

There are but nine men in Congress to-day who sat in the Fifty-fourth Congress when Mr. HILL first entered national life—Mr. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. JONES of Virginia, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts, Mr. FAIRCHILD of New York, Mr. CRISP of Georgia, Mr. FOSS of Illinois, Mr. MONDELL of Wyoming, and Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Our beloved Speaker had been in the Fifty-third Congress, and returned in the Fifty-fifth Congress, from which time he had been associated with Mr. HILL in many important matters, and has on more than one occasion indicated his admiration of our deceased colleague.

The longer an industrious man remains in service, the more valuable he is to his constituency, the greater opportunity he has for the development of his talents, and the richer is his State for his achievements.

Mr. HILL was in Congress when the United States declared war against Spain in 1898, and when the existence of a state of war thrust upon it by the Imperial German Government was formally declared in 1917. He has seen other problems, less historic, indeed, but in themselves large, met and overcome by the country he served so faithfully.

He left to his family the priceless heritage of a life well spent. It should be to them a rich source of consolation; and it should be to every man an incentive to added effort.

When a man has worked so ceaselessly as did Mr. HILL for the things he thought best, one wishes that an All-Knowing Providence had granted him more years in which to continue his constructive activity and to enjoy association with those for whom and with whom he labored, but in his being taken off "still achieving, still pursuing," his family and his friends are comforted with the assurance that when he entered into his reward, his stewardship was accounted for a hundredfold.

Mr. TILSON resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is acknowledged by all that in the death of the late EBENEZER J. HILL the State of Connecticut has lost an able and faithful Representative, and this Congress and the Nation at large has been deprived of a strong and experienced legislator at a time when such effective services as Mr. HILL was able to render were most sorely needed.

I remember in 1894 when he was first elected to represent the fourth district of Connecticut, and since that time I have watched his career here in Congress with ever-increasing interest and appreciation. It was my privilege first to meet him personally in the summer of 1903 when he paid a visit to his son at the encampment of the Connecticut National Guard, and at that time I was impressed with his thorough knowledge of the subjects he discussed, his wealth of information, and his strong, sincere convictions upon the financial and economic questions of the day. At that time his party was in control of the affairs of the Government, and he certainly devoted to his share of the task all his energy, industry, and talent. Because of the unfortunate division of our party in 1912 Mr. HILL failed of reelection, but I had a long talk with him at Bridgeport in the winter of 1913-14, and I was surprised at his intimate acquaintance with the affairs of Congress—his knowledge of the state of the national Treasury, and of many other matters which indicated that with the exception of not being daily upon the floor of the House, he was as active and as interested as if still a Member of Congress.

When he was reelected by his district in 1914 it was my fortune to be elected as his colleague, and from that time until his death I relied upon his counsel and advice. I found him one of the most hard-working Members of Congress, but never too busy to aid, encourage, and advise a new Member of Congress. During his last illness he remained constantly in touch with the situation here, with intellect unimpaired, and when "God's finger touched him" he had well earned eternal rest and peace.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members desiring to print remarks on the life and services of Mr. HILL may have permission to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that Members desiring to print in the Record remarks on the life and services of Mr. HILL may have permission to do so. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. In compliance with the resolution already adopted the House will stand adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE.

MONDAY, March 4, 1918.

(Legislative day of Saturday, March 2, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian.

THOMAS J. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, appeared in his seat to-day.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TELEPHONE SYSTEM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General in response to a resolution (S. Res. 207) of February 25, 1918.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the communication be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. What is the request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That the communication of the Postmaster General, in response to a resolution passed February 25, regarding the telephone service of the District of Columbia be printed in the Record.

Mr. NORRIS. Why not have it read? It seems to me that the answer of the Postmaster General ought to be read.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to hear it read.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the communication will not be read. We took a recess on Saturday for the purpose of expediting the unfinished business, and I am very anxious to begin the consideration of Senate bill 3714.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to delay the unfinished business, but it seems to me that the answer of the Postmaster General on the question we have submitted to him ought at least to be read to the Senate, although if the Senator from North Carolina objects I will be content to have it printed in the Record.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no earthly objection to its being printed in the Record.

Mr. GORE. I will state that I did not prefer the request to have it read, because I apprehended the objection suggested by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. NORRIS. Let it be printed in the Record, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is that the communication of the Postmaster General be printed in the Record. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The communication is as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1918.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

Senate of the United States of America.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have received Senate resolution of date February 25, reading as follows:

"Whereas it is reported in the public press that the Postmaster General of the United States offered to take over and operate in behalf of the United States the telephone system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. within the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate the proposition made by him to the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and also to transmit to the Senate any information which he may possess authorizing him to make such, or any, proposition looking to the taking over of the operation by the Government of said telephone system."

In compliance with this resolution I deem it proper to recite the circumstances referred to therein and officially reported by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a public utility commission, to wit:

"Chairman BROWNLOW. I asked the Postmaster General if he desired to be heard in this matter, since I know of the interest of the Post Office Department in the telephone situation. He was not able to be present, but he sent as representing him the chairman of the telephone and telegraph committee of the Post Office Department. Mr. Chance is present and desires to make a statement.

"Mr. CHANCE. Mr. Commissioner, my statement is very short. I am here representing the Postmaster General, and he has directed me to say that, if he is given authority, the Post Office Department can take over the entire telephone service within the District of Columbia and operate it without increased charges to the patrons and without reducing the salaries of the employees and pay for it out of the surplus revenues of the Postal Service.

"That is all I have to say."

With respect to the information upon which the statement made by Mr. Chance was made, beginning with the statement of the undesirable telephone situation prevailing, and threatened, in the District of Columbia, it may be well to briefly detail the history of the subject matter, the measures proposed heretofore by Members of Congress looking to its treatment, and the relation of the Post Office Department to such measures, as well as the proposals of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. itself.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress, early in 1917, bills were introduced in the Senate by the Hon. THOMAS P. GORE, of Oklahoma, and the Hon. ATLEE POMERENE, of Ohio, and in the House of Representatives by the Hon. David J. Lewis, of Maryland, which provided for the taking over of the Washington telephone system by the Government, with a view to its substantial extension and development to meet existing and future needs. These bills made provision for the development of an adequate telephone service for both public and private needs, as they should arise. The bill of Senator POMERENE was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, which committee requested the opinion of the Postmaster General as to its merits. The Postmaster General, in response to such request, gave the bill his approval.

The like bill in the House of Representatives was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House, and the Postmaster General was asked in like manner by said committee for his opinion on the merits of the bill, as were also the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Both the Postmaster General and the commissioners made reply, giving their approval to the measure. If any of those measures had been enacted into law, the present telephone system in Washington, which may be described at this time as deplorable, would have been avoided.

The House bill was made the subject of extended hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia which continued so near to the close of the session that no final action was taken on the bill.

Meanwhile, with the same objects in view, the Postmaster General caused to be made by telephone experts a careful study and investigation of the telephone situation in Washington, with a view to definitely ascertaining the necessary operating expenses of conducting the system as a part of the Postal Service. These experts reported on the 1st day of May, 1917, that the final cost of a network—including value of the existing plant—embracing 80,000 telephone stations, would be \$10,862,310. The network of the present system in 1915, the latest previous data, included 54,671 telephones. The larger network proposed would have fully met the needs of the city for both its present and prospective emergencies.

With respect to the costs of operating the telephone system these experts, after careful study, reported that including capital, depreciation, and all operating expenses—if conducted by the Post Office Department as a part of the Postal Service—the cost per telephone could easily be reduced more than one-third. The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. estimates the expense per telephone in 1918, without making allowance for capital charges or taxes, to be \$38.10, which is grossly in excess of what the cost would be if the service were operated by the Post Office Department. Such was the proposal of Members of Congress and the Post Office Department to meet the requirements of a public and private character for telephone service within the District of Columbia.

In its statements made before the Public Utilities Commission the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. reports having 71,276 telephones in December, 1917, and it proposes to increase this number to 75,000 during the year 1918, a number which may prove inadequate. The study made for the Post Office Department, by the expert engineers referred to above, contemplated a network of 80,000 telephones. Their study was based on the data of the year 1915, it being the latest available, and represented as stated 54,671 telephone stations, with a capital of \$6,241,134. Thus the addition of an investment of \$4,621,176 would have added 25,329 stations to the network, raising it to 80,000 in number, and at the same time rendering it susceptible to prompt and economical extension and development. The proposal of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1918 raises its capital to \$10,694,001, but raises the number of telephones to only 75,500.

The quality of service rendered in the city of Washington was extremely low before the war, the lowest per telephone reported for any city in the United States in 1914, while the average rate charged for completed calls was the highest for all the cities reporting, with one exception, as is shown by the following table:

Average calls per telephone and average rate per 100 calls in different cities.

	Annual calls per phone. ¹	Average telephone rate per 100 local calls. ¹
New York, Manhattan ²	962	\$4.45
Brooklyn ²	875	4.21
Washington, 1914 ²	823	4.21
Washington, 1915 ²	888	3.88
Washington, 1917 ²	1,099	3.13
Baltimore ²	993	3.53
Philadelphia ²	1,445	2.20
Pittsburgh ²	1,998	1.52
Cleveland ²	2,000	1.48
Indianapolis ²	2,238	1.15
Spokane ²	2,155	1.08
Kansas City ²	3,366	1.05
Rochester ²	2,940	1.04
Plattsburg ²	2,090	.94
Buffalo ²	2,710	.77
Louisville ²	4,027	.69

¹ Not counting toll calls.

² Bell System.

³ Independent.

While Washington is given a service of only 800 to 1,100 calls per telephone, the average calls per telephone in the United States was 2,055, according to the census of 1912, and some of the cities show a phone utilization of more than 3,000 calls per annum. For this half-normal service I am informed that the average paid per 100 calls in Washington was \$3 to \$4, when the average for the United States was 89 cents per hundred for the independents, with a general average of less than \$1 per hundred in some of the large cities.

Obviously, the test of any service institution is the amount and quality of service rendered the public, stated in terms of the number of employees and the amount of capital employed to obtain such service.

The committee of the Post Office Department on telephones and telegraphs which made an elaborate investigation of this subject, the report of which I had the honor to transmit to the Senate on the 31st day of January, 1914, and which was published as Senate Document No. 399, second session Sixty-third Congress, found that the assumption by the Post Office Department of the function of electrical communication would permit of substantial savings and economies through the coordination of these two now diversely organized and operated services of communication. They differ only in this: That the railroad or personal carrier bears one communication and the wires carry the other.

The following bureaus or services are now maintained, each independently, by the Post Office Department and the telephone system:

THE POST OFFICE.	THE TELEPHONE SYSTEM.
Postmaster General.	President of the company.
Four assistants.	Vice presidents and directors.
Law department.	Law department.
Auditor.	Auditor.
Treasurer's office.	Treasurer's office.
Purchasing bureau.	Purchasing bureau.

The "commercial account" under private management includes such items as "advertising, canvassing, promotion, revenue accounting, revenue collecting, collection expense, salaries of general officers, and their clerks." These are susceptible of complete elimination by postal methods. Indeed, it is not too much to say that their entire revenue-collecting and accounting system can be practically displaced under postal methods and the work reduced substantially to one of maintenance and development.

Much—indeed, nearly all—the above duplicating official telephone personnel represent established functions in the Post Office Department, dischargeable by it with slight, if any, additional expense. There is, besides, the very considerable item of earnings on investment. Public utility commissions proceed on the theory that private enterprises are entitled to claim, if they can earn, a return of 8 per cent per annum, which is not unreasonable to private enterprise. Government capital, on the other hand, should cost only about one-half this amount. Taking the savings from unification of mail and telephone communication systems, along with the immense saving in capital charges, I have the fullest confidence in the statement made to the District Utilities Commission as to the results of postal management of the District telephone system if authority be given to unite it with the Postal Service.

In fact, the accomplishments suggested present a very great understatement of what postal policy and postal management

can accomplish in operating the telephone system in the District of Columbia.

The suggestion that the Post Office Department enter the field of electrical communication is in no sense new or recent. As Postmaster General I have made the recommendation in my annual reports five successive times. The recommendation was made by my immediate predecessor and by many other Postmasters General. In the infancy of telephone communication a like recommendation was made by Postmaster General John Wanamaker. Among other things he stated:

"A year from next March the telephone patent expires, and unless Congress acts promptly to authorize its adoption for communication among the people it requires no stretch of the imagination to believe that in the next two years one immense syndicate will unite and control all the hundreds of telephone plants of the country as the telegraph is now controlled, or the two will be united, and then for the next 20 years the most astute attorneys will be legitimately earning large salaries in indignantly opposing the so-called attacks of future Postmasters General upon defenseless vested rights."

How prophetic this statement was! At this time how familiar we are with it! How often did we hear it when there was pending before the Congress the propositions for the establishment of the parcel post and the postal savings!

The function of communication so clearly appertains to the Government that it is provided for in the Constitution of the United States.

Communication is a means primal to the gratification of all human requirements. It should therefore be made accessible to all persons, whatever their fortunes may be, as considerations of public economy will allow. This means that ample facilities should be provided by the Government which is charged by the Constitution with this great function. It means, too, that the service should be provided at reasonable cost; in fact, at as low cost as efficient service permits, so that the largest number possible may use it. The Postal System has so realized these great objects, so formulated its rates, that the poorest self-sustaining human being can afford to use any service it performs. The only postal limitation on his communicating from end to end of the Republic is the cost of a 2-cent stamp. On the other hand, the use of these great facilities of communicating by electricity is woefully restricted among the masses of the people by the necessities of the interest of private persons who own and manage them. Among the masses of the people, even here in Washington, the Capital of the richest country of the world, the majority are shown to be denied this great convenience. The following table on the testimony of the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., testifying as to the distribution of the telephone service among the residences of the city before the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, speaks conclusively as to the effect of high rates and private control upon this great agency of communication:

One hundred families, paying a house rent—
Up to \$20, have 10 phones—10 per cent.
Up to \$35, have 23 phones—23 per cent.
Above \$35, have 82 phones—82 per cent.

It is no criticism of private endeavor to quote the above facts. They represent failures—grave failures—in modern communication; but they are failures judged by postal standards, not by the standards of private enterprise. The wealth of the United States is ample to justify a complete telephone service in its Capital. Private endeavor does not have the kind of motive necessary for the accomplishment of this or other postal objects. Great organizations of national scope it has built up in that part of the field of communication which the Government has so long neglected—neglected, I say, but not surrendered either its right or duty to perform. While the postal rates in the United States are the lowest among postal systems, the following table, taken from the report of the telephone and telegraph committee of the Post Office Department, shows how postal telephone rates in other countries compare with the private rates in the United States:

Statement of the average rates for nine countries on the Continent of Europe:

Toll telephone rates.

	Distance.				
	100 miles.	300 miles.	400 miles.	500 miles.	700 miles.
Continental rate.....	\$0.20	\$0.37	\$0.39	\$0.46	\$0.53
Bell rate.....	.60	1.80	2.40	3.00	4.20

Of the long-distance telephone rates it has been stated by one who has made a most searching study of the question that "it costs the American as much to ship his communication over the wires, mile for mile, as it costs him to ship a ton of freight on the railway. The telephone rate equals 6 mills a mile, the average railway rate about 7 mills."

It should be added that the aggregate postal revenues in the 16 great postal systems conducting these, as well as other functions of organized communication, show a surplus profit of 20 per cent in their annual receipts. A reason why the postal system can achieve cheap rates and provide efficient service is that it has no uneconomic, no wasteful interests to serve. Hence the great disparity of the telephone rates in the United States as compared with those of postal systems, notwithstanding our postal rates are as low or lower. Hence, too, the humiliating knowledge that instead of ranking first in the frequency of our use of the telephone communication we rank low, and not high, in the use of these services.

The conclusion can not be escaped that private rate making is responsible for the out-of-date and inadequate telephone service, and for its resulting breakdown from congestion of traffic, in Washington. And the local company proposes relief only by destroying, through higher rates, even more of the existing traffic of the city. The rates now restrict the use of the phone to about one-half the utilization obtaining throughout the country. Its proposed remedy is to eliminate, by higher rates, a large part of the service that is left.

PROPOSITIONS RESTATED.

Finally, I wish to add that there is much other information gathered, studied, and compiled by the Post Office Department, reflecting on the proposition that, if given authority, the Post Office Department can achieve the results stated in the announcement made before the Utilities Commission.

In concluding I wish to repeat, on the basis of the information hereinbefore produced, and as the result of careful studies:

First. That, if given authority by the Congress, the Post Office Department can take over the telephone service of the District of Columbia and be able to—

- Operate it without increased charges to the patrons.
- Without reducing the salaries of employees.
- And pay for the system out of the surplus revenues of the Postal Service.

To which propositions I am able to add another:

Second. That within a reasonable time after receiving such authority the Post Office Department will permanently remove the present congestion of telephone traffic and bring about a more general use of the lines to both the Government and private patrons.

I have only to further add that so much as might be necessary of the surplus of the Post Office Department for the fiscal years 1916 and 1917 could nowhere and in no way be more appropriately applied than in giving the Government, in its stress, and the people of the Capital City permanent, adequate facilities for communication, and at reasonable rates.

Permit me also to direct attention to the fact that there is no Government engaged in the present war—there is hardly a government anywhere—which intrusts its official secrets and correspondence to unofficial and private carriers.

Respectfully,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Lewis McKune Post, No. 27, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Waseca, Minn., praying for an increase in the pensions of veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of W. T. Sherman Post, No. 113, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Concordia, Kans., praying for an increase of pensions to veterans of the Civil War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Parsons, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Union, of Groveland, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation fixing the price of the 1918 wheat crop at \$2.50 per bushel, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a memorial of Local Branch, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Bellingham, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the placing of railroad employees under the pro-

visions of the Federal employees' compensation act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Local Branch No. 192, National Association of Letter Carriers, of New Britain, Conn., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport and New Haven, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Board of Commerce of Detroit, Mich., praying for the creation of a commission to report a plan for the adoption of a national budget system, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies' Literary Club, of Shelby, Mich., and a petition of the Pastors' Association, of Jackson, Mich., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3426) to empower the President to requisition timber and timber products for war purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 298) thereon.

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

S. 3980. A bill to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 296); and

S. 3982. A bill to suspend certain restrictions on the purchase and distribution of military stores and supplies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 297).

STATUS OF ARMY NURSE CORPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. On January 16 the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] submitted a resolution (S. Res. 185) directing the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate to investigate and report as to the available number of trained nurses for service in the United States Army. The resolution was agreed to, and I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to make a report (No. 299) pursuant to that resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report submitted this day by Mr. FLETCHER was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Senate Report No. 299, 65th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Military Affairs, which was directed by the Senate to investigate and report upon certain matters relative to the status of the Army Nurse Corps, having had the matter under consideration, begs leave to submit herewith a memorandum from the Surgeon General of the Army giving detailed information on the subject, together with a communication of similar import from Dr. Franklin Martin, member of the advisory commission, Council of National Defense, which your committee presents as its report:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF WAR RELATING TO STATUS OF THE ARMY NURSE CORPS.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, January 24, 1918.

There are at present in the United States about 200,000 nurses, of whom it is estimated between 80,000 and 90,000 are registered, the remainder being composed of graduate nurses and the so-called practical nurses. Approximately 30,000 nurses will be needed for service in the Army hospitals during the present year. In 1909 the plan was evolved whereby the enrolled nurses of the American Red Cross were constituted the reserve of the Army Nurse Corps for service in time of war or other emergency. It is estimated there are about 16,000 nurses enrolled with this organization at this time, 8,000 of whom have enrolled since the declaration of war. Nurses are also admitted into the regular corps, and for the period of the war emergency. The applications of all graduate nurses who are professionally, morally, and physically qualified for service will be given consideration, whether registered or not.

There are at present 40,000 student nurses in accredited training schools for nurses in this country, and about 13,000 graduate annually. The plan of organizing training schools in connection with Army hospitals is not believed to be practicable, and it is thought preferable to accept only nurses who have graduated from civil institutions.

It is not contemplated at this time to employ any but graduate nurses in the Army hospitals, but should conditions indicate there will be a shortage of graduate nurses, steps will be taken in ample time for the establishment of courses for nurses' aids in certain civil institutions in this country. These aids will be selected from among those women who have taken the course in home care of the sick and elementary hygiene under the American Red Cross, and also other women who are considered suitable. They will be given a course of practical instruction in a civil institution with a view to assignment as nurses' aid in an Army hospital if needed.

At the present time there are 534 members of the regular corps and 4,204 who have entered the service as reserve nurses, Army Nurse Corps, through the American Red Cross. It is believed that the present supply of nurses is sufficient to meet the prospective needs of the service.

W. C. GORGAS,
Surgeon General, United States Army.

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, Washington, January 24, 1918.

From: Dr. Franklin Martin, member of advisory commission.
To: Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, chairman Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Subject: Present and prospective supply of nurses for military service.

1. We have the honor to submit to you the following report:
2. The committee on nursing of the general medical board, Council of National Defense, will be pleased to appear before your committee at any time and submit full information regarding the present and prospective status of the nursing supply for military service.

3. In the meantime, however, I submit the following facts: There are approximately 80,000 registered nurses in the United States, 40,000 student nurses in accredited schools, 13,000 nurses graduating annually.

4. The following are figures received to-day from the Army, Navy, and Red Cross Department of Nursing:

Assigned to active duty in the Army:	
From the Army Nurse Corps	534
From the Red Cross	4,204
Total	4,738
Assigned to active duty in the Navy:	
From the Navy Nurse Corps	257
From the Red Cross	570
Total	827

Assigned to active duty under the Red Cross:	
United States Public Health Service	70
Over-seas service	64
Specialized services in United States	3
Total number furnished by Red Cross to Army and Navy, now on active duty	4,911
Total number awaiting orders	2,500

Nine thousand nurses have been enrolled by the Red Cross since the declaration of war. The total enrollment of Red Cross nurses is approximately 17,000, which includes, however, those enrolled for special service and a proportion who are not available for active service.

5. At the present date the Army, Navy, and Red Cross are filling all demands. A mobilization camp for nurses has just been established which will facilitate the movement of nurses to their posts.

6. A definite publicity program has been planned and is in progress by the committee on nursing for the purpose of rapidly increasing enrollment for service and for strengthening the reserve. Since war was declared approximately 1,000 nurses have been enrolled for service each month.

7. This committee now has under serious consideration other radical measures to propose which, if found feasible, will, in its judgment, insure an adequate supply of nurses for the anticipated future increments, taking into consideration the increased demand when the Army shall more largely engage in active conflict.

FRANKLIN MARTIN,
Member the Advisory Commission.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN. With the consent of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who has charge of the pending bill, I ask leave out of order to report back from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 295) thereon. As the matters in the bill are very urgent, I shall endeavor to have the Senate take it up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ISSUANCE OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask permission to make a favorable report from the Committee on Finance on Senate joint resolution 133, authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, and I shall follow that, after the joint resolution has been read, with the request for unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution reported by him from the Committee on Finance. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to have the joint resolution read first. I am a member of the Finance Committee, but I know nothing about it.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That 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, shall be granted by the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance on application made by the person to be insured or, subject to such regulations as the bureau may prescribe, by any other person.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like the Senator from Mississippi, reporting the joint resolution, to explain it, because I have not seen the joint resolution, nor have I heard it read, except as it was read from the desk just now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the Senator from Utah, I will say that we have found some difficulty in the execution of the insurance clause of the soldiers and sailors' allowance and allotment and insurance bill, growing out of the fact that we provided in the bill that the soldier alone should make the application. Many of these soldiers have gone to France; and when their agents here, or somebody on behalf of them, wants to make the application the law stands in the way. This joint resolution does not change the beneficiaries under the law; it does not widen or restrict them, or the choice of them, in any way; but it merely permits the father or the mother or any other person here to make the application for the soldier, under the provisions of the law as now written, for the insurance as now provided. It was accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, who wanted as quick action as possible. As a consequence, the committee, not being able to be called together, was polled and all of the members of the committee that could be seen immediately signed it. It happened that the Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber, I suppose, at the time; but it was signed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and myself.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have had a chance to read the joint resolution, and I hope it will pass at this time.

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

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

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

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. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4012) to protect persons in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war from loss of rights under claims initiated upon the public lands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4013) to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 136) providing for the registration for military service of the subjects or citizens residing in the United States of a foreign country with whose Government the United States has concluded or hereafter concludes a convention or agreement consenting to such aliens being drafted into the military forces of the United States under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," and all amendments thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 for the installation of an electrically operated fog-signal whistle on the east breakwater, Nantucket Harbor, Mass., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9867), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CLAIMS OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3527) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I think it important before we take up the amendments to Senate bill 3914 to secure a fuller attendance than we now have.

