facts. The public ought to know what is going on, and Admiral Bowles has indicated that it shall know. He is dispensing with the services of those who have tended to muddy the waters. [Applause.] Now he talks about getting down to business. He says he is going to produce ships. Mr. Hurley, of the Shipping Board, and Mr. Vice President Piez, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, say they mean business now and propose to stand by Admiral Bowles. That is the situation at this moment, and because of it we will hope for better things.

In order that some of the details may be better understood I desire to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, sent to me the other day in answer to some inquiries; one with respect to the change of name, one with respect to the matter of local improvements for the convenience of the workmen who are to locate in this vicinity, and another with respect to the various forms of amusement, entertainment, educational facilities, and so forth, that ought to be provided for so large a community. I ask unanimous consent to print this letter as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION,
Washington, February 7, 1918.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: Replying to your letter of January 27 to Mr. Hurley, which has been referred to me for reply, permit me to say that Admiral F. T. Bowles has recently been put in charge of the Government plants, with headquarters at Philadelphia. I am certain that he joins me in favoring a change in the name of the yard, "Hog Island" hardly being a proper appellation for the largest shipyard in existence. I am certain that if your constituents in Philadelphia desire the change, the officers of the Fleet Corporation will be very willing to lend their aid. Please bear in mind that the name now refers to the location of the yard and that it is the province of either the State or Federal authorities to make the change. Owing to its brevity "Hog Island" is likely to stick, particularly as the name of our agents, the American International Corporation, is too long to serve as a proper alternative.

Replying to your second paragraph, we are still awaiting the passage of the act authorizing an expenditure for housing and transportation of workers, and may be unable to finally close contracts until that act is passed. We have, however, definitely settled on a location in Philadelphia, the city having agreed to provide the necessary street, water, and sewerage improvements.

In regard to the third paragraph of your letter, it is our own feeling, and that of several of the members of the Senate committee now investigating the Emergency Fleet Corporation's affairs, that in all cases where the communities are large enough school facilities should be provided by the community and that amusement and social features should be left to private initiative.

The reports of housing plans at Hog Island have been rather exaggerated, because it is our intention to materially improve the transportation facilities and to reduce the number of houses to about two thousand. We have been rather chary of making this information public because, owing to lack of legislative authority, we were unable to promptly complete our plans and were unwilling on that account to make a general announcement of them. We hope, in the course of a few days, to have proper congressional authorization, and we shall be glad thereupon to furnish you any additional information that may be of use and value to your community.

Very truly, yours,
CHARLES PIEZ,
Vice President and General Manager.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would not ask even for this additional minute if this were not such an important matter; but I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that my amendment does not unduly restrict the Shipping Board. There is no difference in their powers to make the necessary contracts. If there is any fault whatever with this amendment, it is that it does not restrict the Shipping Board sufficiently. It follows what I have understood to be the general plan that has been used in some instances by Mr. Secretary Daniels in making contracts for the Navy. It is a process which results in a decrease of the profits, cutting down the unreasonable profits and preventing this outrageous profiteering which has been going on in cases like that at Hog Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GREEN of Iowa), there were—ayes 21, noes 26.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa demands tellers. All in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Sixteen Members, not a sufficient number.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The other side, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUTLER. The rule requires 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not requested the other side to rise. One-fifth of a quorum of the Committee of the Whole is required. The amendment is lost.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I desire to offer an amendment. I hope the gentleman will withhold his motion.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will withhold the motion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 6, line 17, after the word "sum," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

"*Provided*, That the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation shall report to Congress on the 1st days of July and January of each year the names of all persons or corporations with whom it has made contracts, and of such subcontractors as may be employed in furtherance of this act, including a statement of the purposes and amounts thereof, together with a detailed statement of all expenditures by contract or otherwise, for land, buildings, materials, labor, salaries, commissions, demurrage, or other charges in excess of $10,000."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment speaks for itself. It has been added to certain other bills when lump-sum appropriations were made, and in view of the criticism of this board it seems to me it ought to welcome a provision of law like this. It can readily make its return, stating to whom these contracts have been awarded, giving the names of the subcontractors, stating the purpose of the contract, the amount thereof, and giving in detail such expenditures as have been made in the way of commissions, salaries, and so forth, in excess of the sum of $10,000. It seems to me an amendment like this ought to be welcome to clarify the situation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to the amendment, unless it is covered by the existing law. The shipping act, section 12, in the last paragraph, provides——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That pertains to the Shipping Board, and my amendment pertains to the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will not oppose the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment at the end of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the paragraph, line 17, page 6, the following: "That no portion of this sum shall be expended to make payment on so-called cost-plus contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALEXANDER) there were—ayes 18, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 3389) to authorize and empower the United States

Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to purchase, lease, requisition, or otherwise acquire improved or unimproved land, houses, buildings, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GREEN of Iowa moves to recommit the bill with instructions to forthwith report it back with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 17 after the word "sum," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "nor shall any part of said sum be paid upon any contract for construction which provides that the compensation of the contractor shall be the cost of construction plus a percentage thereof for profit, unless such contract shall also fix the reasonable cost of such construction as determined by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and provide that upon any increase in cost above the reasonable cost so fixed by such board, the percentage of profit shall decrease as the cost increases in accordance with a rate to be fixed by said board and expressed in the contract: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent said board from contracting for the payment of premiums or bonuses for the speedy completion of the work contracted for."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREEN of Iowa) there were 25 ayes and 25 noes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair votes in the negative.