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

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

Ashurst	Hollis	Owen	Smoot
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Sterling
Brandeggee	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Stone
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Poinexter	Sutherland
Culberson	Kendrick	Pomerene	Swanson
Curtis	King	Ransdell	Thomas
Dillingham	Kirby	Reed	Thompson
Fernald	Lodge	Saulsbury	Tillman
Fletcher	McCumber	Shafroth	Underwood
Gallinger	McKellar	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gerry	McNary	Sherman	Walsh
Gore	Martin	Shields	Warren
Gronna	Nelson	Simmons	Watson
Hale	New	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Harding	Norris	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Hardwick	Nugent	Smith, Mich.	
Henderson	Overman	Smith, S. C.	

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

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], is absent by reason of illness.

Mr. BECKHAM. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TELEPHONE SERVICE.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. KING. On the 25th day of February I offered a resolution, which reads as follows:

Senate resolution 207.

Whereas it is reported in the public press that the Postmaster General of the United States offered to take over and operate, in behalf of the United States, the telephone system of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. within the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate the proposition made by him to the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and also to transmit to the Senate any information which he may possess authorizing him to make such, or any, proposition looking to the taking over of and the operation by the Government of said telephone system.

I am just advised, Mr. President, that in response to this resolution, which was adopted, the Postmaster General transmitted this day to the Senate—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we are unable on this side to hear the Senator. I should like to hear what he has to say. I ask that we may have order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Utah was not in the Chamber at the time I think when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] asked that the communication of the Postmaster General be ordered printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KING. I rose for the purpose of submitting an objection to what was done by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator from Utah that the communication came to the President pro tempore and by the Chair was laid before the Senate, and on request of the Senator from Oklahoma and by unanimous consent it was ordered printed in the RECORD. That is the situation.

Mr. KING. Later during the day I may offer a motion to set aside the order for the printing of the report. I have just come into the Chamber and have had no opportunity to examine the communication from the Postmaster General, except very hastily, but, I believe it goes beyond the terms of the resolution. The resolution merely requested the Postmaster General to state under what law he had made a proposition, if any, for the Government to take over and operate the telephone system owned by the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. In response to such resolution there is submitted an argument of 10 pages of typewritten matter in favor of the Government taking over the telephone system. We did not ask him for an argument in favor of governmental ownership or operation of the telephone system; we asked him by what authority of law he submitted a proposition, if one was made, to the telephone company.

Mr. STONE. Do I understand the Senator favors taking over the telephone system?

Mr. KING. I have hardly looked at the report, but I gather from it that the Postmaster General is in favor of the Government taking over the telephone system.

Mr. STONE. The Postmaster General, I understand, is in favor of it. I was asking the Senator if he is in favor of it?

Mr. KING. I am very much opposed to it. I will state to the Senator from Missouri I think that the Government of the United States has burdens enough now, and ought not to be called upon to assume additional ones, unless absolutely necessary. In my opinion, it ought not to purchase and take over the telephone system of the District of Columbia or undertake its operation. However, the question of governmental ownership or operation and control is one which can be considered in a proper way and at the proper time. But the point I am making is that when an executive officer is asked for the authority for a certain proposition, it is not a proper response to submit an argument in favor of the proposition.

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

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

Mr. STONE. I have nothing to say at the present moment as to whether the reply of the Postmaster General to the resolution is proper or not, nor have I anything at this moment to say as to whether the Government should take upon itself the burden indicated by the Senator from Utah, if the taking over of the system of telephones is a burden, but I do undertake to say that the system as operated in the District of Columbia is so absolutely inefficient that it would seem to me that even the Government's business would require that some better service be rendered. Whether or not that service can be better rendered in this way I do not know, but I do undertake to assert that the service could not be worse than it is.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that is not the question which is involved in this matter. A simple resolution was adopted asking the Postmaster General to state whether he had submitted a proposition to take over and operate a certain telephone system, and if so, what law existed authorizing it; and I submit that it is not proper under that resolution for an argument to be sent to this body in favor of Government ownership or operation of the telephone system. It is that of which I am complaining. We did not ask in the resolution for the opinion of the distinguished and able official or for an argument in favor of governmental control or operation of the telephone system.

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

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Washington, who first addressed the chair, and then I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was merely curious to know whether the Postmaster General has in fact given the Senate the information asked for in the resolution.

Mr. KING. In a certain way he does furnish it. In effect he says there is no statute authorizing governmental control, but he furnishes an argument in support of the Government taking over the control and operation of the telephone system in the District. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Utah that it seems to me his suggestion is that the answer of the Postmaster General is not responsive to the request of the Senate. If that be true, I presume it would be perfectly proper for the Senator or the Senate to call on the Postmaster General for another reply, but it must be apparent to the Senator that the Senate can not decide that question until it has before it the response of the Postmaster General. Therefore I think it ought either to be read to the Senate or it ought to be printed in the RECORD, so that the Senate will be able to see whether the response of the department is responsive; and if it is not, it would be very proper, it seems to me, to pass an additional resolution calling attention to the fact that it is not responsive and ask him for a more definite reply.

Mr. KING. I am inclined to think, without reading the entire reply submitted by the Postmaster General, that it is apparent he concedes a lack of authority for making a proposition for governmental control and also alleges that any proposal made was conditioned upon congressional approval. The resolution could have been answered categorically in half a dozen words. My point is that in the report submitted in reply to the resolution I do not think that part of the report which contains an argument for Federal control was responsive or proper.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if in the reply of the Postmaster General there is any indication that in the interest of the conduct of the war private conversation should be controlled in the District of Columbia?

Mr. KING. I have not had the opportunity to sufficiently acquaint myself with the report in order to determine.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And that certain hours of the day should be assigned for Government business exclusively?

Mr. KING. I do not know whether such a suggestion as that was made, but that does not reach the point to which I am calling the attention of the Senate. I am submitting to the Senate this proposition: A resolution was adopted asking the department if it made a certain proposition; and if so, to state whether there was any legal authority for the same; and I am contending that it is not the proper or orderly way for the department to submit a reply which contains an argument in favor of some governmental policy.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HARDWICK. As the Senator knows, I am quite in sympathy with his views on this matter, but it occurs to me that on an examination of the communication which the Postmaster General has sent it will be seen that he is simply saying, "I did not make any proposition; I merely said I would do this thing if Congress gave me authority," and besides that he goes further to make an argument to the Senate that Congress ought to give him authority. That is about the situation.

Mr. KING. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks that was warranted by the resolution which was adopted?

Mr. HARDWICK. It is difficult to say. Of course the Postmaster General ought to have answered directly the question of the Senate. I think possibly he has done so, if the Senator will examine what he says. He states that the postmaster of Washington, Mr. Chance, went before the Utilities Commission and stated that if the Postmaster General would give him the opportunity he would be glad to take over and operate this system.

Of course the question of propriety which the Senator raises is not of much interest, but there are many precedents on both sides of the question in both Houses as to whether or not a Cabinet officer, having answered the specific inquiry of either one of these legislative bodies, should proceed further to advance argument in support of his views on the question about which he is asked. That is all there is in it.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me, and allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, I yield, and in the Senator's time.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the departments and branches of the Government should be volunteering information or suggestions to Congress with respect to legislation when they are not asked for their opinions with respect to the matter?

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite agree with the Senator. I want the Senator to understand exactly what has happened. If the Senator wants my opinion, I will say that I do not think the Postmaster General delivers a message to Congress under the Constitution, and I do not think he has any right to make an argument, except as that argument is invited by the Senate or by the House. I do not think that the resolution of the Senate, which was introduced by the Senator from Utah, invited the Postmaster General to make an argument. It invited him simply to state what the facts were in connection with this matter.

Mr. KING. I wish merely to say, in conclusion, that I was not in the Chamber when the present occupant of the chair submitted this report, or I should have objected to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that it be printed in the RECORD. The order having been made that it be printed in the RECORD, I shall not move to reconsider it; but I do want to register my protest against the course which has been pursued by the Postmaster General in this matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to make an inquiry.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. REED. I understand the complaint of the Senator from Utah is that he asked the Postmaster General to answer a specific question, and that he has sent a rather long argument to the Senate?

Mr. KING. He has sent 10 pages here.

Mr. REED. Has the Senator from Utah been acquainted with the Postmaster General very long?

Mr. KING. I have had the pleasure of knowing the Postmaster General for 18 years.

Mr. REED. Then, I think the Senator might be charged with at least contributory negligence. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. I might plead guilty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to go on record in connection with this question as saying that when either House of Congress propounds an inquiry to the chief of a department, that chief is not confined to making a categorical reply. He not only can give reasons for what has been done by his depart-

ment, if "invited" by the legislative branch in making an inquiry, but he can do it if it be relevant to the inquiry. So far as I have been able to see—I have not read the resolution itself but only a synopsis of it in the newspapers—the reply or the argument—call it that if you choose—is perfectly relevant to the inquiry. The inquiry is, What have you done? The reply is to state what was done, which was merely to say that if the Post Office Department were given authority, it would be glad to take over this function. Then, the inquiry was, "By what authority did you do it?" And the answer was, "By no authority of law"; but then the Postmaster General goes on to make an argument—if you choose to call it such—which is perfectly relevant to the inquiry about the reasons which, seemingly to him, justified Mr. Chance in making the proposition.

There also comes into play the other side of that; whether it is proper and right for a Senator to criticize an officer of the executive department because that officer has exercised his right of judging for himself whether or not what he said in his reply, outside of a categorical "yes" or "no," was or was not relevant. If it be granted that he has a right to go further than a mere "yes" or "no" and to put in such other things in his reply as are relevant, then it seems to me that he must be the judge of the relevancy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi what this question has to do with the general policy as to the taking over of the telephone company by the Government? What does the question of whether or not this is printed in the Record have upon that, and what bearing has it on the winning of the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has no bearing upon the winning of the war; but I have sat here for about two weeks now and have heard some thousands of words per day—per Senator in some cases—that had no bearing at all upon the winning of the war. But it has this bearing, to answer the other part of the Senator's question, that if it were a wrong thing to ask to be authorized by Congress to do, that is one thing; if it were a right and proper and useful thing to be asked to be authorized to do, then the Postmaster General had a right to say that in his opinion it was proper, and that if it were achieved as a purpose it would be useful.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. STONE. I understood the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] to ask what the taking over of the telephone system of the District of Columbia had to do with the winning of the war.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I correct the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator has misstated my question. My question was, What bearing would the discussion here in the Senate—the taking up of the morning hour—on the subject of whether or not this communication should be printed in the Record, have upon the winning of the war? If the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will allow me, I will say that it took me on one occasion four hours to get the War Department on the telephone. I think if it can be arranged in some way so that one could get the War Department on the telephone inside of half an hour, that that would have some bearing upon the winning of the war.

Mr. STONE. If my friend from Mississippi will permit me, I wish to say—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me conclude, and then I will yield.

Mr. STONE. No; I wish to make the statement in the time of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. STONE. I wish to say that it does seem to me that the effective use of the telephone in Washington has something to do with the public service of the Government, which public service has a vast deal to do with the winning or the losing of the war. I do not know what the department's troubles may be in getting telephonic connection, but my experience is something like that which has just been detailed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]. If it takes a half hour for him, as it has often taken for me, to get connection with the departments or the bureaus of the departments, to communicate with them about the public business, then I am prepared to say that it is a matter of great importance to the public service of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I agree perfectly with the Senator from Missouri, of course, but the inquiry of the Senator from Washington was not directed to that phase of the matter. If I had been asked the question, "What thinking over the telephones had to do with the winning of the war," my answer would have been that it might have a great deal to do with it or it might not; I think probably it would have; but I was asked what all this so-called argument of the Postmaster General and what the argument now going on, in which I am participating, had to do with the winning of the war, and my answer was frankly nothing at all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word. The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Mississippi are good lawyers, but certainly they have forgotten the rules of evidence or have misapplied them when justifying the reply of the Postmaster General to the simple interrogation which was propounded to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I will not yield for the present; I will do so in a moment. We are not discussing whether or not it is advisable to take over the telephone system. We are not discussing whether or not the telephone system has been inefficient. We may come to a discussion of that question, and the great knowledge of the Senator from Missouri about telephone systems will doubtless be of great advantage to us when we shall discuss that question; but I submit again that when a proposition is submitted to an executive officer asking a question—

Mr. STONE. The Senator must not misrepresent me.

Mr. KING. Let me complete my statement. I do not yield until I conclude, and then I shall yield to the Senator. When a question is submitted asking for a reply as to whether or not there is any legal authority for a proposition which it is reported the Postmaster General submitted, in my opinion it is not relevant for him to submit an elaborate argument in favor of the governmental control of a telephone system. It would have been just as irrelevant if a question had been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, if there had been some publication to the effect that he had proposed to take over for the Government all of the railroads of the United States, asking him by what authority he made the proposition, and he had replied with an exhaustive argument in favor of governmental ownership and control of railroads. That would not be relevant; it would not be proper; and I submit the propriety of it could be challenged by any Senator.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri, if he desires to propound a question.

Mr. STONE. No; I do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had asked the Senator to yield to me first.

Mr. KING. I beg the Senator's pardon; I yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the first place, the Postmaster General made no proposition to take over the telephones. All that was said was that, if the authority were granted by the Congress, the Post Office Department would gladly take them over. So much for that.

Now, the Senator from Utah is himself a great lawyer, and, being a lawyer, he ought to know that a Cabinet officer having an inquiry directed to him is not in the attitude of a witness on the stand in a court of justice and that the technical rules of legal evidence do not apply to him; but, even if the technical rules of legal evidence did appear, when a witness in court is asked a question the court will not let counsel confine the witness to a categorical reply; the witness has a right to explain the reasons why he makes the reply or to explain the reply or to modify it from a "yes" or "no."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] introduced a resolution, which the Senate passed, and so it became a Senate resolution, making an inquiry of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General has responded to that resolution, and the response is laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer. It has never been read and it has not yet been printed in the Record, so that Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to read it. I have not read it, and I presume no Member of the Senate has read it. The Senator from Utah himself, who has the copy in his possession at the present time, has only glanced through it, and he says in effect that it is not responsive to the resolution of the Senate. Now, it seems to me the proper course to pursue, since we have not been allowed to hear it read, is to wait until to-morrow, so that Senators may have an opportunity to read the response, and then if the Senator from Utah still thinks the answer of the Postmaster General does not respond to his resolution, it would be perfectly proper, and I would be glad to see it done, to have a resolution introduced and passed that would call for a more definite response; but we certainly ought not to be asked now

to say that the answer of the Postmaster General is not responsive when we have neither read it nor had an opportunity to read it.

The Senator from Utah referred to other Senators as great lawyers. That reference can also be made to the Senator himself, and I should like to suggest to him that if he made a motion in a court and in response to his motion some document or report had been introduced on the other side by order of the court and he determined that the production of the paper or the document was not an answer and a compliance with the order of the court, he could not expect the court to pass on his request, reject the report, and ask for an additional report until the court had an opportunity to examine the report that had been made.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Utah is not making any request that calls for a determination by the Senate as to whether or not the resolution adopted was complied with or was not complied with.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood from what the Senator said that he did not regard the reply as a proper answer. It may be that when we have an opportunity to read it we may all agree with the Senator. Certainly I am not finding fault with him for wanting a direct reply to the resolution. I would be glad, so far as my vote goes, to assist in bringing about such a reply, if the answer of the Postmaster General is not responsive; but before I take any action officially to do that I want an opportunity either to read or to have read that response.

When it is read I do not believe that we ought to take it upon ourselves to say that the Postmaster General might have answered this request with fewer words; that he might have done it in one sentence, whereas he has used 100 sentences. We must permit him to use some discretion in his answer; in other words, we ought not to begin now in the Senate a censorship proposition. I confess if we ever did begin it the Postmaster General would be the right official to begin with, because it would give him some of his own medicine.

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

Mr. NORRIS. But instead of doing something that might be in the nature of a censorship of his department, we ought to give the Postmaster General the widest latitude to respond. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator misunderstood the statement which I made. I said in substance, as I recall, that, taking the entire report, I believed that it was an answer, that it was a confession that there was no law authorizing him to take control or operate the telephone system, and that any proposal made calls for legislation. My criticism is that the distinguished Postmaster General submitted an argument, for which we did not ask, in favor of legislation by Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it may be that when I have examined the reply of the Postmaster General I will entirely agree with the Senator; but I understood the Senator to say, when he first took the floor on this subject being brought up, that he expected later on to make a motion of some kind affecting it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I dislike to take a moment of the valuable time of the Senate in continuing this discussion, but if the Postmaster General did make his usual argument in behalf of Government ownership of telephones it does not surprise me, although I think he had no right to do it in answering a direct question that emanated from the Senate. The Postmaster General loads down every report that he makes with arguments in favor of Government ownership of telegraphs and telephones; but Congress has not paid any attention to them, and I do not believe that Congress will pay any attention to what he has said in response to the Senate resolution in this instance.

Just one further word, Mr. President, and I am done.

In view of what has been said, I can not for the life of me understand how a minority Senator, in my person, can get connection with the War Department very promptly over the telephone. I have had no trouble, not the least in the world, and I have had my secretary call the War Department a dozen times in the last 10 days. I have always gotten the connection, and have made appointments to see officials of the War Department. For Senators to say that it takes two hours to get telephone connection with the War Department surprises me beyond measure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question just there?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I have never found any difficulty in being landed at the War Department by the telephone company in Washington; but after you get into the War Department, under the management of Government employees, they pass you about from one place to another, and it may take hours or it may take five minutes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I confess I have not had that trouble; but, if that be so, it is not the fault of the telephone company.

Mr. President, we have had 40,000 people loaded into this District in the last six months, and of course there is some disarrangement of everything connected with the Government service. While I do not speak for the telephone company, because I do not know anything at all of the officials, I think this is a matter that might well rest until we have an investigation, if one is required, to ascertain whether the service here is good or bad or indifferent. I know that in every country on the face of the earth where they have tried government ownership of telephones they have had a service that was utterly execrable, and some of us know that from personal experience in Germany and in England and in France; and it does not compare with the service we have had in the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] seems to overlook the fact that in the Senate the less we know about a subject the more we are disposed to discuss it. The Postmaster General served for a number of years in the House. He is familiar with the rules and practices which prevail in the Senate. He knows that there is no rule in the Senate which requires a speech to be germane to the subject. If not the rule, that certainly is the practice; and if he had confined himself rigorously to the subject he would have sinned not only against the rule but against all the precedents and practices which obtain in this body. I may say that if his answer is not direct—and I have not had an opportunity to examine it—of course steps will be taken to obtain a direct answer. For the present we ought to proceed on the maxim that that is certain which can be made certain.

My purpose, however, in rising was to say that my original intention was to ask that the report be read into the RECORD, in order that Senators might hear it this morning. This discussion has hardly risen to the dignity of an ex parte proceeding, because Senators have not heard it. I asked that the report be printed, rather than that it be read, because I feared that objection might be made to the reading. I knew how anxious, not to say how impatient, Senators were to proceed with the regular order. I say this in explanation of why I did not ask to have it read, so that if a discussion was to be had Senators could proceed with the document clearly in their minds. I will merely add to that that the objections indicated by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Utah justify the fear which I entertained as to having the document read.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is in section 7, on page 13, where it is proposed to strike out and insert—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in order that we may save time I have consented that the bill be laid aside until to-morrow. I have conferred with the committee about it, and I am satisfied that owing to certain conditions we shall facilitate final action upon the bill by letting it go over until to-morrow.

I therefore ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9054, being the Agricultural appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to state the pending amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it has been suggested with considerable force that Senators did not apprehend that this meas-

ure would be taken up at this time. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum in order to afford Senators an opportunity to be advised.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Swanson
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Thomas
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Poinexter	Thompson
Culberson	Kirby	Ransdell	Trammell
Curtis	Lodge	Saulsbury	Underwood
Dillingham	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Fernald	McKellar	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	Walsh
Gallinger	McNary	Shields	Warren
Gore	Martin	Simmons	Watson
Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Hale	New	Smoot	Williams
Harding	Norris	Stone	Wolcott
Hardwick	Nugent	Sutherland	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is necessarily detained.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], who are in Iowa in attendance upon the funeral of the wife of the senior Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] on account of sickness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORE] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. The amendment of the committee is, on page 13, on line 19, after the word "authorities," to strike out "\$250,000" and to insert "\$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. L. p. 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture," so that, if amended, the paragraph will read:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. L. p. 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. This is an amendment which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I was, however, in favor of increasing this amount to \$750,000. That amendment was proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I shall not, of course, now attempt to further increase the appropriation. But I wish only to say that there never was a time when this country was in need of meat and of beef as much as it is to-day, and when we realize, as has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture, that it has been estimated we are losing \$25,000,000 worth of meat by this tubercular disease it seems to me it would be well to appropriate at least \$1,000,000.

While I am on my feet I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any objection to striking out the amendment which the committee proposed, limiting the shipment of tubercular cattle to immediate slaughter?

Mr. GORE. I would not object to striking out the words "immediate slaughter."

Mr. GRONNA. I was going to suggest that the latter part of the amendment I believe takes care of the whole situation—"in accordance with rules and regulations transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture." That gives the Secretary of Agri-

culture entire control, and it seems to me we can well afford to trust it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GORE. Upon further investigation I am inclined to believe that the words "immediate slaughter" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SMOOT. Before that is done I should like to have a little more information.

Mr. NORRIS. May I make a suggestion in regard to the parliamentary situation? The Secretary read it all as one amendment. As a matter of fact, there are two amendments, and it was so considered in the committee. I think the Chair stated that it was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to announce that the amendment was agreed to when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] rose.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to the first amendment. I am perfectly willing that the first amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. GORE. I think that would be better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be divided, and the amendment proposing to increase the appropriation from \$250,000 to \$500,000 will be agreed to without objection.

Mr. GRONNA. I move to strike out—

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator wait a moment until I offer an amendment which may meet the point, and then the Senator can go on with his remarks?

Mr. GRONNA. I will be glad to hear the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the amendment just agreed to—that is, after the numerals \$500,000—insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That if in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation destruction of tuberculous animals becomes necessary, there may be paid from this appropriation not more than one-third the net loss to the owner, and in no event shall there be paid more than \$20 for any grade or \$50 for any pure-bred animal so destroyed, or a greater sum than shall be paid by the cooperating State or municipality.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May the last paragraph be read again? This is exceedingly important legislation.

The Secretary again read Mr. WARREN's amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, first, what is the law now in relation to paying for cattle which may be affected by tuberculosis?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know of any specific law regarding payments for stock killed on account of tuberculosis, but the Government has provided payment for stock killed because of other diseases.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the Government in the past paid for it?

Mr. WARREN. The Government has in cases of the foot-and-mouth disease adopted similar legislation and paid a third to a half of the value of the cattle killed.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the Government ever paid in the past for tubercular cattle that may be killed upon the order of the Government?

Mr. WARREN. I think so. The States themselves have usually provided a part, as this amendment proposes, the Government paying the expenses and some proportion of the value of the animals killed.

Mr. SMOOT. Then this is imposing an additional burden upon the Government of the United States.

Mr. WARREN. The facts are as follows: We want to appropriate money to arrest and stamp out tuberculosis wherever it may be. This mainly is for the reactionists, for those that have had the tuberculin test applied and have reacted. We provide in another amendment which the department has asked for, and which the Senator from North Dakota may move to strike out, that these cattle can be shipped across State lines, which they can not do under the present law, provided they are consigned for immediate slaughter. For instance, Utah or Wyoming may ship to the market at Omaha, if it is for slaughter.

The destruction of tuberculosis which would be taken care of by the Government is in isolated cases. For instance, in a dairy where it is discovered that there may be only one or two animals that are past the point where they can be shipped for meat slaughter, those one or two or more can be immediately destroyed, and the Government will pay its part of it, one-third of the value.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past the State has always paid for cattle killed within the State?

Mr. WARREN. No; they have not always done so.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean it was supposed they would.

Mr. WARREN. Some of the States have provided fully and some have not.

Mr. GORE. This is not to be available in any State where the local authorities may make any provision for it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no such provision in the amendment.

Mr. GORE. It says it shall not exceed the amount paid by the local authorities.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That does not prevent their paying.

Mr. GORE. If they pay nothing, then the Government pays nothing.

Mr. WARREN. This is not a matter that I care to impress unduly upon the Senate. If under this appropriation we leave it to the Government and we meet the losses of this kind, of course we can still perhaps take care of it in the western country as they have done in some parts of the East. The trouble with tuberculosis is mainly in the dairies. I think myself the amendment is one that will cost the Government a very trifling sum, but it does insure a sum on which they can immediately act in case tuberculosis is discovered in a very advanced stage.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not believe we ought to pass legislation now imposing on the Government of the United States an expense that they have never yet assumed. It seems to me it should be paid by the State itself. If this amendment is adopted, I think the result will be that wherever there is a tubercular animal, I care not in what State it may be, the Government of the United States will have to pay at least \$20 if a common cow or calf or steer, but if it is an improved animal the Government will have to pay not to exceed \$50.

Mr. WARREN. It is much the same as in the case of the foot-and-mouth disease, no more and no less.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator from Wyoming is mistaken about that. I think the foot-and-mouth diseases proceeded on the "fifty-fifty" ratio.

Mr. WARREN. It is the same system; but the Government was more liberal than in this proposal.

Mr. GORE. This contemplates that the State or municipality will meet one-third of the loss, the Federal Government one-third of the loss, and the individual owner of the stock slaughtered will sustain one-third of the loss, and as an additional limitation in no case shall it exceed \$20 for grade or \$50 for a pure-bred animal. I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the further fact that it does not relate to the amount of appropriation at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, it does not relate to the amount of appropriation, but it will have to be paid by the Government of the United States, no matter what it amounts to.

Mr. GORE. And none will be paid in States where no provision is made to meet any part of the expenses.

Mr. WARREN. Under the regulation of the Agriculture Department it never has been paid except where the States share the loss.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he understands that the Federal Government to-day is authorized to kill tuberculous cattle without the consent of the owner?

Mr. GORE. I am not able to answer the question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think not.

Mr. GORE. I think not, myself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They may do it with the consent of the owners or they may invoke the law of the State in which they are cooperating where the State law may authorize the State to kill the animal, not the Federal Government.

Mr. GORE. I think the Federal statute relates to interstate shipments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The point I am endeavoring to bring out is that the Federal Government, not being clothed with the power to do as it pleases, is yet compelled by this suggestion to pay the money for what somebody else desires to have done.

Mr. WARREN. Except that the State pays its share, of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not entirely certain about the last clause of the proviso.

Mr. WARREN. If the amendment does not cover that, I desire that it shall do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would like the Secretary to read it again. This is a very important question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will be again read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, however, That if in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation destruction of tuberculous animals becomes necessary there may be paid from this appropriation not more than one-third the net loss to the owner and in no event shall there be paid more than \$20 for any grade or \$50 for any pure-bred animal so destroyed, or a greater sum than shall be paid by the cooperating State or municipality.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment forbids the payment of a sum greater than that paid by the cooperating State. Now, the State of New York pays for animals killed on the order of

the State department of agriculture. My recollection is that they can pay as high as \$100 for a registered dairy cow.

Mr. WARREN. Under the State law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And under this amendment the Federal Government may pay another \$50. There is no question about it. Is not that the understanding of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I feel sure that no practice of that sort would prevail under this provision. I take it that it would be administered a good deal like the taking and slaughtering under the foot-and-mouth disease appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I recollect that appropriation there was a specific provision that there should be a definite amount paid.

Mr. GORE. No; I think not, but that was the practice which prevailed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. At least the Federal Government had a right to kill the animal on its own motion.

Mr. GORE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This legislation does not give the Federal Government that right?

Mr. GORE. I do not think that gave the Federal Government the right to slaughter the animals. In fact I do not think that this could.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under what authority did they slaughter them?

Mr. GORE. I think this is essential to the eradication of tuberculosis among animals. The reason it has persisted so long is the fact that the Federal Government has not had power to make this arrangement. It is the opinion of experts that this would arrest the progress of the disease and I think at present we ought to be more generous and more insistent that the disease be eradicated.

I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram from the president of the Live Stock Exchange of Chicago which illustrates the importance of the subject by those more familiar with it. It is believed that legislation of this sort is necessary for the eradication of the disease itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma desires to have the telegram read?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNION STOCK YARDS, ILL., February 16, 1918.

Senator THOMAS P. GORE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Wire received. Records of Government meat inspection show that out of total of 40,000,000 hogs slaughtered under Federal inspection in the United States last year 10 per cent were found affected with tuberculosis. It comes from infected cattle, either through milk or dropping. Losses from tuberculosis more than all other diseases combined, approximately \$30,000,000 annually. Enormous waste of meat condemned as inedible. Urge appropriation of \$1,000,000 so Department of Agriculture can indemnify owners of cattle which react to tuberculosis test in those States which will cooperate by appropriating additional funds. Tuberculosis among cattle in the District of Columbia reduced from 18.8 per cent to less than 1 per cent by tuberculosis testing and payment of indemnity by Department of Agriculture. Similar results can be had in all States, and the general feeling among stockmen and legislators of these Middle West States is that the States will make liberal appropriations if Congress will take the initiative in providing indemnity. Tuberculosis is our biggest conservation problem, discouraging increased production of meat and milk. Tuberculin testing of cattle and partial indemnity to owners of reacting cattle slaughtered is only way by which rapid progress can be made in eradicating this disease. Our committee will come to Washington if needed.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
By EVERETT C. BROWN, President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not out of sympathy with the object of this amendment and not in the slightest degree with the object of this legislation generally. I have seen the ravages of tuberculosis among dairy cattle in the State of New York. That State embarked several years ago on the problem of eradicating it. It has established a thorough system of compensation for the cattle that are killed on the order of the inspectors of the State department of agriculture.

My contention is with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, that while it seeks to place a limit which the Federal Government shall pay from its Treasury for the destruction of grade cattle and registered cattle, it does not attempt to place any limit upon that payment when combined with the payment made by the State. The closing sentence of the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming recites that the Federal Government shall not pay a sum greater than the sum paid by the cooperating State.

Mr. GORE. That point ought to be met, and I would be glad if the Senator would offer an amendment.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment has been offered on the assumption that no States were paying in full; and I know of none except New York, and that New York is doing it I am very glad. I congratulate the Senator upon his State having

taken it up so thoroughly, but is he aware of any other State that has the same law and pays in full?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not positive, but I think Massachusetts pays liberally and I think Pennsylvania pays liberally.

Mr. GORE. That point can be easily met if the Senator thinks there would be an overpayment by the Federal Government.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state to the Senator from Wyoming that I am quite sure the State of New Hampshire does pay a portion, I think 40 per cent, of the value of the stock.

Mr. WARREN. Without regard to the United States Government?

Mr. GALLINGER. Without regard to the United States Government. I think that the point that the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has made is a very good one, and it ought to be guarded against so that the payments may not be duplicated.

Mr. WARREN. I agree and I have no objection whatever to that; but the telegrams and letters which I have had from great cattle States, like Iowa and other similar States, have sought to bring about an amendment whereby the State would pay a third, the owner stand for a third, and the United States pay a third. I should be glad to have the amendment so framed that it may cover and protect the States generally, if the Senator knows what States should be covered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is rather difficult to introduce or to suggest an appropriate amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I suggest that the matter go into conference, where it can be properly shaped.

Mr. GORE. I suggest that the amendment be passed over for the present. If the Senator from New York desires that the amendment be framed on the theory that one-third of the total loss shall be devolved on the owner of the stock, of course it would be well enough to safeguard the possibility of making excessive payments. It seems to me there should be a proviso that in any case the payment should be by the Federal Government, except one-third of the actual loss, and that in no case should the aggregate payment made exceed the loss.

Mr. WARREN. Let me ask the chairman of the committee a question: Would it not be better to let the matter be voted on and go into the bill, if it can be so ordered, and then take the subject before it goes to conference and provide against what the Senator from New York has brought to our attention?

Mr. GORE. I suggest that the amendment be passed over, and that the Senator from New York offer his amendment when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the wiser course is to pass the matter over for the present and let those of us who want to look into it have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present order, the Chair understands, is that the Senate is first considering committee amendments. This is not a committee amendment, and the regular order is to first dispose of committee amendments.

Mr. GORE. Then I ask that this amendment be passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The Senate will proceed with the consideration of committee amendments. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 13, line 19, after the word "authorities," to strike out "\$250,000" and to insert "\$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. L., p. 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and method of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. L., p. 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, as I understand, the chairman of the committee has no objection to striking out the words "for immediate slaughter."

Mr. GORE. I have no objection to that. I rather think it ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota make that motion?

Mr. GRONNA. At the top of page 14, line 1, in the committee amendment, I move to strike out the words "for immediate slaughter."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test are sound cattle in every respect, and whether or not they could be used as milch cows with safety to the public health?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would say that about 80 per cent of the reactors are used as human food.

Mr. NORRIS. But not for milk?

Mr. GORE. Not for milk, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. That was my question. They are never used for milk purposes, are they?

Mr. GORE. I would not want to give a categorical answer to that question.

Mr. SMOOT. But generally they are not so used?

Mr. GORE. No; I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. I have understood that such use would be unsafe. Mr. President, if we strike out the words "for immediate slaughter," then there will be nothing in the bill to prevent such tubercular cattle from being shipped into any part of the United States.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will observe that the language used is "in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. SMOOT. But that applies only to shipments.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Secretary of Agriculture may say that such cattle should be shipped in a car by themselves; he may say that they can only be shipped upon certain trains running on certain days in the week, and so forth; but there is nothing to prevent such cattle being shipped into any State in the Union where they may be sold to any person and used by any person for milk purposes.

Mr. GORE. I would say as to the history of this amendment that it was prepared by the Department of Agriculture and sent to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It has, I think, the approval of the stock-breeding associations of the country. As the amendment was prepared and sent to me it did not contain the words "for immediate slaughter," but when the committee came to consider it they decided to insert those words out of an abundance of caution and in anticipation of such results as the Senator indicates. The Department of Agriculture, however, expressed the opinion that the words ought not to be inserted, for this reason: As I have said, 80 per cent of these cattle are still available for human food. It is suggested—and it seems to be a very forcible suggestion—that if the words "for immediate slaughter" are retained in the amendment, then the situation will be turned over to the packers, and they can probably dictate and control the price, because the cattle can not be held by the feeders for any length of time but would have to be sold immediately. It would, therefore, subject the owners of cattle to further control and combination on the part of the packing houses.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I believe that the owner of a tubercular cow ought to keep that cow until it is to be sold for slaughter. I do not think such cows should be sold indiscriminately to anybody anywhere in the United States.

Mr. GORE. This does not affect that situation at all. It does not affect the availability of these cattle for slaughter at all. The illustration used by the department as they look upon this subject is that, for instance in the State of Iowa, cattle just across the Missouri River from Omaha may be in this position: They could not be shipped 1 mile to a packing house in Omaha but they must be shipped to Des Moines or to some other point in Iowa for slaughter.

Now, as to the availability of cattle for slaughter, this provision makes no difference whatever. It simply provides that in that sort of case the owner of cattle could ship to Omaha and not be subjected to the loss which would result from paying freight for a longer shipment.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, I am not trying to interfere at all with the shipment of these cattle from one State to another.

Mr. GORE. But that is all this provision proposes to do.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I do think, if such cattle are to be shipped from one State to another, they ought to be shipped for immediate slaughter; and if not shipped for immediate slaughter, then a cow could be shipped from one State to another and from that State to another and sold to an innocent purchaser, he never knowing at all that she had been diseased

in any way, and she might be innocently used for the purpose of producing milk for the family of such a person.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if there is any objection to that, I will say that a similar situation now prevails in Texas, which is larger than either France or Germany. Such cattle are now shipped from one point to another, and not for immediate slaughter.

Mr. SMOOT. But Texas is the only State in the Union as to which that is true.

Mr. GORE. That is true as to any State in the Union, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. Take Iowa. Cows may be shipped from the neighborhood of Des Moines to the northeastern part of Iowa. This simply saves the owners of stock the loss resulting from long shipments. They do not have to ship them now from point to point in the State for "immediate slaughter."

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but that is within the State, and this provision widens the scope so that they may be shipped all over the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have a good deal of sympathy with the argument the Senator is making, and it seems to me there is something in it. At the same time I can see that it might be a hardship to require immediate slaughter. As the chairman of the committee has said, it would force a man to sell immediately and would place him, perhaps, at the mercy of the packing interests, when it might be desirable for him to hold the cattle for a few days, to feed them, or something of that kind.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the suggestion I am about to make, as he has made the motion to strike out. Would not the result be accomplished, and would it not meet all the requirements of the situation if, instead of striking out the words "for immediate slaughter," we should strike out the word "immediate." Then it would permit the shipment for slaughter and would obviate the objection the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] makes, that diseased cattle might be shipped in interstate commerce and the milk produced by them then be used.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to go on for just a moment. The adoption of the amendment I have suggested would permit the department to make regulations by which the shipper of the stock would not be required to offer his stock for immediate sale, but it would not permit the shipment of the stock if the milk of the animal was to be used. Would not that meet the entire situation?

Mr. GRONNA. No, Mr. President; that would not meet the entire situation; but I am perfectly willing for the present to withdraw my amendment, and I shall take it up again later on.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator withdraws his amendment, I desire to make a motion to strike out the word "immediate."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so far as the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, its adoption will obviate the objection which I have, and I shall then be perfectly willing that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that it would accomplish all the other suggestion seeks to accomplish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] withdraws his amendment and the Senator from Nebraska offers an amendment to strike out the word "immediate." The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 1, before the word "slaughter," it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "immediate."

Mr. GRONNA. I prefer, rather than to have that word stricken out, that the amendment go over.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that; that is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment go over, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 14, line 4, after the words "cattle ticks," to strike out "\$620,420" and insert "\$750,000," so as to read:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$750,000, of which sum \$50,000 may be used for live stock and dairy demonstration work, in cooperation with the States Relations Service, and of this amount no part shall be used in the purchase of animals.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the chairman of the committee if there is a recommendation for an increase of

this appropriation? There appears to be a very specific amount named in the bill as it came from the House. It is \$620,420, and it is proposed by the Senate committee to make the amount an even \$750,000.

Mr. GORE. I will say that there has not been a specific recommendation upon this subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I either want the amendment passed over or I will make a point of order that it makes an increased appropriation which has not been recommended. On second thought, however, the amendment having been reported by the committee, perhaps a point of order will not lie.

Mr. GORE. I think that would save the point of order. If the Senator desires, I have no objection to the amendment going over; but I do not think it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it had better go over. This is a pretty large appropriation, and it is one of the appropriations we are constantly increasing year by year. Whether this trouble, or whatever it may be called, is becoming more and more serious, I do not know.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that the work of the Federal Government is entirely in conjunction with that of the States and local authorities.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. They are required to put up dollar for dollar. The record of the results obtained, I think, is remarkable.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that if we should allow the appropriation to stand as it comes from the House, there will be over \$800,000 available for the work of eradicating the cattle tick.

Mr. SMOOT. The amount would be over a million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; the amount will be over a million dollars. I was thinking the amount appropriated by the House was \$420,000, but it is over \$620,000, and if the State and local authorities contribute an equal amount, the total will be nearly \$1,300,000.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that they are just gradually driving the tick toward the ocean. A large section of territory has been freed from the presence of the tick. By the system employed of dipping in vats and washing cattle with the character of chemicals necessary, the tick is being gradually eradicated, and as the process goes on the tick will be entirely eradicated in time.

Mr. GORE. The record of the progress of this work has been most remarkable.

Mr. GALLINGER. They may drive the tick into the ocean, I presume.

Mr. GORE. We all hope so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It should be driven into the ocean.

Mr. GALLINGER. As was done in the case of a certain other plague in the Scriptures.

Mr. GORE. I am quite sure nobody would rejoice more than the Senator from New Hampshire if the work were successfully completed. It has been a most remarkable record. We have rescued 379,000 square miles from the domination of the tick. There still remain, however, 349,000 square miles subject to its ravages. Seventy thousand square miles were rescued last year. The department says that it is really a matter of available funds and that they can expand their organization to the limit simply by the cooperation of the local authorities.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I may ask the Senator a question, the department I apprehend recognized that the amount that is now in the bill as it came from the House was sufficient, and they did not ask to be given any larger amount?

Mr. GORE. Yes. Of course the department has to balance these various appropriations for various purposes. The committee, however, realized the importance of this work, and the fact that it was merely a matter of time and money, there being no doubt that the tick can be entirely eradicated from the United States, and we thought that under existing circumstances it was a matter of wisdom and of conservation to increase this appropriation in order to facilitate this work.

It is a matter serviceable to all sections of the country. Breeders are shipped from the North into the South, and when the territory is rid of these ticks feeders are shipped from the rescued territory in the South to parts of the North for feeding. It is of double service; and no argument against it can be made, except the one of general economy; but it seems to me that it would be very short-sighted economy in this situation to withhold an appropriation of this character, simply tolerating the tick, rather than getting rid of it, and realizing the benefits that may come from its eradication, because wherever territory is rescued there is a great stimulus to cattle breeding. I may say that the State of Mississippi is now entirely out from under quarantine.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator kindly state what territory is still infected?

Mr. GORE. I think that parts of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Texas are still infected.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to be factious about this at all, but the point is that the extent of the infected territory is lessening, while the appropriation grows larger year by year.

Mr. GORE. That is true; it is merely a matter of speed; that is all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me in this connection, I want to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that there is a good deal of skepticism in the efficacy of and opposition to the work of cattle dipping and employing vats for that purpose. Four years ago, however, officers came to my farm, which was infected with the Texas fever tick, and began their operations, and in two years they had my entire place freed from the tick.

The peculiar biology of this little insect is that he does not go over a space of 2 feet. When the tick that propagates the little tick drops from the cattle, it then propagates millions of the species. They are very small insects, called "seed ticks," and the cattle in moving over them pick them up by coming in contact with the little twigs or whatever the little colonies of ticks may cling to. If they can be kept from propagating on a given piece of ground for one year, that piece of ground will be entirely immune, provided a tick infested cow or animal is not allowed to come on that land any more. Now, when you get rid of them it is permanent. The reason why we have suggested this larger amount was that since we have the force educated and know the territory, in place of spreading it out over these years, in a short time we can eradicate the pest from the whole tick-infested region of this country, and there will not be any danger of reinfection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but upon the theory of the Senator from South Carolina we ought to make this appropriation five or ten million, so as to try to clean up the job in one year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we had the force ready to do it, I would be in favor of making it five million to finish it.

Mr. GORE. By all means.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must suggest that Senators address the Chair, because otherwise the Chair can not tell whom to recognize.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor. The Senator from North Dakota has requested a number of times the privilege of interrupting.

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

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Oklahoma have really explained what I was going to explain to the Senator from New Hampshire. I want to say that the committee was convinced that it was in the interest of economy to appropriate a larger amount, and I am quite sure that this money can be expended with splendid success. The Agricultural Department have done most wonderful work in the eradication of ticks, and as long as they have the force to do the work I believe we ought to be liberal in the appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Florida. I am seeking light on this important subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know that I can be of any assistance, but perhaps I can in this way—that I know that this plan is successfully operating in Florida. At first there was a disposition to resist interference by the Federal Government, and a great many of the cattle growers were disposed to say, "We do not like to have our business interfered with at all; we propose to handle this thing ourselves." But it has been so thoroughly demonstrated to the people of the State that the plan is absolutely successful—there is no theory about it; there is no guess about it at all; they clean up the tick wherever they dip the cattle—that now the people have become thoroughly sympathetic with it and are cooperating with the Federal Government, and the tick is being absolutely eliminated from portions of the State wherever they are putting it in practice, and they are doing it rapidly.

For instance, they have demonstrated it at the country fairs, and now at the State fair at Jacksonville. They have a vat there, and they actually bring in the cattle and put them through this dipping process. The people are shown the results, and, as I say, there is no longer objection to it on the part of the people, and there is not any question at all about its effect. So that it is just a question of spending enough money to carry on the work as rapidly as the department can carry it on, because no one will deny that it is a splendid work, and the effect

of it is to increase very greatly not only the size of the cattle but the cattle industry itself.

I hope the Senator will not object to this amendment, because whereas a few years ago they might have not been able to utilize as much of an appropriation as they can utilize now, there is not any doubt but that their forces are thoroughly organized, the plant is thoroughly demonstrated to be a success, and the people are cooperating. It is just a question of pushing it on to completion; that is all.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senator of a little piece of history in connection with the first legislation on this subject. It became a law in June, 1906. Mr. Wilson was then Secretary of Agriculture. He had studied this subject very carefully, and I remember an address he made before the Committee on Agriculture of the House. He said at that time that if Congress would give him enough money he would very speedily drive the cattle tick into the Gulf of Mexico; that it would take a considerable amount of money; that the cattle tick was at that time costing the Government nationally between seventy-five and one hundred million dollars every year. It is a very expensive proposition to the Nation to allow the cattle tick to go ahead with its ravages.

That was nearly 12 years ago. As stated by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the tick has been eradicated from a very large portion of the South; but it still exists in many portions, and it is quite a difficult problem. I raise a few cattle myself, and I know that on my plantation for the past three years we have been religiously dipping the cattle and doing our utmost to eradicate the ticks; but, unfortunately, that is a largely wooded area. Only a small percentage of the land in my portion of Louisiana is cultivated, and it is thought that these ticks get on the deer and other wild animals. At any rate, we have not been able to entirely free East Carroll Parish, where I live, from the tick, in spite of the fact that we have done everything that was humanly possible for three years. The people in the adjoining parish did not make the same attempts that we did. They did not have the dipping vats and they did not try to eradicate the tick, and the cattle would move from one place to the other in this big, continuous forest; but at the last session of the legislature in Louisiana stringent laws were passed making it obligatory on every community to eradicate the ticks.

I will say that the dipping vats are constructed by the local communities. The Government does not contribute for that purpose. It is done locally, and the people are most enthusiastic and earnest in their endeavors and their determination to get rid of the tick. As one result in my community, let me say that some cotton plantations there which could not make anything at all in cotton have gone into cattle raising. There is one plantation near me where there are 3,500 head of cattle which have been brought in from the north and west. The good varieties of cattle have been bought, as I understand, largely in Missouri, and I have no doubt they have come in from Iowa and other parts of the West. Hundreds of fine bulls were brought into that community and the people are beginning to increase the grade of their stock there very much. Formerly if you would bring in these fine animals they would die with the Texas fever, and there was no inducement to bring them in; the loss was too great. Now we are protecting our animals and we are increasing the grade very, very rapidly, with the result that I think there is a strong hope of increasing the national supply of livestock from the South so much as to give us cheaper meat; and that certainly is something in which we are all very much interested.

I know that in my State every effort is being made to eradicate these ticks. I know it is said that in Mississippi the people have been successful, and Mississippi is practically free from the tick. The papers last fall stated that they were having a big celebration in Mississippi of the complete eradication of the cattle tick from that State. I understand that the whole State was to come out from under the cattle-tick quarantine on the 1st of January, and they are raising many fine cattle there. It is certainly a matter of the greatest national importance, and I hope the Senator will not insist on his motion to strike out this amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have not made any motion. I am not going to make any motion. I have been seeking light, and I have received some light and some darkness as a result. The suggestion that we are going to have cheaper meat is so often made that it has failed to produce much impression on my mind. I think it is a delusion and a snare.

Mr. RANDELL. I will say to the Senator that we will probably have more. Whether it will be any cheaper or not I can not say.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is the cheapness to which I am addressing myself. My impression is that the more we get the higher the price will be.

But however that may be, Mr. President, I am not opposing this amendment. I was asking some questions about it. I am so deeply impressed with the feeling—and perhaps I ought not to be, because I belong to the minority of this body, and the responsibility of making the appropriations is upon the other side of the Chamber—I am so deeply impressed with the feeling that we are going recklessly along, appropriating the money of the taxpayers of the country, that I had hoped there would be some effort at economy at some point in our proceedings.

I have just come from a committee that considered a bill that came over from the House. The committee added only \$73,000,000 to it in addition to what the House appropriated. I presume it is necessary, and I am not going to criticize the additions that were made to that bill, although there was a time when it would have startled every one of us and would have startled the country, and there would have been a protest against it that would have been heard around the world. But now it does not disturb us at all to add half a million or a million dollars, or \$10,000,000 for that matter, to any bill that we may have under consideration.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL. We added only \$1,115,160 to the House agricultural bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, I know; but \$1,000,000 used to trouble us somewhat. It does not now, because we are dealing in billions nowadays; and I have observed this in connection with the Agricultural appropriation bill: We put an item in the bill to cure some evil connected with the live stock of the country, and the next year it is increased, and the next it is further increased, and it goes along until we lose all interest in it and pay no attention to it. I just thought that it might be well for us to look at this a few minutes, and see whether it is absolutely essential that this added appropriation should be made.