So the motion to recommit was lost.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is going to issist on his point, the result of which would be to throw the passage of this bill over until Thursday, I prefer to accept the amendment. We can not with good grace criticize the Shipping Board for not speeding up its program.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit is rejected by the vote of the Speaker.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings on the motion to recommit and take a new vote upon it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings on the vote on the motion to recommit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee I report back the bill with the amendment, with the recommendation that it be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Green amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "As act to authorize and empower the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to purchase, lease, requisition, or otherwise acquire, and to sell or otherwise dispose of improved or unimproved land, houses, buildings, and for other purposes."

On motion by Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 13, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Engineer Department for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 930); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7998) granting the consent of Congress to the village of East Dundee and the village of West Dundee to construct a bridge across the Fox River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 301), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9783) to prevent and punish the desecration, defamation, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9784) incorporating the patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9785) to amend section 3173 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 9786) allowing reduced rate of transportation for men in the military and naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9787) to provide further for the national security and defense by making provision for the purchase of iron ore, coking coal, limestone, and other material, essential for the manufacture of iron and steel, and constructing, equipping, maintaining, and operating blast furnaces and steel plants and mills by the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 248) providing for the consideration of House bill 9414, entitled "A bill granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Resolution (H. Res. 249) directing the Committee on Military Affairs to make an investigation of the leasing of the hotel Cape May for hospital purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUNN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 243) calling the attention of the American public to the patriotic opportunity of using thrift stamps for valentines on Valentine Day, Thursday, February 14, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 244) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9788) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9789) granting a pension to Phedora J. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 9790) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ellett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Henry N. Wilks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 9793) granting an increase of pension to John G. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 9794) granting an increase of pension to William F. Thornberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting a pension to John F. Joyce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting an increase of pension to Oscar P. Quiggle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting an increase of pension to Seth N. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9799) granting a pension to Mathew N. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9800) granting an increase of pension to John Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9801) for the relief of Mrs. Susie A. Van Kirk; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9802) granting a pension to Cinderella Jackson; to the Committee on Inavlid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9803) granting a pension to Stanley W. Lemley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 9804) granting a pension to David A. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9805) granting a pension to Emma Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9806) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Althaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 9807) granting an increase of pension to Byron R. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9808) granting a pension to Emri Sites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9809) granting a pension to Seth J. Huron, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9810) granting a pension to Louisa F. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9811) granting a pension to David Phillips, alias Charles Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9812) granting a pension to Joseph W. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 9813) granting an increase of pension to George W. Downing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 9814) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Truax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Ann E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9816) granting an increase of pension to John C. Mitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) granting a pension to George Starrh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9818) granting a pension to Eliza C. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9819) granting a pension to Isaac Holley, alias Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9820) making appropriation for payment of balances due by readjustment of salaries of postmasters under existing law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 9821) granting an increase of pension to Darius N. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 9822) granting an increase of pension to Mattie L. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) granting a pension to Louis T. Lutzio; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 9824) for the relief of George R. Gary; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9825) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wilson King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9826) granting a pension to William A. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 9827) granting an increase of pension to Martha Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9828) granting an increase of pension to Lawson Ellsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to pay to Silas McElroy, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $10,000 for injuries received while in the service of the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Union No. 121, Long Island City, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, asking that the United States bring about an armistice to bring about peace on basis suggested by revolutionary Russian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), a resolution of the United Irish Catholic Societies of Lowell, Mass., asking that the political independence of Ireland be assured; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the National Security League, urging that all espionage activities be placed in charge of one person appointed by and responsible to the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the Noonday Luncheon Club of Joplin, Mo., against repeal of periodical postage rates amendment to war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the National Federation of Federal Employees, protesting against the Borland amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of D. Clyde Snyder, Hagerstown, Md., urging increased salaries to post-office printers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLAND: Evidence to accompany a bill granting a pension to James B. Perkins; also, evidence to accompany a bill granting a pension to John H. Ellett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution of the Merchants, Manufacturers, and Employers' Association, protesting against the periodical amendment to the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the National Security League, urging that all espionage activities be placed under one person, who shall be appointed by and responsible to the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolutions of the Maryland State Federation of Women's Clubs, the Fortnightly Club, Sharon, Mass., the Entre Nous Club, Longmont, Colo., and the Community Association of Crawfordsville, Ind., protesting against the zonal system for periodical postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Boston & Maine Minority Stockholders' Protective Association, submitting an amendment to S. 3385; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Edwin B. Frost, director of the Yerkes Observatory, for the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Waukegan (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce for requiring second-class mail to pay the full cost of the service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Women's Club of Lake Placid, N. Y., for repeal of the increased rates of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Riverside Woman's Club, Riverside, Ill., against allowing grazing in the national parks and shooting in the national bird reservations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Illinois Commercial Association for the Chamberlain bill for universal military training; also, a memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, for a board of war control and a director of munitions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany H. R. 9537, a bill to pension Sarah Haggard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Letter from Amanda N. Hamilton, of Greeley, Colo., urging the admittance of osteopathic physicians to the Medical Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mile High Lodge, No. 680, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, urging the Congress to refrain from action on legislation designed to place men engaged in transportation service under Federal workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of O. E. Johnston, of Leadville, Colo., urging the passage of H. R. 1654, providing for increase of pay for post-office clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 22, of San Francisco, Cal., and 12 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the Madden bill, H. R. 1654; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Nyglicek, secretary Pacific coast division Bohemian National Alliance, San Francisco, Cal., favoring independence of small nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany H. R. 9740, to pension Nels Christensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Igloo No. 16, Pioneers of Alaska, Ketchikan, Alaska, relating to suspension of eight-hour law in connection with fisheries industry; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Woman's Club, Beaver Dam, Wis., on increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Fortnightly Club, Sharon, Mass., on increase in postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia on H. J. Res. 73 and S. J. Res. 64; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 13, 1918.*