The Agricultural Department is very apt to suggest a sum large enough to meet emergencies, and they recommended certainly not more than the sum that was in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives, and without any suggestion from the department the committee think that they had better add a hundred or a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars to it. It is not much, and there is an emergency existing, so it is said, and we are supposed to vote for it without giving it any special consideration.

As far as I am concerned, I am not going to make any factious opposition to this thing. I am quite willing that it should be voted on at this very moment. I shall vote against it, because I am getting anxious about the Democratic majority in this matter of appropriations. I am afraid that they are going at a rate that will be very troublesome to them in the near future, and I want to save them from their own indiscretions as far as I can. That was the feeling I had when I occupied a good deal of time in debate on a certain river and harbor bill not long ago; and while I have never advertised it to anybody, it was a great gratification to me that the minority did save thirty millions on that bill, and it did not do any harm. If we can save a hundred thousand dollars in this bill, I think it will be worth trying for; but I am not going to take up the time of the Senate. I am quite ready to vote on the proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, like the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I have tried on one or two occasions to limit the appropriations in the agricultural bill; but the only success—if success it may be called—that has thus far attended my efforts has been the adoption of every appropriation that I have opposed. Consequently, I have come to the conclusion that the only headway I can make, in view of my past experiences, toward reducing them is to advocate the bill, or to suggest their enlargement.

Now, the cow tick is a very insidious and pernicious little insect. It interferes with the growth and prosperity of live stock, and particularly of cattle, and it should be exterminated; but it would seem that we are not making much headway in that direction, or that of the various other insects so long sheltered under the aegis of the agricultural appropriation bill. Indeed, the cow tick seems to thrive in proportion as our appropriations to extinguish it increase. It not only holds the trenches all the time, but frequently comes over the top; and whenever that occurs we cheerfully increase the appropriation, and so it goes with the others. The increase of cow ticks and the increase of appropriations to head them off are much like

increasing salaries that employees may overcome the high cost of living. But the "H. C. of L." has better facilities for climbing than the salary enjoys. To keep pace with it is impossible.

Therefore, this bill should embrace something more than cow ticks. We should extend the appropriation to enable the department to investigate bedticks as well. They are the origin and the lair of a number of very pernicious insects, whose activities seriously decrease the efficiency of labor; and inasmuch as we can strike at the source of their creation, and possibly cut them off in their youth, why not make an appropriation not only for the investigation of bedticks as well as cow ticks, but also create a bureau to investigate the anatomy, the physiology, and the habits of the flea, the louse, and the nit? [Laughter.] I think it is very important, Mr. President, if we are to develop our economic productivity to the highest possible point of efficiency during the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. These are war measures?

Mr. THOMAS. This is decidedly a war measure, and I think I can demonstrate it. Mr. President, no man can be as efficient when his body is infested with the louse or with the flea as when he is free from those parasites. They work while he sleeps [laughter], and the victim of their toil must necessarily scratch whenever the industry of the parasite becomes serious and irritating; and if accurate time were kept of every such interruption of the activities of the individual it would show that a man so unfortunately infested loses probably 30 per cent of his efficiency.

There is another standpoint from which this subject may be considered. I have said that these pestiferous insects never stop their activities. They work all the time and overtime; and, as a consequence, the activities of the individual to get rid of them, or at least to mitigate their disagreeable attention, tend to violate the eight-hour law. When a man is bitten by these insects, no matter whether he has worked eight hours or not, he must stop to relieve himself of their attentions; and that requires an expenditure of physical energy. So I am sure that we should also utilize this bill to work both ends of the line—the insects which attack crops, and those which attack those who plant and who reap them. By that means, Mr. President, we shall reach the point of complete efficiency, which some departments and bureaus would do well to imitate. I therefore suggest an increase of this appropriation, with a view to doing everything possible to win the war; and certainly if we can add to the efficiency of the farmer by relieving him of these pests and conserving all his time we ought to do it.

Now, the flea is perhaps the worst of these pests, because he is superactive and his powers of locomotion are so infinitely out of proportion to all the other representatives of the insect world that in all probability if we could provide funds for the study of the little beast we might discover some way of hamstringing him, and thus, if we can not rid ourselves of him we could reduce his activities to the "nth" power. [Laughter.]

The suggestion is well worthy of consideration. Perhaps the flea should deserve our special attention at this time if we can not cover them all, for they are the most irritating of all these pests. Moreover, they feed other parasites. I think Dean Swift once said:

And little fleas have other fleas
Upon their legs to bite 'em;
And lesser fleas have other fleas,
And so ad infinitum.

Therefore the annihilation of the little flea would necessarily annihilate those infinitely microscopic parasites which, the poet says, infest the larger insect and is infested in turn by others. So why, Mr. President, should we make several bites at the cherry?

We have the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that the appropriations of this bill have been increased in the Senate by only \$1,115,150. What are \$1,115,000 between friends? I am surprised by the committee's exceptional conduct. I am really ashamed of this meanly modest showing. It is completely out of proportion to the magnitude of our other increases, to one of which the Senator from New Hampshire has just referred; and I have no doubt he feels, as to that increase of \$73,000,000, that the committee making it could well say with Lord Clive that it is astonished at its own moderation.

Indeed, Mr. President, in these times any Senate increase of less than \$100,000,000 is too trifling to arrest our attention; it amounts to nothing. I heard some time ago that the chairman of one of the House committees was visited by a constituent who had a tremendous scheme for relieving the Government which required an initial expenditure of \$100,000,000. The

Representative said: "Go and see my secretary; I am dealing in billions; he will attend to your trifling affair, no doubt. I am too busy with billions to consider it."

Seriously, Mr. President, we have reached and long ago passed the limit of appropriations designed to investigate and destroy certain insectivorous parasites which do very seriously interfere with the growth of plants and with the healthy increase of live stock, because we do not seem to get actual results. Whenever an item of this sort, however small and insignificant, is designed to meet, study, and, if possible, remove these little plagues, it becomes a greater source of legislative concern and is far more deadly to the Treasury of the United States than the pest is to the thing to which it relates.

I think I can say that, without exception, if a solitary pest has been destroyed by these means, if the amount needed for continuing the study of its habits, of chasing it from its lurking places, and killing it has ever been reduced in succeeding bills I ask the chairman to inform me what particular insect has been so unfortunate?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would not undertake to enumerate the insects, but I would instance as an illustration of Government service of this character the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease. It took \$10,000,000 to do it, but it was cheap at that price. It would not have done at all to permit that worst of all animal maladies to range unbridled throughout the country.

Mr. THOMAS. Let met ask the Senator if the foot-and-mouth disease is caused by an insect or parasite?

Mr. GORE. It is a microbe; it is not an insect.

Mr. THOMAS. A microbe is perhaps too small to come under the provisions of a bill like this, except it be disguised under the cover of a disease.

Mr. GORE. The Senator, though, seems to have greater faith in his ability to prevail over it than over the insect. The smaller the enemy the more animated is his hostility.

Mr. THOMAS. The fundamental difference between the microbe and the tick is that you can extinguish the microbe if he exhibits himself in the shape of the foot-and-mouth disease, but the tick, like the poor, is with us forever; and so I may say of the cow tick, the boll weevil, and the gypsy moth, and the moth that has nothing to do with gypsies. These, Mr. President, are constantly occurring sources of appropriation from the Treasury. I am now advocating extensions of such appropriations. I may offer an amendment appropriating a certain sum of money—not a great deal—starting with only a few millions to the consideration of the matters to which I have called attention in the hope that by advocating the bill in that shape I may be able to defeat some of its more objectionable features.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I was not present, although a member of the committee. I was ill at the time this appropriation was increased from \$620,000 to \$750,000. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture made a very careful estimate of what he could profitably spend in the eradication of the cattle tick?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, of course we have to assume that the estimates of these items are made with more or less care, but I am pretty sure the attitude of the department is that the speed of exterminating the cattle tick is largely a matter of money and organization.

Mr. THOMAS. Particularly money.

Mr. GORE. Every dollar expended by the Federal Government is matched by a dollar expended by the State or local authorities. That is a perfect guaranty against extravagance. If the money can not be expended under those circumstances it will not be expended. It will lapse; it will return to the Treasury.

I wish to say, while I am on my feet, that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who ordinarily has accurate information as to facts, in this instance is incorrectly advised when he assumes that the cattle tick is spreading. When this crusade was commenced there were 728,000 square miles infested and infected with ticks—larger than Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark combined. I am satisfied that there is not a Government on this globe making any pretension to civilization that would tolerate a pest of this sort for one year if it were possible to exterminate it. It is merely a matter of time and money. It will be exterminated in time. We will appropriate the money in time to carry out this work. The only question is, Will we appropriate it in larger amounts and speed the day of extermination or spread it over a longer series of years? Now, that is the only question.

I suggested a few moments ago that 379,000 square miles have already been rid of the tick, and 349,000 square miles are still subject to its ravages. Seventy thousand square miles were

released from quarantine last year. I reiterate the statement that the only question is as to whether wisdom would recommend that larger appropriations be made and the time of eradication be shortened in order that we may enjoy the larger benefits at an earlier date, or whether we shall procrastinate and project those benefits further into the future.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the chairman of the committee whether there was an unexpended balance last year, or was the appropriation last year expended? Has the Senator that information at hand?

Mr. GORE. I am advised there was no unexpended balance. There is no doubt that the amount would be expended. I will say this, not by way of criticism at all, I think that the opposition of Senators to appropriations is in inverse proportion to their amount. Some bill has been increased \$73,000,000, and, as suggested by a Senator across the aisle, I apprehend the Senate will concur in the \$73,000,000 increase in less minutes than are taken upon this item of the bill. I doubt if any measure could occupy as much time of the Senate as this particular amendment. As suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, we have increased the appropriation \$1,100,000, with, I believe, only one exception. The amounts have been studiously limited to questions of production and conservation of food, an urgent and important question in peace times, but a matter of supreme importance in times of war. The fate of this war may depend even more than Senators realize upon an available food supply in the United States, and for this small amount we ought not to jeopardize the fullest possible service in that direction. I do not believe it is sound economy.

In the main I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in their efforts to maintain reasonable appropriations and to obviate unreasonable appropriations, but I think this appropriation comes in the former category and is in no sense unreasonable.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator one question at that point? Is it not true that there has been no estimate made showing that we need \$130,000 more? Many seem to go on the simple principle that if \$620,000 was good, \$750,000 might be better, and we might just as well have gone on and increased the appropriation to \$1,000,000.

Mr. GORE. The Senator was away for a few minutes. I have already stated that there was no estimate for this amount. The Senate Committee on Agriculture ventured to take one step forward, without being commanded to do it by some executive department of the Government. The committee has not abdicated either its appreciation of public questions or its devotion to the common good.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture, in the absence of the Senator from Vermont, thought if we could, by increasing this appropriation \$130,000, speed the extermination of the cattle tick, if we could encourage the cattle business in this country, if we could provide larger supplies of cattle and of beef, not only for the civilian population and our own armies but for the civilian population and armies of our allies, we had rendered a service; and the fact that \$130,000 is essential to that purpose did not deter the Senate Committee on Agriculture from venturing to submit such a recommendation to the Senate. It is, of course, a matter for the Senate entirely to determine whether the Committee on Agriculture outran either the propriety or the safe limitations upon public expenditures.

Mr. PAGE. I simply suggest, Mr. President, if I may be allowed, that it is quite common for the Committee on Agriculture to take the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture and, without any showing whatever except the general claim, as it has been made by the Senator from Oklahoma this morning, that there is a great evil, and without any especial reason being given, without the facts or figures having been submitted, increase it by \$130,000.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is aware, of course, that the Senate has already voted an increase of \$250,000 to eradicate tuberculosis, an increase of 100 per cent upon the amount recommended by the Department of Agriculture. I think it a wise appropriation. It will be used to exterminate tuberculosis in every part of the United States where that disease prevails; and I think it would be a shortsighted, a niggardly sort of economy that would withhold a quarter million dollars in an effort to save an annual loss of \$25,000,000 in the value of meat products. The loss used to be estimated from the cattle tick at \$70,000,000. I believe it has now dropped to between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000. An increase of \$130,000 to re-insure against a loss of \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 of foodstuffs when the world faces a crisis in foodstuffs is the act of boldness which the Committee on Agriculture has committed.

Mr. PAGE. Why not, on the same principle, may I ask the Senator from Oklahoma, increase this appropriation of \$620,000 to \$1,000,000?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, nothing that the Senate could do and nothing that it will do would afford a higher or more unmistakable proof of statesmanship than to make such an appropriation increasing this amount to \$1,000,000. Nothing, I say, would betray symptoms of intelligent patriotism on the part of the Senate to a greater extent, except an appropriation of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000, or whatever amount it would take to rid this great country, professing to be enlightened and civilized, of this pest which costs \$50,000,000 a year and places a limitation upon our food supplies.

Mr. President, there is no act which I would rather be the author of than an appropriation securing at one time a sufficient and a perpetual fund available until the tick is eradicated, so that the spectacle will not be exhibited every time the Agricultural appropriation bill comes up for consideration in the Senate that this very debate has to be gone through with, and have Senators sit here and pare cheese and nibble at cherries when the destiny of the Nation may be to a measurable extent affected by this measure. I think it is extremely shortsighted.

I do not mean to be critical when I say that we ought like a great Nation and like, I believe, any other nation on earth would do, make an appropriation to carry this work out and complete it. Say it will take \$5,000,000 to do it and we extend the appropriations over 8 years. We have been 12 years now. We will probably be 8 years more. It would have been wiser to have made the appropriation in the beginning and to have cleaned up the entire country by this time. We would not then in war times find in our country with 350,000 square miles subject to a pest which is eradicable and which places a limitation upon our food supplies.

Mr. PAGE. I thank the Senator. The Secretary of Agriculture is a very good man; he has made his estimates as to what sums he can use properly and efficiently for the coming year. I do not know but that we might by adopting the theory which the Senator from Oklahoma has just expressed increase every one of these appropriations immensely to our advantage. So far as I am concerned I propose to vote against the amendment, because we have a man at the head of the department who has given the matter his careful consideration, and who says that \$620,000 is what he can wisely and properly expend. We ought to stop there and not increase it by \$130,000, without some facts or some figures or some data upon which to vote a larger sum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture was, on page 16, line 23, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$2,743,098" and insert "\$3,122,678," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$3,122,678.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, after the words "Animal Industry," to strike out "\$3,700,008" and insert "\$4,079,588," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, \$4,079,588.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 11, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$85,510" and insert "\$107,510," so as to read:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, \$107,510.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 18, after the word "production," to strike out "\$241,505" and insert "\$291,505"; and in line 21, after the word "That," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and improvement of cereals and methods of cereal production and the study of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broom corn and methods of broom-corn production, \$291,505: *Provided*, That \$40,000 shall be set aside for the study of corn improvement and methods of corn production: *Provided also*, That \$100,000 shall be set aside for the investigation and control of the diseases of wheat, oats, and barley known as black rust and stripe rust, which sum shall be immediately available: *Provided also*, That \$25,000 shall be set aside for the investigation of corn root and stalk diseases and for the inauguration of such control measures as may be found necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 19, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$2,232,098" and insert "\$2,304,698," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$2,304,698.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 19, to strike out:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$242,320. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packing, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall upon their requests, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

And, on page 30, line 10, after the words "Plant Industry," to strike out "\$2,915,038" and insert "\$2,744,718," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, \$2,744,718.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment may go over.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over for the present.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service," on page 45, after line 17, to strike out:

That, during the existing state of war, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make sales, without advertisement, at a fair valuation, to be determined by him, of national forest timber which is to be used so far as suitable for the construction of aeroplanes.

And in lieu to insert:

That hereafter during the existing state of war, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the War Department, or any other department, board, or commission, of the Government, to take from the national forests such timber as may be needed in the prosecution of the war, and the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to sell, or otherwise dispose of, any timber necessarily cut in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph and any materials manufactured therefrom which are not necessary for war purposes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is absent for a few moments and in his absence he asked me to suggest an alteration in the amendment now before the Senate to conform to the suggestion made by a memorandum from the Forestry Bureau. I therefore move, on page 46, lines 3 and 4, that the words "the Secretary of Agriculture is further" be stricken out and to insert:

Secretaries of the departments, the boards, or the commissions which may obtain such timber are severally.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment may be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The Secretary read the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], then, has the floor. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I merely want to say a word. I assume that the reason for suggesting this amendment is that the sale of this timber will come under various departments. The committee thought, of course, it would come under the Department of Agriculture, but I can readily see that the Secretary of the Interior may have something to say about the sale of some of this timber. I can see no other reason for the change.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what the amendment provides for; I will say to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. It speaks of different departments.

Mr. SMOOT. It authorizes all of the departments or any of the departments.

Mr. GRONNA. It simply authorizes them to cooperate.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it authorizes them to sell the timber.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; on examination I see that is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. It authorizes any board that we create to sell this timber, and it authorizes any commission to sell the timber.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Utah, of course, understands that this timber is simply for the purpose of constructing ships or aeroplanes; that it is absolutely for nothing else but for use in this war. This does not authorize anyone to sell any timber except what may be used in the construction of ships and aeroplanes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah understands that, because it is specifically so stated in the amendment. What I desired time for was merely to see what the amendment did provide, because a Senator can hardly ascertain that by the reading from the desk, and without reading it in connection with the amendment itself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I can enlighten the Senator from Utah on that point.

Mr. SMOOT. After comparing the Senator's amendment with the amendment of the committee I see that his amendment is a wise one and I think it ought to be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 46, after line 7, to strike out:

Whenever, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, he may, in lieu of actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 2 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 6 cents per mile for an automobile, used for necessary travel on official business in the Forest Service: *Provided*, That there shall be no payment of mileage for the use or travel of motorcycle or automobile furnished or owned by or maintained by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge if the provision proposed to be stricken out has not generally been in Agricultural appropriation bills and also in other appropriation bills?

Mr. RANDELL. I understand that the department is anxious to have that provision, and that it has usually been in the bill, but in this case it is proposed to strike it out. I was not present in committee, I will say to the Senator from Utah, when that action was taken, and the Senator in charge of the bill has momentarily left the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I remember when the wording contained in this proviso of this bill was first placed in an appropriation bill; and, if I remember rightly, it has been generally in regular appropriation bills. It reads:

Provided, That there shall be no payment of mileage for the use or travel of motorcycle or automobile furnished or owned by or maintained by the Government of the United States.

The reason for inserting those words in previous appropriation bills, Mr. President, was because there had been claims for mileage and there had been payments for mileage, in which the persons claiming the mileage had used motorcycles and automobiles which had been furnished by the Government of the United States. The claim for such mileage was unfair to the Government and should never have been allowed. I have, therefore, wondered why the committee proposed to strike this provision out of the bill.

Mr. RANDELL. I can not give an explanation of that, and I will suggest to the Senator from Utah, if he desires such explanation, that the amendment be passed over until the chairman of the committee returns.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have some explanation of that matter, and so I ask that the amendment go over until the chairman of the committee returns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Bureau of Soils," on page 54, line 9, after "\$217,600," to insert:

Provided That the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold at a price to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

So as to make the clause read:

For the investigation and demonstration within the United States to determine the best method of obtaining potash on a commercial scale, \$127,600: *Provided*, That the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold at a price to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Entomology," on page 56, line 4, after the word "nuts," to strike out "\$83,380" and insert "\$93,380"; so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$93,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 12, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$557,300" and insert "\$567,300"; so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$567,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 11, after the words "Bureau of Entomology," to strike out "\$976,680," and insert "\$986,680"; so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Entomology, \$986,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Biological Survey," on page 60, line 25, after the words "wild animals," to strike out:

Provided further, That of this sum \$10,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the purpose of investigating the extent and effect of the killing and harassing by dogs of sheep and other meat-producing animals and of the best methods for reducing and preventing the same;

So as to make the clause read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, \$394,820: *Provided*, That of this sum \$15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests, and other public lands: *And provided also*, That of this sum not less than \$125,000 shall be used on the national forests and the public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture, animal husbandry, and wild game: *And provided further*, That of this sum not more than \$125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I simply desire at this time to congratulate the Senate, if it is about to adopt this amendment, on its wisdom in refraining from the attempt to teach people how to kill dogs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 61, line 13, after the words "insectivorous birds," to insert "and any act of Congress to give effect to the treaty with Great Britain relating to migratory birds"; so as to make the clause read:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats. L., pp. 847 and 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, and any act of Congress to give effect to the treaty with Great Britain relating to migratory birds, and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, \$50,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator having the bill in charge to make an explanation of that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. First, I should very much like to have the paragraph read and then read in conjunction with the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary again read the clause as proposed to be amended.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I will ask that this section be passed over until the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Gore] returns to the Chamber. He will be here in a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the treaty with Great Britain relating to migratory birds has not yet been ratified, and it

seems to me rather strange that we should put into an appropriation bill an item referring to a treaty that is yet to be ratified by Great Britain and the United States. The only question in my mind is whether or not it is really consistent legislation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, though I am not a member of this committee, I am very sure there was some good reason for putting the amendment into the bill. In order that the chairman of the committee may be permitted to explain it, I ask that the section may be passed over until he returns, which will be in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be temporarily passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads," on page 76, line 2, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$60,900, of which sum \$35,900 shall be made immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For investigating farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal, the construction of farm buildings, and other rural engineering problems involving mechanical principles, including the erection of such structures outside of the District of Columbia as may be necessary for experimental purposes only, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$60,900, of which sum \$35,900 shall be made immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 7, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$489,520" and insert "\$525,420," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$525,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 8, after the words "Public Roads," to strike out "\$593,540" and insert "\$629,440," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Public Roads, \$629,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Markets," on page 79, after line 7, to strike out—

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruit, vegetables, and other perishable farm products when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will cover the cost of the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$113,000.

And insert—

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, and other perishable farm products when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$113,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 15, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to install an experimental flour mill, baking and other apparatus, in order to investigate the milling and baking qualities of wheat and other grains, including the payment of rent in the city of Washington, \$50,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not care particularly to discuss this amendment, but I have a matter which I wish to put in the Record, and I will take this opportunity to do it.

At the last session of Congress a bill looking to the control of food products was prepared and sent to Congress by the administration. In that bill provision was made giving the President full control over the matter of the use of food products in the manufacture of malt, vinous, and distilled liquors. When the matter came up in Congress, Congress was prepared to relieve the President from that responsibility and prohibit by positive act the use of food products in the manufacture of liquors of this kind. One body of Congress adopted a positive provision to that effect. That provision was substantially reported by the Senate committee, and the Senate was prepared to pass it, when the President practically requested us to leave that authority in him and place upon him that responsibility. That was done; and although Congress did prohibit the manufacture of distilled spirits, Congress, as the President requested, left the authority in him and the power in him to permit or prohibit the use of food products in the manufacture of malt and vinous liquors.

There is a tremendous sentiment throughout the country in favor of war prohibition independent of the merits of the question in times of peace, and much pressure has been brought upon Congress; but the country is beginning to understand and realize that this power is in the hands of the President, that

the responsibility is his, and that while Congress was perfectly willing to assume this responsibility and discharge this duty, it left it with the President at his own request.

A few days ago, Mr. President, one of the most remarkable petitions ever prepared was presented to the President of the United States, asking in very respectful terms that he exercise the power that Congress has given him and, as a war measure, prohibit the further use of grain and other food products in the manufacture of malt and vinous liquors. That petition was signed by many of the most prominent women of this country of every class and occupation. It was signed by the representatives of all of the temperance organizations in the United States. It represented over 6,000,000 of the patriotic women of this country, of the most representative character, not only in their own persons but in those whom they represented as the officials of organizations of various kinds. This was distinctly a "winning of the war" appeal by the patriotic women of this country, who are doing everything in their power to bring this war to a successful termination. The women of America are doing their part now, as they have always done in the history of the Nation, and they presented the petition to the President as a war proposition. They believed that it would have much to do with the winning of the war, and as patriots they presented it to him and not as partisans of any particular idea.

Mr. President, I have the letter transmitting this petition to the President. I have also the petition signed by about a thousand of the most representative women in this country. Not all of the representative women of the country who would have signed it have signed it, simply because they did not have the opportunity; but these women do represent the patriotic, loyal sentiment of the great majority of the women of the Republic.

I think this is the first time in the history of the temperance movement that all of the leading organizations of women have united in behalf of a particular proposition. They have all united in behalf of this proposition and they are all represented in the petition that was presented to the President.

This petition is signed by and represents the women whose husbands, sons, and brothers are in training camps, on ships, and at the battle front. They favor the conservation of our food products for the boys at the front, and are denying themselves and will deny themselves to the limit. They favor the use of food products for bread rather than for beer, and make this appeal to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy as staunch patriots whose highest aim and purpose now is "to win the war."

This petition was prompted by that great organization the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and, in my judgment, will take rank among the historic petitions of the world. I have, as I have said, the letter tendering this petition to the President; I have the petition with the names which was presented to him March 1, and also a summary of the petition and the character and standing of the signers. I ask that they be printed in full in the Record, including the names.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: We deeply appreciate the privilege of presenting to you a memorial representing 6,000,000 women patriots of the United States.

We believe this is the first petition in the history of our country in which all leading organizations of women—civic, fraternal, social, patriotic, and religious—as well as hundreds of notable women in the educational and official life of the Republic, have united. It comes to you, Mr. President, as the voice of the women of America. It comes to you, our Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, at the time of an appalling crisis which peculiarly concerns the mothers of the Nation.

Educated by the Government to believe that food will win the war, these women, whose magnificent war service and sacrifice are everywhere attested, plead for the maximum conservation of food materials for the duration of the war. They earnestly and respectfully ask that all food materials now used in the production of malt liquors be diverted to food supplies desperately needed by our Army and the armies of the allies.

On behalf of the 6,000,000 petitioners, Mr. President, we thank you for the steps in this direction already taken, and we beg your early and favorable consideration of the prayer of the memorial we have the honor to place in your hands.

ANNA A. GORDON,
President National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

TO HON. WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States:

Believing that the women of the United States are loyally doing their utmost in our national crisis to carry out all Government plans for the conservation of food; and

Realizing that there is still an alarming waste of foodstuffs in the production of malt and vinous liquors;

We, in behalf of mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, and sweethearts of enlisted men, appeal to you, our Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to prohibit the further waste of these foodstuffs in the production of malt and vinous liquors during the period of the war.

NATIONAL PRESIDENTS WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS—OFFICIAL SIGNERS.

Mrs. Josiah Evans Cowles, president general Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Cal.	2,600,000
Sarah E. Guernsey (Mrs. George Thacher), president general National Society Daughters American Revolution, Independence, Kans.	101,178
H. K. Schoff (Mrs. Frederick), president National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association, Philadelphia, Pa.	150,000
Emma Bailey Speer (Mrs. Robert E.), president Young Women's Christian Associations of America, New York City	362,191
Myra Kingman Miller, president National Federation of College Women, New York City, N. Y.	70,000
Mrs. Alice V. Morrill, president Woman's Board of Foreign Missions of Christian Church, Dayton, Ohio.	5,000
Mrs. Wilbur P. Thirkield, president Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New Orleans, La.	260,000
Mrs. M. Katherine Bennett, president Woman's Board of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church, Englewood, N. J.	175,000
Mrs. William Watters, acting president the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.	90,000
Marietta B. Wilkins, president Women's National Missionary Association of the Universalist Church, Salem, Mass.	6,200
Mary A. Davis, honorary president National Free Baptist Women's Missionary Society, Pittsburgh, Pa.	9,000
Clotilda L. McDowell (Mrs. Wm. F.), president the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.	220,804
Helen Barrett Montgomery (Mrs. W. A.), president Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Rochester, N. Y.	752,000
Maudie M. Chadsey, president Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Advent Christian Church, Boston, Mass.	1,700
Miss Lucy Lowell, president of the Alliance Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women, Boston, Mass.	21,700
Bina M. West, supreme commander Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees, Port Huron, Mich.	194,000
Mrs. Walston Hill Brown, president National Child Welfare League, New York City, N. Y.	400
Mary B. Talbert, president National Association of Colored Women, Buffalo, N. Y.	100,000
Mrs. Charles R. E. Koch, national president Dames of the Loyal Legion, Evanston, Ill.	360
Anna A. Gordon, president National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evanston, Ill.	450,000
Emmeline B. Wells, president National Woman's Relief Society, Salt Lake City, Utah.	50,000
Mary Eleanor Tarbox (Mrs. Wallace R.), president Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Fryeburg, Me.	38,000
(Mrs.) Lois M. Knauff, national president Woman's Relief Corps, Chagrin Falls, N. Y.	160,000
Alice Cary Risley, president National Association Army Nurses Civil War, Jefferson City, Mo.	113
Mrs. Cynthia Westover Alden, president general the International Sunshine Society, New York City, N. Y.	50,000
Louisa King (Mrs. Francis), president Woman's Farm and Garden Association, Alma, Mich.	16,000
Mary Clark Barnes (Mrs. Lemuel Call), president Neighbors' League of America, New York City, N. Y.	100
Martha H. Tingey, president Young Ladies' National Mutual Improvement Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.	35,080
Mary M. North, president American Woman's Press Association, Herndon, Va.	150

WIFE OF FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Frances F. Cleveland Preston (Mrs. T. G. N.), Princeton, N. J.

WIFE OF FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE.

Mrs. William J. Bryan, Lincoln, Nebr.

WIVES OF UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.

Mrs. William F. Kirby, wife of United States Senator, Little Rock, Ark.	
Marie Bankhead Owen (Mrs. Thomas M.), daughter of United States Senator; State chairman League for Service; first vice chairman Woman's Council of Defense, Birmingham, Ala.	
Mrs. Charles A. Sulzer, wife of United States Delegate, Juneau, Alaska.	
Mrs. Carl Hayden, wife of United States Representative, Phoenix, Ariz.	
Mrs. C. H. Randall, wife of United States Representative, Los Angeles, Cal.	
Mrs. William Kent, wife of former United States Representative, Kentfield, Cal.	
Margaret Keating (Mrs. Edward), wife of United States Representative, Pueblo, Colo.	
Margaret Timberlake (Mrs. Charles B.), wife of United States Representative, Sterling, Colo.	
Mary T. Henderson (Mrs. J. B. H.), wife of late United States Senator, Washington, D. C.	
Mrs. Duncan U. Fletcher, wife of United States Senator, Jacksonville, Fla.	
Mrs. Park Trammell, wife of United States Senator, Lakeland, Fla.	
Mrs. Frank Clark, wife of United States Representative, Gainesville, Fla.	
Mrs. Hoke Smith, wife of United States Senator, Atlanta, Ga.	
Mrs. Thomas W. Hardwick, wife of United States Senator, Sandersville, Ga.	
Mrs. W. H. Felton, wife of former United States Representative, Cartersville, Ga.	
Mrs. S. J. Tribble, wife of late United States Representative, Athens, Ga.	
Mrs. Henry R. Harris, wife of late United States Representative, Odesdale, Ga.	
Mrs. Charles Crisp, wife of United States Representative, Americus, Ga.	
Mrs. S. A. Roddenberry, wife of late United States Representative, Thomasville, Ga.	
Irene M. Brady (Mrs. James H.), wife of late United States Senator, Boise, Idaho.	

Mrs. Addison T. Smith, wife of United States Representative, Twin Falls, Idaho.	
Mida E. McCracken (Mrs. R. M.), wife of former United States Representative, Boise, Idaho.	
Mrs. Medill McCormick, wife of United States Representative, Chicago, Ill.	
Mrs. M. D. Foster, wife of United States Representative, Olney, Ill.	
Mrs. Richmond Pearson Hobson, wife of former United States Representative, Evanston, Ill.	
Mrs. Charles Curtis, wife of United States Senator, Kansas City, Kans.	
Mrs. Dudley Doolittle, wife of United States Representative, Strong City, Kans.	
Mrs. John W. Langley, wife of United States Representative, Pikeville, Ky.	
Mrs. Bert M. Fernald, wife of United States Senator, Poland, Me.	
Mrs. Martin Holcomb, wife of former United States Representative, Grand Rapids, Mich.	
Annie S. Beakes (Mrs. S. W.), wife of United States Representative, Ann Arbor, Mich.	
Mrs. Louis C. Crampton, wife of United States Representative, Lapeer, Mich.	
Ona Winants Borland (Mrs. William P.), wife of United States Representative, Kansas City, Mo.	
Ellie L. Norris (Mrs. George W.), wife of United States Senator, McCook, Nebr.	
Mrs. Dan V. Stephens, wife of United States Representative, Fremont, Nebr.	
Emma L. Lobeck (Mrs. C. O.), wife of United States Representative, Omaha, Nebr.	
Natalie S. Jones (Mrs. Andrieus), wife of United States Senator, East Las Vegas, N. Mex.	
Anna M. Hawley (Mrs. W. C.), wife of United States Representative, Salem, Oreg.	
Elizabeth H. Cooper (Mrs. John G.), wife of United States Representative, Youngstown, Ohio.	
Elizabeth P. Griest (Mrs. W. W.), wife of United States Representative, Lancaster, Pa.	
Vida Ruth Kelly (Mrs. M. Clyde), wife of United States Representative, Braddock, Pa.	
Mrs. B. R. Tillman, wife of United States Senator, Trenton, S. C.	
Mrs. E. W. Martin, wife of former United States Representative, Deadwood, S. Dak.	
Mrs. Newell Sanders, wife of former United States Senator, Lookout Mountain, Tenn.	
Ida L. Padgett (Mrs. L. P.), wife of United States Representative, Columbia, Tenn.	
Jeannette S. D. Shields (Mrs. John K.), wife of United States Senator, Knoxville, Tenn.	
Mrs. Mary E. Byrns, mother of United States Representative, Nashville, Tenn.	
Mrs. Charles B. Wilson, sister of United States Representative, Nashville, Tenn.	
Mrs. Carter Glass, wife of United States Representative, Lynchburg, Va.	
Anna Portner Flood (Mrs. Henry D.), wife of United States Representative, Appomattox, Va.	
Mrs. E. W. Saunders, wife of United States Representative, Rocky Mount, Va.	
Augusta M. Dale (Mrs. Porter H.), wife of United States Representative, Island Point, Vt.	
Elizabeth Gale Poindexter (Mrs. Miles C.), wife of United States Senator, Spokane, Wash.	
Lavalette C. Hadley (Mrs. Lindley H.), wife of United States Representative, Bellingham, Wash.	
Elizabeth Gray Bowers (Mrs. George M.), wife of United States Representative, Martinsburg, W. Va.	
Mrs. Stuart F. Reed, wife of United States Representative, Clarksburg, W. Va.	
Emma B. Woodyard (Mrs. Harry C.), wife of United States Representative, Spencer, W. Va.	
Mrs. Edward E. Browne, wife of United States Representative, Wau-paca, Wis.	
Mrs. John B. Kendrick, wife of United States Senator, Sheridan, Wyo.	

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE.

JEANNETTE RANKIN, Missoula, Mont.

WIVES OF GOVERNORS AND FORMER GOVERNORS.

Anna Hall Strong (Mrs. J. F. A.), wife of governor, Juneau, Alaska.	
Mrs. Alfred P. Swineford, wife of former governor, Ketchikan, Alaska.	
Abigail M. W. Miller (Mrs. Charles R.), wife of former governor; chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Wilmington, Del.	
Mrs. Julius C. Gunter, wife of governor, Denver, Colo.	
Mrs. Sidney J. Catts, wife of governor, Tallahassee, Fla.	
Mrs. N. E. Harris, wife of former governor, Macon, Ga.	
Mrs. W. Y. Atkinson, wife of former governor, Newman, Ga.	
Mary Dillingham Frear (Mrs. W. F.), wife of former governor, Honolulu, Hawaii.	
Mrs. James P. Goodrich, wife of governor, Indianapolis, Ind.	
Anna Larrabee (Mrs. William), wife of former governor, Des Moines, Iowa.	
Mrs. Arthur Capper, wife of governor, Topeka, Kans.	
Mrs. E. W. Hoch, wife of former governor, Marion, Kans.	
Mrs. W. R. Stubbs, wife of former governor, Lawrence, Kans.	
Mrs. A. E. Noel, wife of former governor, Lexington, Ky.	
Emma V. Milliken (Mrs. Carl E.), wife of governor, Augusta, Me.	
Mrs. Edith H. Curtis (Mrs. Oakley C.), wife of former governor, Rockland, Me.	
Mrs. William T. Haines, wife of former governor, Waterville, Me.	
Mrs. John F. Hill, wife of former governor; chairman woman's committee on liberty loan for Maine, Augusta, Me.	
Mary C. Sleeper (Mrs. Albert), wife of governor, Lansing, Mich.	
Mrs. Luren D. Dickinson, wife of lieutenant governor, Charlotte, Mich.	
Lillian Osborn (Mrs. Charles S.), wife of former governor, Maric, Mich.	
Alice Tye Noel (Mrs. E. F.), wife of former governor, Lexington, Miss.	
Marion B. Longino (Mrs. A. H. L.), wife of former governor, Jackson, Miss.	
Linda Bilbo (Mrs. Theo. G.), wife of governor, Jackson, Miss.	

Jeannette V. Gardner (Mrs. Frederick), wife of governor, Jefferson City, Mo.
 Mrs. Chester H. Aldrich, wife of former governor, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Margaretta S. Dietrich (Mrs. C. H.), wife of former governor, Hastings, Nebr.
 Mrs. J. H. Mickey, wife of former governor, University Place, Nebr.
 Mrs. D. H. Goodell, wife of former governor, Antrim, N. H.
 Mrs. John McLane, wife of former governor, Milford, N. H.
 Mrs. Henry B. Quimby, wife of former governor, Lakeport, N. H.
 Olive Whitman (Mrs. Charles S.), wife of governor, Albany, N. Y.
 Mrs. Lynn J. Frazier, wife of governor, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 Mrs. L. B. Hanna, wife of former governor, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Andrew L. Harris, wife of former governor, Eaton, Ohio.
 Allie D. Willis (Mrs. Frank B.), wife of former governor, Delaware, Ohio.
 Flora B. Brumbaugh (Mrs. Martin G.), wife of governor, Harrisburg, Pa.
 Mrs. Richard I. Manning, wife of governor, Columbia, S. C.
 Mrs. Peter Norbeck, wife of governor, Pierre, S. Dak.
 Mrs. Frank E. Byrne, wife of former governor, Faulkton, S. Dak.
 Mrs. T. C. Rye, wife of governor, Nashville, Tenn.
 Mrs. John Farris Nolan, daughter of governor, Nashville, Tenn.
 Mrs. W. H. Mann, wife of former governor, Petersburg, Va.
 Isabel S. Graham, sister of governor, Craftsburg, Vt.
 Mrs. Eva B. Steunenberg, wife of former governor of Idaho, College Place, Wash.
 Alma Lister (Mrs. Ernest), wife of governor, Olympia, Wash.
 Mrs. A. B. Fleming, wife of former governor, Fairmont, W. Va.
 Mrs. W. H. Upham, wife of former governor, Marshfield, Wis.

STATE SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.

Mrs. Pauline M. O'Neill, former member State legislature, Phoenix, Ariz.
 Mrs. Frances Willard Munds, State senator, Prescott, Ariz.
 Helen Ring Robinson, former State senator, Denver, Colo.

WIVES OF STATE OFFICIALS.

Octavia A. White (Mrs. Frank S.), wife of former State senator, Birmingham, Ala.
 Mrs. H. W. Hill, wife of Associate Justice Supreme Court, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. T. E. Patterson, wife of State prison commissioner, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. Agnes Hall Boyd Judd, wife of Chief Justice Hawaiian Islands, Hawaii.
 Mrs. S. M. Brewster, wife of attorney general, Topeka, Kans.
 Jennie Botkin (Mrs. Thomas), wife of secretary of state, Topeka, Kans.
 Mary C. Tunis (Mrs. J. T.), wife of former State senator, Lexington, Ky.
 Mrs. R. M. Salmon, wife of State senator, Madisonville, Ky.
 Mrs. Frank C. Greene, wife of member of State legislature, Carrollton, Ky.
 Mrs. S. D. Pearce, wife of State senator, Ruston, La.
 Lena Allen Price (Mrs. Fred W.), wife of State representative, Ruston, La.
 Mrs. W. R. Pattengall, wife of former attorney general, Augusta, Me.
 Edith Hayes Wheeler (Mrs. Alton C.), wife of member of legislature, South Paris, Me.
 Mrs. J. Morgan Stevens, wife of judge of supreme court, Jackson, Miss.
 Mrs. Lee F. Russell, wife of lieutenant governor, Oxford, Miss.
 Alfreda G. Collins (Mrs. Ross A.), wife of attorney general, Jackson, Miss.
 Edith Hyde Colby (Mrs. Everett), wife of former State senator, West Orange, N. J.
 Mrs. William A. Carson, wife of State senator, Rushville, N. Y.
 Mrs. Sarah M. Witter, wife of assemblyman, Berkshire, N. Y.
 Hattie M. Fenner (Mrs. Casper), wife of assemblyman, Heddens, N. Y.
 Mrs. J. C. Allen, wife of State assemblyman, Clinton Corners, N. Y.
 Martha McGilfert Whitney (Mrs. George H.), wife of State senator, Mechanicsville, N. Y.
 Lena M. Sweet (Mrs. Thaddeus C.), wife of speaker of New York Assembly, Phoenix, N. Y.
 Mrs. Andrew A. Bruce, wife of judge of supreme court, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Richard H. Grace, wife of judge of supreme court, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 Mrs. J. N. Hagan, wife of judge of supreme court, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 Mrs. D. H. McArthur, wife of former State senator, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Walter Ferguson, wife of State representative, Cherokee, Okla.
 Mrs. J. O. McCollister, wife of former representative, Mangum, Okla.
 Mrs. W. W. Murray, wife of late judge of Federal court of land claims, Huntington, Tenn.
 Mrs. J. Taylor Ellyson, wife of former lieutenant governor, Richmond, Va.
 Mrs. A. T. Lincoln, wife of former State senator, Marion, Va.
 Mrs. G. Walter Mapp, wife of State senator, Accomac, Va.
 Mrs. B. F. Buchanan, wife of lieutenant governor, Marion, Va.
 Mrs. Martin Williams, wife of former member of legislature, Pearisburg, Va.
 Mrs. John F. Mains, wife of judge of supreme court, Olympia, Wash.
 Mrs. Louie Pemberton (Mrs. W. H.), wife of superior judge, Bellingham, Wash.
 Mrs. J. T. Ronald, wife of superior judge, Seattle, Wash.
 Mrs. C. W. Lynch, wife of judge of supreme court, Charleston, W. Va.
 Mrs. John S. Darst, wife of State auditor, Charleston, W. Va.
 Harriet P. Williams (Mrs. L. Judson), wife of judge of supreme court, Charleston, W. Va.
 Helen J. Ritz (Mrs. Harold A.), wife of judge of supreme court, Charleston, W. Va.
 Grace R. Montgomery, wife of commissioner of labor, grand chief of West Virginia Pythian Sisters, Charleston, W. Va.

EDUCATORS.

Julia C. Lathrop, Chief Child Labor Bureau, Washington, D. C.
 (Mrs.) Ella Flagg Young, former president National Education Association; recently superintendent of schools; member of woman's liberty loan committee, Chicago, Ill.
 Mary C. C. Bradford, State superintendent of public instruction of Colorado; president National Education Association, Denver, Colo.
 Marion Churchill, dean of women, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.
 Ellen Spencer Mussey, honorary dean and founder of Washington College of Law; first dean of a law school; president Woman's Bar Association of District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. S. D. Weakley, president Girls' Training School, Birmingham, Ala.
 Mrs. T. G. Bush, treasurer Boys' Industrial School, Birmingham, Ala.
 Grace E. Berry, dean of women, Pomona College, Claremont, Cal.
 Irene S. Myers, dean of women, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.
 S. Antoinette Bigelow, dean of women, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
 Anne McKeen Shuler, dean of women, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.
 Jessie E. Arbuckle, superintendent of Blakeslee Training School, New Haven, Conn.
 Lucy Hale Tapley, president Spelman Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. John K. Ottley, chairman State Library Commission, Atlanta, Ga.
 (Miss) Martha Berry, founder Berry School, Mount Berry, Ga.
 Mrs. S. B. C. Morgan, president and founder of the State Association for the Education of Georgia Mountaineers, Savannah, Ga.
 (Miss) Ethel E. Redfield, State superintendent of public instruction, Boise, Idaho.
 Mary Ross Potter, dean of women, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 S. P. Breckenridge, dean of women, Chicago University; lawyer, Chicago, Ill.
 Grace A. Stayt, dean of women, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
 Laura T. Brayton, educator, Chicago, Ill.
 Katharine S. Alvord, dean of women, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
 Eliza A. Blaker, president The Teachers' College of Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Martha Doan, dean of women, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
 Ruby E. C. Mason, dean of women, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
 Anna M. Klingshagen, dean of women, professor of history, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Carrie Louise De Nise, dean of women, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.
 Emily Cunningham, adviser of women, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
 Mrs. Eustace H. Brown, adviser of women, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 Cora Wilson Stewart, president Kentucky Illiteracy Commission; superintendent midnight schools, Frankfort, Ky.
 Mrs. Evan S. Rees, educator, Louisville, Ky.
 May Stone, director Hindman Settlement School, Hindman, Ky.
 Florence Offutt Stout (Mrs. R. L.), physical director of Women, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
 Ruth Huntington, director Hindman Settlement School, Hindman, Ky.
 Katherine Pettit, founder Settlement School, Pine Mountain, Ky.
 Mary E. Sweeny, dean agriculture, Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.
 Sarah Frances Whiting, professor emeritus physics and astronomy, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
 Ellen F. Paudleton, president Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
 Mary E. Woolley, president Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
 Caroline S. Davies, dean of Jackson College, Tufts College, Somerville, Mass.
 Myra B. Jordan, dean of women, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Annie E. Shelland, chairman Patriotic Education, St. Paul, Minn.
 Maria L. Sandford, professor emeritus department of English, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Amy P. Morse, professor home economics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Elizabeth H. Foss, teacher plant industry, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Mary L. Benton, dean of women, Carleton College, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Eva Johnston, adviser of women, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Katherine Devereaux Blake, educator and writer, New York City.
 Annie F. Petty, librarian State Normal School, Greensboro, N. C.
 Laura H. Colt, teacher State Normal School, Greensboro, N. C.
 Mary M. Petty, teacher of State Normal School, Greensboro, N. C.
 Elizabeth Kelly, director of schools for illiterates, Raleigh, N. C.
 Mary Shannon Smith, department of history, Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C.
 Lillian Baker Griggs, librarian, Public Library, Durham, N. C.
 Ella L. Fulton, dean of women, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 Minnie J. Nielson, county superintendent of schools, Valley City, N. Dak.
 Mrs. M. C. Budlong, secretary and director North Dakota Library Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.
 Laura B. Sanderson, secretary and registrar, Wesley College, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 Grace P. Tracy (Mrs. Charles Alden), member of faculty of Kimball Union Academy, Meriden, N. H.
 Mrs. Kathryn McLean, associate dean, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
 Vivian B. Small, president Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio.
 Caroline M. Breyfogle, dean of women, Ohio State University; chairman of woman's committee, council of national defense of Franklin County, Columbus, Ohio.
 Elizabeth Hamilton, dean of women, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
 Helen M. Smith, dean of women, Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Florence M. Fitch, dean of women, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.
 Miss Louene Pattee, dean of women, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Elizabeth F. Fox, dean of women, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.
 M. Carey Thomas, president Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 Anna Garlin Spencer, professor sociology and ethics, Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pa.
 Lida Shaw King, dean of women's college, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Frances Lucas, principal Lincoln School for Girls, Providence, R. I.
 Ella G. Agnew, assistant director demonstration work for girls, Blacksburg, Va.
 Bessie Bacon Goodrich, principal Normal School, Johnson, Vt.
 Alberta L. Beeman, vice principal high school, vice president State teachers' association, St. Albans, Vt.
 Josephine Corliss Preston, superintendent public instruction, State of Washington, Olympia, Wash.
 Ethel Everett, county superintendent of schools, Bellingham, Wash.
 Rhoda M. White, dean of women, Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.

Mabel Graham, county superintendent of schools, Mount Vernon, Wash.
 Mrs. R. A. Small, ex county superintendent of schools, Everett, Wash.
 Susan Maxwell Moore, dean of women, University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Martha Brock, educator, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Anna P. Cooper, dean of women, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Carrie E. Morgan, superintendent of schools, Appleton, Wis.
 Edith K. O. Clark, State superintendent public instruction, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Agnes R. Wright, State librarian, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Martha Post, assistant State librarian, Cheyenne, Wyo.

AUTHORS, EDITORS, ARTISTS, PENWOMEN.