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

Almighty God, in Thy divine providence we have been called in this place of the Nation's highest council, in the midst of times that are tense, that are tragic; times where words are carried by the winds to the uttermost parts of the earth, where records are written in blood. O do Thou give to us divine inspiration and wisdom for the duties that day by day present themselves to us, that we may perform our duties with an eye single to Thy glory, knowing that the welfare, happiness, and peace of the world must come at last into conformity to the will of God and as an expression of Thy purpose among men. Hear us in this our prayer, and lead us in the discharge of every duty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, at the request of the secretary of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, a copy of the circular issued by the Nobel Committee, furnishing information as to the distribution of the Nobel peace prize for the year 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3389) to authorize and empower the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation to purchase, lease, requisition, or otherwise acquire improved or unimproved land, houses, buildings, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life and public services of the Hon. ELLSWORTH R. BATHRICK, late a Representative from the State of Ohio.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McLEAN. I present brief resolutions adopted at a meeting of Hartford citizens held under the auspices of the Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading.

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

To Senator GEORGE P. McLEAN:

Resolutions adopted at a meeting of Hartford citizens, held under the auspices of the Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association on Friday, February 8, 1918.

Resolved, That this meeting call upon the Senate of the United States to pass the Federal woman suffrage amendment, thus insuring to our own country that democracy for which our men are fighting abroad. Be it also

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to Senator GEORGE P. McLEAN, and that he be requested to see that it is read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Local Branch No. 65, First Slovak Catholic Union, of Bridgeport; of Local Branch No. 508, First Slovak Catholic Union, of Bridgeport; of Local Assembly No. 9, Slovak Workers' Society, of Torrington; of Local Branch No. 452, National Slovak Society, of Torrington; of the Catholic Gymnastic Union Slovak Sokal, of Bridgeport; and of Local Branch No. 131, Slovak League, of Danbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the liberation and unification of the Czecho-Slovaks of Austria-Hungary into one independent Czecho-Slovak State, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Division of the woman's committee of the Council of National Defense, praying for the enactment of legislation to insure the planting of the tobacco lands of the country in foodstuffs as fast as may be done without injustice to the producer or disaster to a business heretofore recognized as legitimate, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Mansfield Center; of the Equal Franchise League of West Haven; and of the Trades Council of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Calaveras and Alpine Stock Association, of San Andreas, Cal., praying that a portion of the Yosemite National Park be thrown open for the use and relief of the stockmen of California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. THOMAS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Miltonvale, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to make it unlawful to deposit in the mails of the United States advertisements of alleged exposures of the secret work of fraternal orders, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented resolutions adopted by the First Congressional District Branch of the South Carolina Branch of the National Woman's Party, favoring the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the New Century Club, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the John Deere Plow Co., of Lansing, Mich., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the espionage act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 269) thereon.

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. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 3825) to amend an act 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 August 10, 1917; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3826) for the restoration of the rate of pension formerly paid to Joseph O. Swigert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3827) granting a pension to Clarence A. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.