(Mrs.) Rosa Meyers Mumma, Alabama representative League of American Pen Women, Robertdale, Ala.
 Ella Polk Hubbert, Birmingham Ledger, Birmingham, Ala.
 Martha B. Keller, Journalist, Skagway, Alaska.
 (Mrs.) Bernie Babcock, Arkansas representative League of American Pen Women, Little Rock, Ark.
 Julia Ellen Rogers, author, Long Beach, Cal.
 (Miss) May E. Countryman, Connecticut representative League of American Pen Women, East Hadden, Conn.
 Annie A. Preston (Mrs. Charles F.), author, Willington, Conn.
 (Mrs.) C. V. S. Wilson, Florida representative League of American Pen Women, Sarasota, Fla.
 (Miss) Eugenia Estill, Georgia representative League of American Pen Women, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. Grace Tower Warren, Hawaiian representative League American Pen Women, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 Julia F. Deane, managing editor the Union Signal, Evanston, Ill.
 Gail Calmerton, Indiana representative League of American Pen Women, Fort Wayne, Ind.
 Gene Stratton Porter, author, Geneva, Ind.
 Emilie B. Stapp, Iowa representative League of American Pen Women, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Margaret Hill McCarter, author, Topeka, Kans.
 May Belleville Brown, author, Salina, Kans.
 Alice Hegan Rice, author, Louisville, Ky.
 Eleanor Talbot Kinkaid Short, author, historian, Lexington, Ky.
 Anna E. Raison, Kentucky representative League of American Pen Women, Newport, Ky.
 Emma Abbott Gage, editor, Maryland Representative League of American Pen Women, Annapolis, Md.
 Margaret Slattery, author, Boston, Mass.
 Katherine Lee Bates, writer; teacher, Wellesley, Mass.
 Cora Frances Stoddard, editor, Boston, Mass.
 Louise Manning Hodgins, author, Wellesley, Mass.
 Lillian Whiting, author, Boston, Mass.
 Alice Hering Christopher, Massachusetts representative League of American Pen Women, Boston, Mass.
 Mrs. H. C. Hotaling, Minnesota representative League of American Pen Women, Mapleton, Minn.
 (Mrs.) R. T. Hobbs, journalist, Brookhaven, Miss.
 (Mrs.) Ella T. Brooke, journalist, Meridian, Miss.
 Mrs. Lily Arnold Frost, editor, Vandalia, Mo.
 Grace Sorenson, editor, Nebraska representative League of American Pen Women, Omaha, Nebr.
 Annetta J. St. Gaudens, sculptor, Windsor, N. H.
 Marie F. Ryerson, New Jersey representative League of American Pen Women, East Orange, N. J.
 Carolyn Wells, author, Rahway, N. J.
 Florence Morse Kingsley (Mrs. Charles), author, Staten Island, N. Y.
 Adella B. Beard, artist; author; formerly secretary Girl Pioneers of America, Flushing, N. Y.
 Mary Mears, sculptor, New York City, N. Y.
 (Mrs.) Louise Seymour Houghton, editor, New York City, N. Y.
 Marietta Holley (Samantha Allen), author, Pierrepont Manor, N. Y.
 Martha Foote Crow, author, New York City, N. Y.
 (Mrs.) Cora Leonard, editor, Bartlesville, Okla.
 (Mrs.) Alice Blackburn, author; editor, Elk City, Okla.
 Jessie Willcox Smith, artist, Philadelphia, Pa.
 (Mrs.) Emma Shaw Colcleugh, editorial writer, Providence, R. I.
 Sarah J. Eddy, artist, Bristol Ferry, R. I.
 (Mrs.) Mary Ligon Miller, South Carolina League of American Pen Women, Trenton, S. C.
 (Miss) Kate Lilly Blue, writer; vice chairman Marion Red Cross, Marion, S. C.
 (Miss) Sarah Ruth Frazier, Tennessee representative League of American Pen Women; president General A. P. Stewart Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Theodora Peck, author, Burlington, Vt.
 Lura E. Brown Smith, author; journalist; Washington representative League of American Pen Women, Seattle, Wash.
 Zona Gale, author, Portage, Wis.
 Mary A. P. Stansbury, author, Appleton, Wis.
 Vivian A. B. Henderson (Mrs. Harry B.), Wyoming representative League of American Pen Women, Cheyenne, Wyo.

STATE OFFICERS' ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMITTEES.

[The signatures that follow represent the individual and not the organization.]

(Mrs.) J. Morgan Smith, president Colonial Dames of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.
 Ellen Peters Bryce, former president Colonial Dames, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 Maude McIver Roundtree (Mrs. J. A. R.), president Alabama Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Birmingham, Ala.
 (Mrs.) Annie K. Weissel, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Birmingham, Ala.
 (Mrs.) Cornelia Templeton Hatcher, president Alaska Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Juneau, Alaska.
 (Mrs.) Henry A. Morgan, president Arizona Federation Women's Clubs, Wilcox, Ariz.
 (Mrs.) George Day, president Arizona Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Phoenix, Ariz.
 (Mrs.) Imogen La Chance, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Phoenix, Ariz.
 Kate E. Dowdle Davis (Mrs. S. P.), State regent National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Little Rock, Ark.
 (Mrs.) Minnie U. Fuller, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Magazine, Ark.
 Mrs. Mary McHenry Keith, president California Equal Suffrage Association, Berkeley, Cal.

Mrs. John E. Scott, honorary president Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Pasadena, Cal.
 Miss Mina D. Edmonds, State deputy for California, Ladies of the Maccabees, Pomona, Cal.
 Bertha Lovejoy Cable (Mrs. Herbert A.), president California Federation of Women's Clubs; chairman California woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Mrs. R. H. Young, honorary vice president Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Long Beach, Cal.
 Mrs. Stella B. Irvine, president South California Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Riverside, Cal.
 Mrs. Sara J. Dorr, president North California Woman's Christian Temperance Union, San Jose, Cal.
 Mrs. W. H. Bagby, president Southern California Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Mary J. Hartley, president Northern California Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Berkeley, Cal.
 Grace C. Simons (Mrs. Seward A.), secretary California women's committee, Council of National Defense, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Nina M. Weiss, president Colorado Federation Women's Clubs, Del Norte, Cal.
 Mrs. Adrianna Hungerford, president Colorado Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Denver, Colo.
 Mrs. Mary L. Parks, president Colorado Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Denver, Colo.
 Carrie O. Kistler (Mrs. W. H.), State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Denver, Colo.
 Julia E. Killam, president Woman's Relief Corps, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Denver, Colo.
 C. Ruutz-Rees, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Greenwich, Conn.
 Ella L. Smiley, president Connecticut Federation of Woman's Clubs, Hartford, Conn.
 Elizabeth M. Spicer, department president, Woman's Relief Corps, New London, Conn.
 Mrs. Caroline B. Buell, president Connecticut Woman's Christian Temperance Union, East Hampton, Conn.
 Elizabeth Barney Buel (Mrs. John L.), State regent National Society Daughters American Revolution, Litchfield, Conn.
 Mary Canby Hofferker (Mrs. George R.), president Delaware Colonial Dames of America, Marshallton, Del.
 Ray Hedrick Powell (Mrs. W. A.), president Delaware Federation of Women's Clubs, Bridgeville, Del.
 Mrs. Lena S. Messick, president Delaware Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bridgeville, Del.
 Sophia C. Hall (Mrs. George C.), State regent Daughters American Revolution, Wilmington, Del.
 Mrs. John A. Logan, president District of Columbia Dames of Loyal Legion, Washington, D. C.
 Anna May Wood (Mrs. Court F.), president District of Columbia General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Emma Sanford Shelton, president District of Columbia Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Washington, D. C.
 Catherine E. Brumbaugh (Mrs. G. M.), District of Columbia regent National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Edgar Lewis, president Florida Federation of Women's Clubs, Fort Pierce, Fla.
 Mrs. W. S. Jennings, chairman conservation committee, Florida Federation Women's Clubs; State chairman woman's liberty loan committee, Jacksonville, Fla.
 Miss Minnie E. Neal, president Florida Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Jacksonville, Fla.
 Mrs. Frank Stranahan, president Florida Equal Suffrage Association, Lauderdale, Fla.
 Mrs. William Hocker, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Ocala, Fla.
 Mabel M. DeLyder, president Department of Florida, Woman's Relief Corps, Zephyrhills, Fla.
 Virginia St. C. Safford, president Florida Federation of Music Clubs, Miami, Fla.
 Ruth Stewart Leaken, chairman liberty loan committee, Savannah, Ga.
 Mrs. William Lawson Peel, National League for Women's Service, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. Hugh M. Willet, past president Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. Lindsey S. Arlington, president Georgia Equal Suffrage Party, Augusta, Ga.
 Emily C. McDougald, chairman Georgia War Work Council of Young Women's Christian Association, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. W. B. Higginbotham, president Woman's Missionary Society, North Georgia Conference, Methodist Church South, West Point, Ga.
 Mrs. Lella A. Dillard, president Georgia Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Oxford, Ga.
 Mrs. W. J. Neel, president Woman's Baptist Union of Georgia, Cartersville, Ga.
 Mrs. A. McD. Wilson, honorary president Young Woman's Christian Association, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. P. W. Godfrey, former State regent Daughters American Revolution, Covington, Ga.
 (Mrs.) Mary Latimer McLendon, president Georgia Woman's Suffrage Association, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. James Jackson, former president and life director of Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, Atlanta, Ga.
 (Mrs.) Nanna Crozier Wood, president Georgia Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Winder, Ga.
 Mrs. Herbert Mitchell Franklin, president Georgia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Tennille, Ga.
 Mrs. A. W. Van Hoose, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense; chairman Civil Service Reform, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, Rome, Ga.
 Mrs. Albert P. Wood, president Georgia Woman's Relief Corps, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. John K. McIver, president Georgia Woman's Auxiliary to Board of Missions, Methodist Episcopal Church, Savannah, Ga.
 Jennie A. Spain (Mrs. A. H.), vice chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. Archibald Davis, president Georgia Synodical Auxiliary; president Atlanta Young Woman's Christian Association; treasurer Ellen Wilson Memorial, Atlanta, Ga.

Emily R. Brown (Mrs. B. F.), president Georgia branch, the King's Daughters and Sons, Augusta, Ga.

Mrs. Jefferson Davis, chairman public health, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, Toccoa, Ga.

Mrs. Lula Wisdom, worthy grand matron, Order Eastern Star of Georgia, Shipley, Ga.

Mary Atherton Richards, president Woman's Board of Missions for the Pacific Islands, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mrs. Mary S. Whitney, president Hawaii Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mary E. Alexander (Mrs. A. C.), chairman woman's committee, Territorial Food Commission; chairman Food Administration Committee, woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Kate W. Forbes (Mrs. W. J.), president Honolulu College Club Branch Association Collegiate Alumnae, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mrs. J. K. Dickie, State president Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers' Association, Boise, Idaho.

Alice Jean Sweeley (Mrs. M. J.), president Idaho Federation Women's Clubs, Boise, Idaho.

Mrs. Charles W. Pursell, State regent National Society Daughters American Revolution, Boise, Idaho.

Mrs. Mabel I. McCrear, president North Idaho Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sandpoint, Idaho.

Mrs. Annetta R. Chipp, president South Idaho Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Boise, Idaho.

Gertrude L. Hays (Mrs. S. H.), State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Boise, Idaho.

Anna S. Kirby, State commander Ladies of the Maccabees, Decatur, Ill.

Jessie I. Spofford, president Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, Rockford, Ill.

Anne M. Bahusen (Mrs. Frank W.), State regent National Society Daughters American Revolution, Rock Island, Ill.

Nina M. Williamson, president Woman's Presbyterian Board of Missions of the Northwest, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Virginia C. McClure, former national president Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Peoria, Ill.

Mrs. Helen L. Hood, president Illinois Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Chicago, Ill.

Catherine Waugh McCulloch, lawyer; president Suffrage Amendment Alliance; first woman in United States appointed master in chancery, Chicago, Ill.

Louise de Koven Bowen, president Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago; chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. E. M. Henderson, president Indiana Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, Lebanon, Ind.

Mrs. Henry A. Beck, State regent Daughters American Revolution, Indianapolis, Ind.

Anna Dunn Noland, president Indiana Equal Suffrage Association, Logansport, Ind.

Marie Stuart Edwards (Mrs. Richard E.), president Woman's Franchise League of Indiana, Peru, Ind.

Mrs. Felix T. McWhirter, president Legislative Council of Indiana Women, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mrs. Culla Vayhinger, president Indiana Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Upland, Ind.

Mrs. Francis E. Whitley, president Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs; State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Webster City, Iowa.

Anna B. Lawther, president Iowa Equal Suffrage Association, Dubuque, Iowa.

Lura E. Borger, department president Iowa Woman's Relief Corps, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mrs. Dixie Cornell Gebhardt, State regent National Society Daughters American Revolution, Knoxville, Iowa.

Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, president Iowa Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mrs. H. O. Garvey, president Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, Topeka, Kans.

Jane M. Brooks, president Kansas Equal Suffrage Association, Wichita, Kans.

Mrs. J. F. Boeye, president Topeka Branch, Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, Topeka, Kans.

Virginia McAfee Nellis (Mrs. De Witte C.), president Native Daughters of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.

Mrs. D. W. Mulvane, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Topeka, Kans.

Mrs. S. L. Wilson, vice president Kansas Christian Women's Board of Missions, Topeka, Kans.

Mrs. Robert W. Ramsey, president West Central District Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Atchison, Kans.

Linna Bressette, member Board State Welfare Committee, Topeka, Kans.

Mrs. Lillian M. Mitchner, president Kansas Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Beloit, Kans.

Mrs. J. M. Miller, chairman Kansas State Board of Review of Motion Pictures, Kansas City, Kans.

Mrs. H. J. Hills, vice president Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs, Paducah, Ky.

Allie R. Alderson, chairman Eleventh District Equal Rights Association, Middleboro, Ky.

Madeline McDowell Breckenridge (Mrs. Desha), lecturer; former president Kentucky Equal Rights Association, Lexington, Ky.

Nellie A. Cammack (Mrs. J. W.), war-relief chairman American Red Cross; first vice chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Owenton, Ky.

Mrs. John Gay, president Kentucky Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Versailles, Ky.

Mrs. Frances E. Beauchamp, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Lexington, Ky.

Mrs. Frank P. Lowry, chairman art department, Federation of Women's Clubs, Paris, Ky.

Cora Wilson Stewart, president Kentucky Illiteracy Commission; superintendent midnight schools, Frankfort, Ky.

Mrs. Anna Stebbins, president Kentucky Woman's Relief Corps, Covington, Ky.

Elise B. Smith (Mrs. Thomas Jefferson), former recording secretary National American Woman Suffrage Association, Louisville, Ky.

Mrs. Luther C. Willis, State chairman legislative department, Federation Women's Clubs, Shelbyville, Ky.

Mrs. Adelaide A. Whiteside, campaign chairman Kentucky State Suffrage Association, Louisville, Ky.

Miss Belle H. Bennett, president Woman's Missionary Council, Methodist Church, Richmond, Ky.

Christine Bradley South, president Kentucky Equal Rights Association, Frankfort, Ky.

Mrs. H. L. Cockerhan, State president Methodist Missionary Society, Wilmore, Ky.

Mary McDowell Lowndes (Mrs. Richard Lasker, jr.), president Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs; vice chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Danville, Ky.

Minnie Parker Durham, corresponding secretary Federation of Women's Clubs, Kentucky.

Martina Grubbs Riker (Mrs. Lafon), general federation secretary, Kentucky Women's Clubs, Harrodsburg, Ky.

Mrs. Helen Bender, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Louisville, Ky.

Caroline Apperson Leech (Mrs. James A.), State director Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs, Louisville, Ky.

Kate L. Burns (Mrs. Henry D.), president Louisiana Colonial Dames, New Orleans, La.

Jean M. Gordon, president Louisiana Equal Suffrage Association, New Orleans, La.

Mrs. Alice C. McKinney, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ruston, La.

Mrs. Brown Funk, State president Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Jennings, La.

Tannie A. D. Chapman (Mrs. Wilford Gore), State regent Daughters of the American Revolution, Portland, Me.

Mrs. H. B. Pulsifer, president Maine Division, International Sunshine Society, Auburn, Me.

Mabel Conner, president Maine Woman's Suffrage Association, Augusta, Me.

Maud C. Kendall (Mrs. N. W.), department president Woman's Relief Corps, Biddeford, Me.

Sarah Rideout Abbott (Mrs. Frederick P.), State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Saco, Me.

Mrs. Grace A. Wing, former president Maine Federation of Women's Clubs; member State Board of Charities and Corrections, Auburn, Me.

Mrs. Althea G. Quimby, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, North Turner, Me.

Madeleine M. Ellicott (Mrs. C. E.), president Equal Suffrage League; president Playground Association, Melvale, Md.

Mrs. Mary R. Haslup, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Charles H. Daniels, president Woman's Board of Missions, Congregational Church, Boston, Mass.

Alice Stone Blackwell, president Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association; editor, *Dorchester, Mass.*

Mrs. R. W. Robinson, president New England Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Worcester, Mass.

S. Anna Starkweather, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Pittsfield, Mass.

Mrs. J. Harry Poole, corresponding secretary Massachusetts Federation of Women's Clubs, Brockton, Mass.

Mattie C. Crawford, president New England District Woman's American Foreign Missionary Society, Watertown, Mass.

Annie C. Ellison (Mrs. F. D.), State regent National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Belmont, Mass.

Alice B. Cook (Mrs. Frank Gaylord), vice president Woman's Board of Missions, Cambridge, Mass.

Mrs. Katharine Lent Stevenson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. William Henry Walt, State regent Daughters of the American Revolution, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Florence I. Bulson, president Michigan Federation of Women's Clubs, Jackson, Mich.

Caroline Bartlett Crane, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Kalamazoo, Mich.

Edith C. Munger, president Michigan Anubodon Society, Hart, Mich.

Mrs. Frederick T. Ramsey, president Michigan Colonial Dames, Detroit, Mich.

Maude Holmes, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Eaton Rapids, Mich.

Nellie Sawyer Clark (Mrs. O. H.), president Michigan Suffrage Association, Kalamazoo, Mich.

Mrs. Harriet C. Jennings, president Michigan Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. E. L. Calkins, State president Women's Christian Temperance Union, Ypsilanti, Mich.

Mrs. Frank B. Morgan, president Minnesota Dames of Loyal Legion, Minneapolis, Minn.

Aleinda Auten Pine, president Minnesota Medical Woman's Association, St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. Andreas Euland, president Minnesota Suffrage Association, Minneapolis, Minn.

Alice Ames Winter, chairman woman's committee Minnesota Commission of Public Safety, Minneapolis, Minn.

Miss Rozette Hendrix, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Minneapolis, Minn.

Mrs. W. U. Smith, president Minnesota Christian Woman's Board of Missions, St. Paul, Minn.

Lavinia C. Gilliland (Mrs. J. B.), official representative Minnesota Council of National Defense, Minneapolis, Minn.

Agnes L. Peterson, superintendent bureau of women and children, Minnesota Department of Labor and Industries, St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. H. P. Hughes, president Mississippi Mothers' Congress and Parent-Teacher Association; chairman child-welfare department, woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Mississippi.

Mrs. J. Turner Saunders, president Mississippi Federation of Women's Clubs, Swan Lake, Miss.

Emily Hyer Price (Mrs. J. H.), former State president United Daughters of the Confederacy, Magnolia, Miss.

Marjorie C. McGehee (Mrs. Edward), president Mississippi Suffrage Association; director general Federation of Women's Clubs; State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Como, Miss.

Mrs. S. E. Stanley, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Starkville, Miss.

Mrs. C. H. Alexander, chairman legislative committee, Federation of Women's Organizations, Jackson, Miss.

Catherine I. Bush (Mrs. B. F.), St. Louis, Mo.

Helen Guthrie Miller (Mrs. Walter McNab), president Missouri Equal Suffrage Association, Columbia, Mo.

Mrs. Ardella Dockery Still (Mrs. George), president Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs, Kirksville, Mo.

Alice Mae Armstrong, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Kansas City, Mo.
 Mrs. Nelle G. Burger, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Clark, Mo.
 Mrs. Emily Newell Blair, vice president Missouri Equal Suffrage Association, Carthage, Mo.
 Katharyn Perham (Mrs. W. T.), president Montana Federation of Women's Clubs, Glendive, Mont.
 Eleanor S. Coit, chairman Montana Good Government Central Committee, Big Timber, Mont.
 Mrs. Tylar B. Thompson, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Missoula, Mont.
 Emma M. Blackburn (Mrs. C. A.), State regent Daughters American Revolution, Butte, Mont.
 Mrs. M. W. Alderson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bozeman, Mont.
 Harriet P. W. Smith (Mrs. Arthur C.), president Nebraska Colonial Dames, Omaha, Nebr.
 Mrs. J. N. Paul, president Nebraska Federation of Women's Clubs, St. Paul, Nebr.
 Cora E. Henry, general secretary Nebraska Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Sarah D. Reuling, president Nebraska Grand Chapter, P. E. O. Sisterhood, Weymore, Nebr.
 Mrs. S. I. Hanford, president Nebraska Congregational Woman's Missionary Society, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Mrs. R. J. McKenzie, State president Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Carroll, Nebr.
 Mrs. L. D. Springer, president State Baptist Woman's Work, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Mrs. James B. Butter, president Nebraska Synodical Society, Florence, Nebr.
 Jennie M. Rodgers, president Department Woman's Relief Corps, Gibbon, Nebr.
 Mrs. Iona Naylor, president Rebecca State Assembly, Chadron, Nebr.
 Mrs. Mamie M. Claffin, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, University Place, Nebr.
 Mayme Hedrick Cleaver, grand chief of honor, Degree of Honor; national treasurer Degree of Honor, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Nora B. Kidder, State president Royal Neighbors, Fremont, Nebr.
 Louise Spencer Ellis (Mrs. Pearson Buckner), president Nevada Federation of Women's Clubs, Carson City, Nev.
 Mrs. Charles Silvey Sprague, State regent Daughters American Revolution, Goldfield, Nev.
 Mrs. Nora R. Linville, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sparks, Nev.
 Frances P. Dudley (Mrs. A. T.), president Anti-Suffrage Association, Exeter, N. H.
 Nancy V. Curtice, K. N., State president Graduate Nurses' Association, Concord, N. H.
 Mrs. Nettie M. C. White, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Raymond, N. H.
 Jennie Mahel DeMerritt, former president New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, Dover, N. H.
 Mary L. Wood, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Portsmouth, N. H.
 Susan C. Bancroft (Mrs. C. P.), woman's committee, Council of National Defense; former president New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, Concord, N. H.
 Lillian Carpenter Streeter (Mrs. Frank S.), member Board of State Charities, Concord, N. H.
 Mary N. Chase, secretary New Hampshire Peace Society, Andover, N. H.
 Nellie F. Woodward, former president New Hampshire Federation of Women's Clubs, Nashua, N. H.
 Mrs. A. Lizzie Sargent, department president Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Concord, N. H.
 Martha S. Kimball, president New Hampshire Equal Suffrage Association, Portsmouth, N. H.
 Mary M. Sibley, chairman Forestry Department, Federation of Women's Clubs, Newport, N. H.
 Mrs. Ellen R. Richardson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Concord, N. H.
 Lillian F. Fieckert (Mrs. E. F.), president New Jersey Woman Suffrage Association, Dunellen, N. J.
 Emma L. Van Winkle (Mrs. Daniel), chairman civics department, New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs, Jersey City, N. J.
 Mae Thompson Simister (Mrs. James), chairman industrial and social conditions, New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs, Upper Montclair, N. J.
 Elizabeth Nicklaus, State chairman Home Makers' Association; chairman Speakers' Bureau, Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Llewellyn Park, N. J.
 Mrs. Beatrice Stern, chairman legislative department, New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs, Matawan, N. J.
 Sarah S. Paddock (Mrs. J. R.), president New Jersey Council for Patriotic Service, East Orange, N. J.
 Mary E. Libbey (Mrs. William), president New Jersey Colonial Dames of America, Princeton, N. J.
 Mrs. Harold S. Buttenheim, State chairman Department Child Welfare, Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Madison, N. J.
 Mrs. Henry H. Dawson, former president Federation of Women's Clubs, Newark, N. J.
 Mrs. Robert H. Dodd, former president Mothers' Congress, Montclair, N. J.
 Caroline C. Crease, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Jersey City, N. J.
 Agnes A. Schermerhorn (Mrs. J. R.), president New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs, East Orange, N. J.
 Lillian J. Stockton (Mrs. C. W.), State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Ridgewood, N. J.
 T. B. Downs (Mrs. William), president Parent-Teacher Association, Orange, N. J.
 Miss Esther H. Elfleth, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, East Vaughn, N. Mex.
 Miss Harriet Henderson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, East Vaughn, N. Mex.
 Mrs. S. M. Ashenfelter, State regent Daughters of American Revolution, Silver City, N. Mex.
 Katherine G. Hildreth (Mrs. Albert H.), former president New York Federation of Women's Clubs, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Mrs. William F. Gurley, president Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Troy, N. Y.

Mrs. Ella A. Boole, vice president National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Anna C. Brown (Mrs. William Grant), State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, New York City, N. Y.
 Miss Alice M. Davison, president Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, New York City, N. Y.
 Mrs. Wesley M. Jones, president Woman's Missionary Union, Raleigh, N. C.
 Laura Holmes Reiley (Mrs. Eugene), State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Charlotte, N. C.
 Bertha Orndorff (Mrs. A. C.), State president North Carolina Department National Federation of Music Clubs, Charlotte, N. C.
 Mrs. W. B. Ramsey, president North Carolina Synodical Auxiliary, Hickory, N. C.
 Mrs. John S. Cunningham, president North Carolina Equal Suffrage Association, Durham, N. C.
 Margaret C. D. Burgoyn, president North Carolina Branch International Order of King's Daughters and Sons, Raleigh, N. C.
 Jackie Daniel Thrash, president North Carolina United Daughters of Confederacy, Tarboro, N. C.
 Mrs. Adelaide Goodno, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Raleigh, N. C.
 Mrs. Lucy H. Robinson, president Woman's Missionary Society, Methodist Western Conference, Greensboro, N. C.
 Mrs. H. G. Vick, president North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, Cavalier, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Grace Clendenning, president Votes for Women League, Wimbledon, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Elizabeth Preston Anderson, recording secretary National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Maria Pattee, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Devils Lake, N. Dak.
 Mrs. F. A. Cramer, president Ohio Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Eva Gould Harris (Mrs. Edward L.), State regent Daughters of American Revolution, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Mary T. Beaver (Mrs. F. P.), president Central District Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Dayton, Ohio.
 Mrs. George Zimmerman, State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Fremont, Ohio.
 Harriet Taylor Upton, president Ohio Woman Suffrage Association, Warren, Ohio.
 Mrs. Florence D. Richard, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Columbus, Ohio.
 Mrs. Mary J. Watson, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Dayton, Ohio.
 Mrs. Eugene B. Lawson, State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Nowata, Okla.
 Mrs. Walter De Witt Elrod, State regent Daughters of American Revolution, Okmulgee, Okla.
 Frances F. Threadgill (Mrs. John), past president Oklahoma Federation of Women's Clubs, Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Mrs. Abbie B. Hillerman, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sapulpa, Okla.
 Mrs. Charles H. Castner, president Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs; State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Hood River, Ore.
 Mrs. James A. Bennett, president Oregon Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Silverton, Ore.
 Mrs. Jennie M. Kemp, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Portland, Ore.
 Lucy Kennedy Miller (Mrs. John O.), president Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Mrs. Ella M. George, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Beaver Falls, Pa.
 Mary R. Teitworth, deputy grand commander Ladies of the Macabees, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook, State regent Daughters of American Revolution, Cooksburg, Pa.
 Mrs. William Loeb, president Rhode Island Council of Jewish Women, Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. Sarah M. Algeo, chairman Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Party; chairman State Americanization Committee, National American Woman Suffrage Association, Providence, R. I.
 Bertha A. Bissell (Mrs. Horace G.), president Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, East Greenwich, R. I.
 Elizabeth H. Sturges (Mrs. Rush), State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Providence, R. I.
 Gertrude S. Hasbrouck (Mrs. Ira D.), former president Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, R. I.
 Lulu Fowler (Mrs. George H.), former president Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs; member Rhode Island Food Conservation Committee; president Young Woman's Christian Association, Pawtucket, R. I.
 Hattie M. Thurber, department president Rhode Island Woman's Relief Corps, Pawtucket, R. I.
 Miss Elizabeth Upham Yates, former president Rhode Island Suffrage Association, Providence, R. I.
 Sophie L. Lustig (Mrs. Alfred L.), former president Rhode Island Housewives' League, Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. Jennie L. W. Rooke, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, East Providence, R. I.
 Annie Howes Barus (Mrs. Carl), State chairman Child Labor Committee, Providence, R. I.
 Alice W. Hunt, president Rhode Island Consumers' League, Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. F. L. Mayes, State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Greenville, S. C.
 R. Cora Brunson, president South Carolina Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Holly Hill, S. C.
 Mrs. J. L. Coker, Jr., president South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, Hartsville, S. C.
 Mrs. Joseph Sprott, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Manning, S. C.
 Mrs. Zillah E. Wilson, State director South Dakota and member Executive Board of General Federation of Women's Clubs, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 Mrs. A. N. Aldrich, president South Dakota Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 Helen S. Peabody, State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mrs. Anna R. Simmons, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Faulkton, S. Dak.
 Lizzie Dickey Laughlin, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Pierre, S. Dak.
 Gertrude B. Gunderson, president South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, Vermillion, S. Dak.
 Anne Dallas Dudley (Mrs. Gilford), president Tennessee Equal Suffrage Association, Nashville, Tenn.
 Laura Lee Sharp Polk (Mrs. Thomas), State regent Daughters of American Revolution, Jackson, Tenn.
 Mrs. N. L. Carney, president Tennessee Christian Woman's Board of Missions, Clarksville, Tenn.
 Mrs. Mary Phillips Bang, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Nashville, Tenn.
 Minnie Fisher Cunningham, president Texas Equal Suffrage Association, Galveston, Tex.
 Mrs. W. W. Woodson, president Texas Women Bankers' Association, Waco, Tex.
 Mrs. Elizabeth H. Potter, third vice president Texas Equal Suffrage Association, Tyler, Tex.
 Mrs. M. Eleanor Brackenridge, honorary president Texas Equal Suffrage Association, San Antonio, Tex.
 Mrs. E. A. Watters, president Texas Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association, Fort Worth, Tex.
 Estelle B. Sharp (Mrs. W. B.), State chairman National League for Woman's Service, Houston, Tex.
 Mrs. Rebecca J. Fisher, president Texas Daughters of the Republic, Austin, Tex.
 Mrs. Laura B. Hart, past most worthy grand matron Order Eastern Star, San Antonio, Tex.
 Mrs. James Lowry Smith, State regent Daughters American Revolution, Amarillo, Tex.
 Mrs. Edward B. Frysinger, president Texas Branch International King's Daughters and Sons, Cleburne, Tex.
 Mrs. Nannie Webb Curtis, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Waco, Tex.
 Mrs. Edward Bichsel, president Utah Federation of Women's Clubs, Ogden, Utah.
 Mrs. W. W. Williams, State chairman Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Mrs. C. A. Walker, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 Nannie V. Owen, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Ogden, Utah.
 Helen Norris Cummings, general federation State secretary Virginia Women's Clubs, Alexandria, Va.
 Lila Meade Valentine (Mrs. B. B.), president Virginia Suffrage Association, Richmond, Va.
 Mrs. S. W. Jamison, former State regent Daughters American Revolution, Norfolk, Va.
 Sara H. Hoge (Mrs. Howard M.), assistant recording secretary, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Lincoln, Va.
 Martha T. Buckham, president Vermont Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, Burlington, Vt.
 Mrs. John A. Mead, president Vermont Colonial Dames of America, Rutland, Vt.
 Isabel Reynolds Marsh, State regent Daughters American Revolution, Brandon, Vt.
 Mrs. J. E. Weeks, State chairman woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Middlebury, Vt.
 Mary B. Coan, vice president Vermont Parent-Teacher Association, Rutland, Vt.
 Mrs. Henry A. Harman, president Vermont Branch National Congress of Mothers, Rutland, Vt.
 Mrs. Minnie L. Pearson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Orleans, Vt.
 Mrs. Martha A. Stoddard, grand matron Vermont Chapter, Order Eastern Star, Charlotte, Vt.
 Nellie C. Crowley, Department Vermont Woman's Relief Corps, Rutland, Vt.
 Mary D. Hickman Price, president Washington Colonial Dames of America, Seattle, Wash.
 Mrs. Solon Shedd, former State president Federation of Women's Clubs, Pullman, Wash.
 Mrs. Lottie P. Shotwell, president West Washington Woman's Missionary Society, Christian Church, Seattle, Wash.
 Mrs. N. L. McCready, president Washington State Federation of Women's Clubs, Olympia, Wash.
 Ruth Karr McKee, former State president Federation of Women's Clubs, Hoquiam, Wash.
 Mrs. Carrie M. Barr, State president East Washington Woman's Christian Temperance Union, North Yakima, Wash.
 Mrs. Harriet B. Dunlap, State president West Washington Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Seattle, Wash.
 Mary Isabel McRae, State commander Ladies' Maccabees, Olympia, Wash.
 Mrs. Kate Carlin, department president Woman's Relief Corps, Spokane, Wash.
 Mary M. De Bolt (Mrs. George), State president Federation of Women's Clubs, Fairmont, W. Va.
 Julia W. Ruhl, president West Virginia Equal Suffrage Association, Clarksburg, W. Va.
 Lenna Lowe Yost (Mrs. Ellis A.), State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Morgantown, W. Va.
 Mrs. Kittie E. Moore, State supervising deputy Ladies of the Maccabees, West Virginia.
 Mrs. D. O. Kinsman, former State president Federation Women's Clubs, Appleton, Wis.
 Mrs. J. C. Thurman, president Wisconsin Woman's Board of Missions, Green Bay, Wis.
 Lellie B. Harvey (Mrs. L. D.), State president Federation Women's Clubs, Menominee, Wis.
 Mrs. John Faville, president Wisconsin Woman's Home Missionary Union Congregational Church, Appleton, Wis.
 Mrs. John Hume, State regent Daughters American Revolution, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Mrs. W. A. Lawson, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Mrs. R. A. Morton, president Wyoming Federation Women's Clubs, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Mrs. Edward Gillette, president Wyoming Colonial Dames of America, Sheridan, Wyo.

Mrs. Anna Allison, State president Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Miss Winifred D. Stuart, deputy commissioner public lands for Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Cornelia B. Mills, secretary State Board of Charities and Reform, Cheyenne, Wyo.
 Mrs. L. B. Bush, State factory inspector, Montgomery, Ala.
 Mrs. Thomas W. Palmer, wife of president Alabama School for Girls, Montevallo, Ala.
 Miss Ethel Moore, vice president southern Pacific section, Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Oakland, Cal.
 Mrs. Alice Stebbins Wells, president International Association Policewomen, first policewoman, Los Angeles Cal.
 Helen Wooster Peckham, Berkeley, Cal.
 Mrs. William H. Crocker, San Francisco, Cal.
 Mrs. Annie E. K. Bidwell, philanthropist, Chico, Cal.
 Mrs. Luther Burbank, Santa Rosa, Cal.
 Margaret G. Hyatt (Mrs. Edward), deputy superintendent public instruction, Sacramento, Cal.
 Dr. Mary Elizabeth Bates, second vice president Medical Women's National Association; president Humane Education Society; Denver, Colo.
 Mrs. Daisy Harrison Snyder, wife of president Fort Lewis School of Agriculture, Hesperus, Colo.
 Clara B. Kelley (Mrs. J. H.), wife of president State Normal School, Gunnison, Colo.
 Carrie Richards Lory (Mrs. Charles A.), wife of president State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
 Clara Ruth Mozzor, assistant attorney general, Denver, Colo.
 Mrs. Fannie Shattuck Howe, wife of dean Denver University, Denver, Colo.
 Mrs. J. G. Crabbe, wife of president State Teachers' College, Greeley, Colo.
 Mrs. R. C. Newton, Woodbridge, Conn.
 Mrs. A. N. Farnham, Westville, Conn.
 Katharine Houghton Hepburn, member national executive committee Woman's Party, Hartford, Conn.
 Mary H. Saulsbury, sister of late United States Senator, Wilmington, Del.
 Elizabeth Everett du Pont (Mrs. Victor), Guyencourt, Del.
 Florence Bayard Hilles (Mrs. W. S.), member national executive committee Woman's Party, Wilmington, Del.
 Josephine du Pont (Mrs. Victor du Pont, sr.), Wilmington, Del.
 Lucy Madeira Wing (Mrs. David L.), vice president southern Atlantic section, Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Cato Sells, wife of United States Commissioner Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Phillander P. Claxton, wife of United States Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Mrs. Kirk Munroe, club woman, Miami, Fla.
 Eloise M. Hulley, wife of president Stetson University, De Land, Fla.
 Flora B. Brown, traveling teacher, Orlando, Fla.
 Mrs. James L. Dickey, Jr., president Catholic Altar Society, Atlanta, Ga.
 Mrs. W. L. Pickard, wife of president Mercer University, Macon, Ga.
 Bernice Sheffield Covington (Mrs. W. A.), Moultrie, Ga.
 Mrs. Lillian Kemp Malone (Mrs. J. W.), wife of president Andrew College, Cuthbert, Ga.
 Mrs. Sam P. Jones, wife of evangelist, Cartersville, Ga.
 Mrs. L. G. Hardman, Commerce, Ga.
 Mrs. Seaborn Wright, Rome, Ga.
 Mary Harris Armor, Macon, Ga.
 Mrs. H. R. Slack, Lagrange, Ga.
 Mrs. W. R. Stubbs, Savannah, Ga.
 Mrs. Marvin McT. Parks, wife of president Georgia Normal and Industrial College, Milledgeville, Ga.
 Mrs. Jere M. Pound, wife of president State Normal School, Athens, Ga.
 Mrs. C. R. Jenkins, wife of president Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga.
 Mrs. W. L. Hopper, Honolulu, Hawaii.
 Mrs. C. E. Rose, Boise, Idaho.
 Ethel W. Cunningham (Mrs. R. D.), president Evanston Political Equality League, Evanston, Ill.
 Jane Addams, founder and head of Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
 Frances Pride Parks, corresponding secretary National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evanston, Ill.
 Margaret C. Munns, treasurer National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evanston, Ill.
 Margaret Robins (Mrs. Raymond), president National Trade Woman's League, Chicago, Ill.
 Grace Abbott, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
 Cella Parker Woolley, lecturer, Chicago, Ill.
 Katharine Punccheon Pomeroy, treasurer National Association Collegiate Alumnae, Chicago, Ill.
 Elizabeth A. Sweets, general secretary Young Woman's Christian Association, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Adelaide G. Mason (Mrs. W. N.), wife of former president Baker University, Topeka, Kans.
 Mrs. G. A. Supple, president Good Government Club, Topeka, Kans.
 Mrs. O. L. Moore, president The Woman's Club, Topeka, Kans.
 Mrs. D. Lee Curry, Harrodsburg, Ky.
 Mrs. V. O. Gilbert, wife of State superintendent of education, Frankfort, Ky.
 Mrs. A. J. G. Wells, Lexington, Ky.
 Mrs. W. A. Frost, wife of president Berea College, Wingo, Ky.
 Mrs. Sarah E. Morse, Pineville, Ky.
 Mrs. Henry L. Stone, Louisville, Ky.
 Mrs. Charles A. Hardin, wife of Commonwealth attorney, Harrodsburg, Ky.
 Julia Washburn, M. D., Lexington, Ky.
 Mrs. Edwin P. Morrow, Somerset, Ky.
 Mrs. H. V. McChesney, Frankfort, Ky.
 Rebecca Gordon Averell, president Philanthropy Club, Frankfort, Ky.
 Mrs. J. E. Grubbs, Winchester, Ky.
 Mrs. S. M. Hubbard, Hickman, Ky.
 Mrs. W. W. Tinsley, Barbourville, Ky.
 Mrs. James M. Benton, Winchester, Ky.
 Alice Lloyd, chairman Food Conservation Campaign, Maysville, Ky.
 Mrs. Frank L. McVey, wife of president State university, Lexington, Ky.
 Alice Lewis (Mrs. William), London, Ky.
 Mrs. J. H. Gilliam, wife of Commonwealth attorney, Scottsville, Ky.
 Mrs. Mary B. R. Day, Frankfort, Ky.

- Kate M. Gordon, New Orleans, La.
 Fannie R. Gordon, New Orleans, La.
 Mrs. J. E. Kenny, Ruston, La.
 Mrs. A. F. Storm, Morgan City, La.
 Mrs. A. M. Mayo, Lake Charles, La.
 Helen Frye White (Mrs. W. H.), daughter of late United States Senator, Lewiston, Me.
 Eunice H. Frye (Mrs. George C.), club woman, Portland, Me.
 Julia D. Dow (Mrs. Frederick Neal), Portland, Me.
 Harriette Gray (Mrs. Carl R.), Roland Park, Md.
 Mrs. Wilfred T. Grenfell, wife of medical missionary to Labrador, Boston, Mass.
 Miss Ellen M. Stone, missionary to European Turkey, Chelsea, Mass.
 Laura A. C. Hughes, former national president Spanish-American War Nurses; medical inspector, department of health, Boston, Mass.
 Mary Almira Smith, M. D., chairman committee, Women's Army Hospitals in Home Zone of Medical Women's National Association, Boston, Mass.
 Emma B. Culbertson, M. D., Boston, Mass.
 Adeline A. Davidson (Mrs. F. F.), vice president Review Club, Auburn-dale, Mass.
 Gertrude Halladay Leonard, lecturer, Brookline, Mass.
 Mrs. Austin C. Wellington, president Daughters of the American Revolution, Cambridge, Mass.
 Mrs. Emory F. Chaffee, vice president Harvard Woman's Club, Belmont, Mass.
 Ida Marion Chase Baker (Mrs. George Minot), president Fathers and Mothers' Club, Concord, Mass.
 Maud Wood Park, lecturer; congressional chairman National American Woman Suffrage Association, Boston, Mass.
 Lucia Ames Mead, lecturer, Brookline, Mass.
 Rev. Ada C. Bowles, Gloucester, Mass.
 Mary Hutcheson Page, president Equal Suffrage Association, Boston, Mass.
 Mrs. Kenyon L. Butterfield, wife of president Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
 Elizabeth L. Clark (Mrs. S. F.), vice president North Atlantic Section Association Collegiate Alumnae, Williamstown, Mass.
 Mary Thompson Stevens, M. D., Detroit, Mich.
 Mrs. Truman H. Newberry, president Needlework Guild of America, Detroit, Mich.
 Mrs. Samuel Dickie, wife of president Albion College, Albion, Mich.
 Mary C. Leet (Mrs. Thomas), president Central District Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Detroit, Mich.
 Mrs. H. J. Van Zalingen, child-welfare work, Muskegon, Mich.
 Cora E. Ketcham (Mrs. John) wife of master State Grange, Hastings, Mich.
 Mrs. Huntley Russell, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Margaret U. Ferguson (Mrs. C. M.), club woman, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Emily H. Noyes, president St. Paul Young Women's Christian Association, St. Paul, Minn.
 Grace Swift Strong (Mrs. A. W.), chairman Minneapolis Division, Public Safety Commission, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Mabel W. Sprong (Mrs. C. E.), Duluth, Minn.
 Mrs. George H. Patridge, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Edith G. Mayo (Mrs. C. H.), wife of surgeon, Rochester, Minn.
 Mrs. J. L. Washburn, club woman, Duluth, Minn.
 Mrs. N. H. Winchell, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Mrs. W. H. Smith, wife of president Agricultural and Mechanical College, Mississippi.
 Mrs. W. H. Frazer, wife of president Belhaven College, Jackson, Miss.
 Daisy McLaurin Stevens, member Naval Commission on Training Activities, Hattiesburg, Miss.
 Stella C. Stimson (Mrs. S. C.), club woman, Terre Haute, Ind.
 Mrs. Philip N. Moore, president National Council of Women, St. Louis, Mo.
 Mary H. McLean, M. D., third vice president Medical Woman's National Association, St. Louis, Mo.
 Mrs. W. H. Bisland, president Woman's Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions of the Southwest, St. Louis, Mo.
 Mrs. G. V. R. Mechin, president Woman's Council of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.
 Maria M. Dean, M. D., vice president North Rocky Mountain Section Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Alma, Mont.
 Mrs. C. F. Zoller, Roundup, Mont.
 Mrs. Carrie E. Armstrong, Culbertson, Mont.
 Mrs. J. A. Morrow, Ryegate, Mont.
 Mrs. Mary J. Wilkinson, Antrim, N. H.
 Marguerite Whipple Stoddard, president Teachers' Guild, Manchester, N. H.
 Grace P. Tracy (Mrs. Charles Alden), wife of principal Kimball Union Academy, Meriden, N. H.
 Fanny E. Minot, past national president Woman's Relief Corps, Concord, N. H.
 Mabel Nevins Adams (Mrs. Wesley), home economics committee; woman's committee, Council of National Defense, Derry, N. H.
 Mrs. Olive Rand Clark, president Manchester Equal Suffrage Association, Manchester, N. H.
 Mrs. Mary Packard Cass, club woman, Tilton, N. H.
 Mrs. Stephen B. Harrison, club woman, Newark, N. J.
 Mrs. Margaret Dye Ellis, national legislative representative, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Newark, N. J.
 Emily P. Dennis (Mrs. Laban), Orange, N. J.
 Emily P. Jenkinson (Mrs. Richard C.), president Newark Young Woman's Christian Association, Newark, N. J.
 Mrs. Julius Levy, Newark, N. J.
 Mrs. John Francis Yawger, president New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, New York City, N. Y.
 Miss Mabel Cratty, president New York City Young Women's Christian Association, New York City, N. Y.
 Fanny G. Villard (Mrs. Henry), daughter William Lloyd Garrison, New York City, N. Y.
 Katharine Bement Davis, chairman Parole Commission, New York City, N. Y.
 Mrs. James S. Allen, corresponding secretary Woman's Board Missions, Reform Church, East Branch, N. Y.
 Eliza M. Mosher, M. D., honorary president Medical Women's National Association, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Isabella Charles Davis, cofounder International Order King's Daughters and Sons, New York City, N. Y.
 Marion Craig Potter, M. D., chairman membership committee, Medical Women's National Association for War Service, Rochester, N. Y.
 Mrs. Richard M. Colgate, New York City, N. Y.
 Belle Thomas, M. D., Medical Women's National Association, New York City, N. Y.
 Gertrude S. Martin, executive secretary Association Collegiate Alumnae, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Elizabeth Johnson Van Slyke, M. D., superintendent Woman's Hospital, New York City, N. Y.
 Maud Ballington Booth, Volunteers of America, New York City, N. Y.
 Elizabeth Bisland Wetmore, Flushing, N. Y.
 Rosalie Slaughter Morton, M. D., chairman American Women's Hospitals organized by war service committee of the Medical Women's National Association; member of the general medical board of the Council of National Defense, New York City, N. Y.
 Mary G. Hay, chairman New York City Woman Suffrage Party, New York City, N. Y.
 Carrie Chapman Catt, New York City, N. Y.
 Mrs. Stephen S. Wise, wife of Rabbi Wise, chairman child adoption committee of Free Synagogue Social Service, New York City, N. Y.
 Angenette Parry, M. D., New York City, N. Y.
 Martha Wollstein, M. D., chairman laboratory work committee of Medical Women's National Association, New York City, N. Y.
 Georgina F. Dewey, New York City, N. Y.
 Bessy R. Finley, New York City, N. Y.
 De Lan Kinney, D.D. S., New York City, N. Y.
 Mrs. E. W. Redell, Clinton Corners, N. Y.
 Edith R. Hatch, M. D., chairman substitution in private practice committee of Medical Women's National Association, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Mrs. William L. Poteat, wife of president Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.
 Mrs. F. P. Houghood, wife of president Oxford College, Oxford, N. C.
 Mrs. C. P. Blalock, teacher, Raleigh, N. C.
 Sally S. Kirby, president Charity Organization Society, Goldsboro, N. C.
 Mrs. R. M. Pollock, chairman press committee North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, Fargo, N. Dak.
 Minnie P. Featherstone (Mrs. J. E.), president Tuesday Club, Valley City, N. Dak.
 Mrs. W. J. Knochshaw, wife of district judge, Pembina, N. Dak.
 Mrs. J. A. Coffey, wife of judge district court, Jamestown, N. Dak.
 Mrs. Charles Malcolm Cooley, wife of judge, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
 Eleanor S. Evarhard, M. D., chairman committee care of soldiers' dependents Medical Women's National Association, Dayton, Ohio.
 Mrs. G. B. Hester, temperance missionary, Muskogee, Okla.
 Mrs. Lila D. Lindsey, secretary and treasurer Tulsa County Council National Defense, Tulsa, Okla.
 Mrs. Booth Tarkington, wife of author, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Evalyn C. Lovejoy (Mrs. Owen R.), New York City, N. Y.
 Miss Laura Clay, Lexington, Ky.
 Mrs. Charles L. Houston, Coatsville, Pa.
 Caroline McDowell (Mrs. J. C.), chairman of temperance bureau of Woman's Home Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Rosamond K. Bender, secretary the Needlework Guild of America, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mrs. Samuel Semple, member of industrial board Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, Titusville, Pa.
 Carrie H. Smith (Mrs. Howard Wayne), president Atlantic District Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mrs. J. D. O'Neill, wife of commissioner of highways, McKeesport, Pa.
 Anna Jarvis, founder of Mothers' Day, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Margaret E. Hodge, former president Woman's Foreign Missionary Society Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Eliza G. Chase (Mrs. Arnold B.), Providence, R. I.
 Maude Howe Elliott, daughter of Julia Ward Howe, Acquidneck, R. I.
 Helen C. Putnam, M. D., former president American Academy of Medicine, Providence, R. I.
 Alice R. Ham (Mrs. Livingston), Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. Henry Fletcher, wife of former mayor of Providence, Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. W. H. P. Faunce, wife of president Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 Ingeborg Kindstedt, suffrage lecturer, Providence, R. I.
 Ada Wing Mead, state chairman food conservation committee woman's division Council of National Defense, Providence, R. I.
 Ellen A. Stone, M. D., city school physician, Providence, R. I.
 Edith Weir Perry (Mrs. James De Wolf), wife of Episcopal bishop, Providence, R. I.
 Mrs. Trisham Tupper Hyde, wife of mayor of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.
 Lucie Barrow Gonzales, Columbia, S. C.
 Mrs. W. G. Bickelhaupt, Aberdeen, S. Dak.
 Mrs. May P. King, St. Lawrence, S. Dak.
 Elizabeth Kane, M. D., first vice president Medical Woman's National Association, Memphis, Tenn.
 Eunice Flite Yost (Mrs. Fielding H.), wife football coach, University of Michigan, Nashville, Tenn.
 Mrs. John M. Hanna, chairman Southwestern Field Committee Young Woman's Christian Association, Dallas, Tex.
 Mrs. John G. Willacy, San Antonio, Tex.
 Mrs. Cone Johnson, Tyler, Tex.
 Mrs. A. V. Lane, vice president general National Society Daughters American Revolution, Dallas, Tex.
 Kate Waller Barrett, president National Florence Crittenton Mission, Alexandria, Va.
 Mrs. Henry Louis Smith, wife of president Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
 Mrs. E. B. White, Leesburg, Va.
 Grace W. Sherwood, M. D., St. Albans, Vt.
 Mrs. Guy Potter Benton, wife of president University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
 Mrs. Frances C. Axtell, vice chairman United States Employees' Compensation Commission, Bellingham, Wash.
 Maud M. Gill (Mrs. Hiram C.), wife of mayor Seattle, Seattle, Wash.
 Mrs. J. W. Bryan, Seattle, Wash.
 Mrs. George F. Cotterill, wife of former mayor Seattle, Olympia, Wash.
 Genevieve S. Blethen, Seattle, Wash.
 Laura Whipple Carr (Mrs. Alvah L.), vice president Southern Pacific Association Collegiate Alumnae, Seattle, Wash.

Mrs. Corwin S. Shank, president Columbia River District Woman's American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Seattle, Wash.
 Harriet B. Jones, M. D., Glendale, W. Va.
 Mrs. R. L. Hutchinson, director general Federation Women's Clubs, Huntington, W. Va.
 Rev. Olympia Brown, national president Federal Suffrage Association, Racine, Wis.
 Mrs. A. P. Nelson, wife of president Wisconsin University, Grantsburg, Wis.
 Mrs. Edward Dwight Eaton, wife of president Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Mrs. Donald D. MacLaurin, president Northwestern District Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, Madison, Wis.
 WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1918.

Headed by the name of Mrs. Frances F. Cleveland Preston, a notable petition representing nearly 6,000,000 women was presented to the President to-day, urging that the production of malt liquors in the United States be stopped in the interest of the conservation of food-stuffs. The petition states that the grain being used in the brewing of beer and ale and other malt beverages in America is enough to make more than 4,000,000 loaves of bread daily. It also states that the women of America ask that this great saving be made by a proclamation of the President.

The petition contains the official signatures of 28 presidents of national organizations, representing 5,917,976 women. Among these signatures are to be found the names of Mrs. Josiah Evans Cowles, president General Federation of Women's Clubs; Mrs. George Thacher Guernsey, president general Daughters American Revolution; Mrs. H. K. Schoff, president National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Association; Mrs. Robert E. Speer, president of the Young Women's Christian Association of America; Myra Kingman Miller, President National Federation of College Women; Anna A. Gordon, president National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

In addition to this official group there are individual signatures of almost a thousand noted women of America. Among the signers are many wives of United States Senators and Representatives, wives of governors and former governors, women members of State legislatures, and Miss JEANNETTE RANKIN, of Montana, the woman Member of the National Congress.

Among the educators who have signed the petition are Mrs. C. C. Bradford, president National Education Association; Ella Flagg Young; Julia C. Lathrop; Mary E. Wooley, president Mount Holyoke College; Ella F. Pendleton, president Wellesley College; M. Carey Thomas, president Bryn Mawr College; and the dean of women of many of the largest colleges in America.

With the individual group of petitioners are presidents and chairmen of State organizations, such as Colonial Dames, Daughters American Revolution, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Red Cross societies, Florence Crittenton missions, missionary societies of all denominations, equal-suffrage associations, Federation Women's Clubs, woman's committees Council National Defense, Dames of Loyal Legion, Woman's Liberty Loan Committee, Woman's Relief Corps, National League for Women's Service, Federation Music Clubs, war work councils, Order Eastern Star, Mother's Congress and parent-teacher associations, Juvenile Protective Association, State boards charities and corrections, Sunshine Society, Good Government Leagues, Royal Neighbors, Anti-Suffrage Association, Ladies' of the Grand Army of the Republic, Graduate Nurses' Association, Home Makers' Associations, Child Welfare Leagues, International Order King's Daughters and Sons, Ladies of the Maccabees, consumers' leagues, humane education societies, woman's party, Catholic altar societies, medical women's associations, associations collegiate alumnae, needlework guilds, woman's farm and garden associations, neighbors leagues; Rebekah assemblies, Pythian Sisters, playground associations, Council Jewish Women, United Daughters Confederacy, women's bank associations.

There are the signatures of women State officials in suffrage States—deputy commissioners public lands, members labor commissions, State factory inspectors, deputy superintendents public instruction, chairmen State public safety commissions, and assistant attorneys general.

Standing out conspicuously are the signatures of women of national reputation—Jane Addams, Hull House; Mrs. Raymond Robins; Laura Clay; Kate M. Gordon; Jean Gordon; Mrs. Truman H. Newberry; Daisy McLaurin Stevens, member Naval Commission on Training Activities; Maud Ballington Booth; Mrs. Frances C. Astell, vice chairman United States Employees' Compensation Commission; Alice Stebbins Wells, president International Association of Policewomen; Katherine Bement Davis; Anna Jarvis, founder Mother's Day; Kate Waller Barrett; Helen Ring Robinson; Mrs. John A. Logan.

Of wives of prominent men in America, Mrs. Philander P. Claxton, Mrs. William J. Bryan, Mrs. Wilfred T. Grenfell, Mrs. Stephen S. Wise, Mrs. Booth Tarkington, Mrs. Owen Lovejoy, Mrs. Luther Burbank, and wives of United States Senators and Representatives, of governors, of members State supreme courts, attorneys general, State senators and representatives, State auditors, commissioners labor, secretaries state.

Among the petitioners are authors, editors, artists penwomen, doctors, lawyers. From almost every State in the Union are the signatures of journalists. Conspicuous are the names of the authors, Alice Hegán Rice, Gene Stratton Porter, Marietta Holley; of artists and illustrators, Mary Mears, Jessie Wilcox Smith, and Annetta St. Gaudens.

It is a "win-the-war" appeal from women who are responding to all conservation requests of the United States Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 81, line 24, after the words "general expenses," to strike out "\$961,705" and insert "\$1,011,705," so as to make the clause read:

In all, for general expenses, \$1,011,705.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 24, after the words "Bureau of Markets," to strike out "\$1,973,255" and insert "\$2,023,255," so as to make the clause read:

Total for Bureau of Markets, \$2,023,255.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 24, to insert:

In the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., 476; United States grain standards act, 39 Stat. L., 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 26, after the words "ordinary work," to strike out "\$25,195,173" and insert "\$25,500,333," so as to make the clause read:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, \$25,500,333.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 91, line 6, after the word "distribution," to strike out "\$400,000," and insert "\$700,000," so as to make the clause read:

To conduct surveys and inspections in Texas or in any other State to detect any infestation and to conduct such control measures, including the establishment of cotton-free areas, in cooperation with the State of Texas or other States concerned, as may be necessary to stamp out such infestation, to establish in cooperation with the States concerned a zone or zones free from cotton culture on or near the border of any State or States adjacent to Mexico, and to cooperate with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, or otherwise, by undertaking in Mexico such measures for the extermination of the pink bollworm of cotton as shall be determined to be practicable from surveys showing its distribution, \$700,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of crops or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask that the entire provision relating to the comparatively new pest called the pink bollworm be read, commencing in line 23, page 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Eradication of pink bollworm: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink bollworm of cotton in Mexico, and to prevent the establishment of such insect in the United States by the employment of all means necessary, including rent outside of the District of Columbia and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, as follows:

To prevent the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of the entry into the United States of railway cars and other vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection thereof, \$50,000;

To make surveys to determine the actual distribution of the pink bollworm in Mexico and to exterminate local infestations in Mexico near the border of the United States, in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$25,000;

To investigate in Mexico or elsewhere the pink bollworm as a basis for control measures, \$25,000;

To conduct surveys and inspections in Texas or in any other State to detect any infestation and to conduct such control measures, including the establishment of cotton-free areas, in cooperation with the State of Texas or other States concerned, as may be necessary to stamp out such infestation, to establish in cooperation with the States concerned a zone or zones free from cotton culture on or near the border of any State or States adjacent to Mexico, and to cooperate with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, or otherwise, by undertaking in Mexico such measures for the extermination of the pink bollworm of cotton as shall be determined to be practicable from surveys showing its distribution, \$400,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of crops or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what the appropriation was last year for the eradication of this pest called the pink bollworm?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that there was no appropriation under this item last year. It is a new pest that has been introduced, I believe, into Mexico and comes to the United States from Mexico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is the Senator quite sure that there was no appropriation last year? There surely was at some time an appropriation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That was for the boll weevil.

Mr. GORE. I fear the Senator has confused this with the Mexican boll weevil.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all. I know all about that appropriation; but I am very sure that last year the question was up as to this new pest, called the pink bollworm.

Mr. GORE. There was an item in regard to it in the urgent deficiency bill, not in the Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; that is it. Can the Senator state the amount?

Mr. GORE. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have made quite a jump in this matter. It is taking a wide range now. There are several paragraphs relating to it—one of \$50,000, another of \$25,000, another of \$25,000, and another of \$700,000. It seems to me that we are traveling at rather a rapid rate, a most extraordinary rate, concerning this new pest.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the appropriation is based on the theory that it is better to prevent the spread of this pest than to wait until it has spread and then try to eradicate it. It has lately come over from Mexico. It is the most deadly and destructive pest which has yet attacked the cotton plant; and in this case we have raised the appropriation to the amount estimated by the department. They estimated \$800,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator tell the Senate how extensive this pest is, so far as our own territory is concerned?

Mr. GORE. I think not very extensive at this time. I have here a letter from the department that I will have read to the Senate, and also a suggested amendment to this provision.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that I thought, from the reading of the text, that this was rather a preventive measure.

Mr. GORE. It is; yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. They are going to arrest it at the Mexican border and keep it on Mexican territory.

Mr. GORE. That is so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish we might do that, because I think it is a good thing to keep those pests on Mexican soil rather than on the soil of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and they have no troubles down there. We have enough of our own already.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, they have some, I think, in Mexico at the present time.

Mr. GORE. I believe Abe Martin said he would rather be wrong than be President of Mexico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator desire to have that letter read? I am interested in this matter, but I will not ask for it.

Mr. GORE. Then I will not inflict it on the Senate.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will state that even as far away from the Mexican line as Mississippi the cotton planters are very much exercised over the appearance of this pest. Recently a convention of the planters of the entire State was held at the capital, and it was stated that the pest really menaces the entire cotton industry of the South if it is not stopped.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was rather startled by recalling the fact that we had made a small appropriation for this purpose—I had forgotten what appropriation bill it was in, but my memory is refreshed by the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma that it was \$250,000—and now \$800,000 is asked; and yet the bug is not yet on the territory of the United States to any considerable extent.

Mr. GORE. I think it is in Texas to some extent.

Mr. GALLINGER. To some extent?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; in Texas.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is in several States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume we have got to try to exterminate this insect if we can. I am much interested in the development of the cotton industry, which seems to be doing mighty well in these days, when cotton is selling at \$180 a bale.

Mr. GORE. No; about \$150 to \$170. Including the seed, it would be more, however.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; about \$180 a bale. But however that may be, Mr. President, we want to protect that great crop. It is very essential to our own welfare and to the conduct of the war. I have sometimes thought it ought to be taxed; but that, I presume, we will never accomplish, and perhaps we ought not. I am not so sure on that point. But the rapid increase in these appropriations attracted my attention, and I wanted to ask this question. If this insect is as deadly as is suggested to the culture of cotton, of course this will be a wise appropriation, provided we can halt its progress into the cotton States; but it was so great a jump from the appropriation of last year to this proposed appropriation that I wanted some information about it.

The truth is, it seems to have become rather an industry to hunt up some insect that is going to attack an agricultural crop. Somebody said to me that the sweet potatoes are in danger. I do not know how that is. It has been suggested to me that we ought to look after some insect that threatens that crop; and I shall be very sorry if that crop is in danger or in danger of being destroyed.

I am satisfied with this matter so far as the answer concerning it is concerned, and shall make no objection to it, beyond expressing the hope that we may not be met by a proposed appropriation of \$1,600,000 next year; and I trust they will be able to stop the ravages of that pink insect at the Rio Grande. That is where it ought to be. It ought to be relegated to Mexican soil, and kept there, rather than to come into Texas or any other State of the Union.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I entirely coincide with the Senator, in the hope that we can stay this invader at the border. I now send to the desk an amendment suggested by the department to the amendment which has just been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 90, at the end of line 11, it is proposed to insert—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that that will be an amendment to the bill and not an amendment to this amendment. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$700,000." This has not any relevancy to that amendment.

Mr. GORE. Yes; it does not refer to the amendment, but to the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, before the committee amendment is adopted I want to ask the chairman of the committee, or some Senator from one of the cotton States, to state, in a few words, if possible, the results thus far accomplished under the appropriations which have been made by Congress for several years in the attempt to eradicate the boll weevil. What has been done with an average of \$600,000 per year?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say that the Government has not been able to eradicate the weevil, but on account of the weevil the production of cotton was reduced. I understand, as much as 75 per cent in some portions of the great cotton belt of Texas. In Louisiana and in Mississippi there was a corresponding reduction when the pest first made its appearance in that region, but the department has succeeded, by cooperative methods with farmers, in restoring the production of cotton to the old level by improved cultural methods and ways and means of circumventing the weevil and counteracting its effects, but not in the way of direct extermination of the weevil itself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the opinion of the Senator that it is necessary to continue to appropriate this sum indefinitely in order to circumvent the weevil?

Mr. GORE. I think for the present it is, because the weevil has not extended itself over the entire cotton country, but is extending its invasion eastward all the while, and it is necessary to institute these ways and means wherever it does make its advance; and until that is done I presume the necessity will continue. I imagine that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD] or the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] could give some statistics as to the actual losses from the appearance of the weevil in those two States. They have been enormous.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course I realize that the losses have been very, very severe, but I think it can be contended that after this series of years we should have some report as to progress.

Mr. GORE. I think I might, however, express the opinion that this appropriation will not disappear.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I never knew one that did, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. That is too true; but I will say to the Senator that it is connected in a way with the general demonstration work and the improvement of agriculture generally; and the appropriations were growing so large, and the benefits were so great and were so well recognized, that Senators from other sections insisted that corresponding appropriations be made to carry forward the same sort of work in their States, notwithstanding they were not cotton-growing States. That has been done. Demonstration agents all over the country have grown out of that; and I think the appropriations for other sections outside of the cotton States amounted to something more than \$400,000 a year or two ago, and I think they are above that now. So it has come to be a permanent part of our agricultural education, and to some extent in the cotton States this is really a misnomer.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is just what I was driving at. Is not this a misnomer?

Mr. GORE. Yes; it is. It was born of this necessity, but its name has never been changed; and the service has been extended, I think, to the entire country. There are 2,860 counties in the United States. I think that 2,100 counties now have agents corresponding to those who were evolved in the Southern States to meet this situation; and they are being rapidly extended to all the counties.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not desire to be overinquisitive. I have had a fleeting idea that this boll-weevil appropriation was, in fact, not alone an appropriation for stamping out the boll weevil; that it was an appropriation to extend the farm-agent system throughout the counties. Now, I am in entire sympathy with the extension of that system; and I

remember also, as the Senator has already reminded the Senate, that when these great appropriations were first commenced another section of the country said: "We must have our share."

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WADSWORTH. So they promptly got their share.

Mr. GORE. They did; yes, sir.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And it has been going on ever since. One part of the country calls it the farm county agents' work and another part of the country says: "We are chasing the boll weevil with it."

Mr. GORE. That is the state of facts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well. I am glad to have it cleared up.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that the Government has never professed to be able to eradicate the boll weevil. It has discovered no ways and means of combating the weevil so as to exterminate the insect itself; but it has so countervailed its ravages as to restore the production of cotton to normal, even where the weevil was most riotous where it first made its appearance.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I venture the hope that the pink boll weevil will not give rise to a pink-colored farm agent.

Mr. GORE. If so, then there will probably be a pink invader of some sort in all sections of the country. I will say that this appropriation, I think, has been abundantly rewarded, not only in the Southern States but in other States, although agriculture was perhaps more scientific in other sections than in the South; but it has been serviceable even in those States, and abundantly so in the Southern States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wanted to ask the Senator about the character of this pink boll weevil and what damage it does.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall have to have read the letter of the department to which I referred a few moments ago.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Can not the Senator state the matter just briefly?

Mr. GORE. It destroys the fruit entirely. It even destroys the seed, so that it will not reproduce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. To what extent has it gotten into our territory?

Mr. GORE. I think only to a limited extent, and only in the State of Texas, as I am informed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. And it is hoped, by this appropriation and under this appropriation, to devise ways and means, in conjunction with the Mexican authorities, to keep it out of our territory, at least?

Mr. GORE. That is the point exactly; yes, sir—to eradicate where it has already made its appearance, and so to inspect and disinfect cars coming over as to prevent its introduction in the future.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How is it propagated? That is, I mean, how does it get into this country from Mexico?

Mr. GORE. It is supposed to have come in in cars in which cotton seed has been shipped from Mexico.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It comes in with the seed?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; or it comes in cars which have been used for the shipment of seed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Have we been inspecting these cars during the last year, and have we tried to prevent its being brought in?

Mr. GORE. I do not know to what extent that has been done. I assume so, and I assume also that the letter explains the matter fully. I had not expected to reach this item this afternoon. Consequently I am not familiar with the contents of the letter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to express my surprise to the Senator from New York that he should be surprised to discover in this bill an appropriation of this nature. We have a number of appropriations called revolving appropriations. They are so called because they never revolve; they only jam.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma now proposes an amendment, following line 9, on page 91, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, on page 91, after line 9:

Any moneys hereafter received by the United States in payment of charges fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture on account of such cleaning and disinfection at plants constructed therefor out of any appropriation made on account of the pink bollworm are hereby appropriated and made immediately available during the continuance of such emergency, in the discretion of the Secretary, for expenditures necessary to prevent the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States and the establishment of the pink bollworm in the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, do I understand that this is a committee amendment?

Mr. GORE. No, sir. The committee did not report it. It was sent up by the department since the bill was reported.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator having the bill in charge offer this amendment?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be stated again, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated again.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that may be necessary; but I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that is reviving a practice that grew to such an extent that we were compelled to stop it by legislation, and to provide that all moneys received from all sources should go into the Treasury of the United States, and all moneys to be appropriated should be carried in a regular appropriation bill for any expense that the Government desired to undertake. I do not believe that the Senator having the bill in charge can say how much money will come from these charges. Was there any information on that subject before the committee?

Mr. GORE. I have no estimate on that subject, Mr. President. I will say, while I am interrupting the Senator, that I think the principle he lays down is a sound one, generally speaking.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not any doubt about its being a sound principle. If I wanted to take the time of the Senate this afternoon, I could rehearse here dozens of cases where it has been abused in the most flagrant manner; and as far as I am concerned, I believe that every single cent that is collected from any source by the agencies of the Government of the United States ought to go into the Treasury of the United States, and not a dollar of it ought to come out of the Treasury of the United States unless it is appropriated directly for the purposes named.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will remember, however, that we created a revolving fund of \$150,000,000 under the food-control act.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, we have done so many things during the past year that can not be defended that I do not want to take time now even to undertake to defend that kind of legislation.

Mr. GORE. No; I do not cite that as justification for this practice.

Mr. SMOOT. I should very much prefer that whatever charges are imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the cleaning under this paragraph shall go in the regular channels. Then, if an additional appropriation is wanted by him for this purpose, let him come to Congress and ask for the appropriation, and I have no doubt that it will be granted.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WADSWORTH called for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the question be stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and read by the Secretary.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Sutherland
Brandgee	Jones, Wash.	Reed	Swanson
Culberson	McCumber	Robinson	Thomas
Curtis	McNary	Saulsbury	Thompson
France	Martin	Shaforth	Trammell
Gallinger	Myers	Sheppard	Vardaman
Gerry	New	Smith, Ga.	Wadsworth
Gore	Norris	Smith, Md.	Warren
Gronna	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Williams
Henderson	Page	Smoot	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the balance of the afternoon.

Mr. ROBINSON. The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] are absent from the Senate Chamber on business of the Senate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business, and the unavoidable absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. COLT, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. KING, Mr. LODGE, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. TILMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. NUGENT entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 10, page 91, and read as follows:

No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move to strike out lines 10 to 16, which have just been read.

Mr. GORE. I ask that that amendment may go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand the bill is being read merely for action upon the amendments of the committee at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was there a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I am willing to have the matter passed over for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be passed over.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if he expects to dispose of the bill this evening?

Mr. GORE. I do not expect to dispose of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. BORAH. I will state the reason why I asked the question. I do not object to having the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas go over, but I do not want to remain here this afternoon, if I can help it, waiting for it if it is not coming up.

Mr. GORE. My impression is that it will not come up this afternoon. I apprehend that it will involve a good deal of discussion. There are other items that will not take much time, and I prefer to dispose of those first. I think the Senator will be safe in going away.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 91, after line 16, to insert the following:

That any moneys heretofore or hereafter received by the United States for or in connection with the disposition of nitrate of soda pursuant to section 27 of the 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 (Public, No. 41, 65th Cong.), are hereby appropriated and made immediately available as a revolving fund to be used at the discretion of the President for further carrying out the purposes of said section and extending its operation throughout the period of the existing war as ascertained and proclaimed in accordance with section 24 of said act: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as prohibiting the sale or disposal of any nitrates remaining on hand at the time of, or contracted for previous to, such termination.

Mr. SMOOT. The same objection could be urged against this amendment that is urged against the paragraph beginning after the word "destroyed," in line 9 on page 91. This, however, is an emergency matter and it refers particularly to the question of securing a product that is absolutely necessary during the continuation of this war. For that purpose, and that only, I shall not object to its adoption, but the principle of it, as I stated before, is absolutely wrong.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 9, to insert:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$250,000, to be used and expended by the Secretary of Agriculture as herein provided in offering and awarding prizes and premiums for the encouragement of the growing of staple foodstuffs on the farms throughout the country. The money appropriated by this paragraph shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the value of the farm products as shown by the last Federal census, and shall be expended under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. I desire to offer a substitute for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill whether there is a sum of \$250,000 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated?

Mr. GORE. We expect to issue Liberty bonds to the amount of \$3,600,000,000. I do not think it is all appropriated.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is that amount in the Treasury, it is blessed news to the country.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I think he is rather mistaken when he says it has not all been appropriated. It has already been appropriated.

Mr. GORE. I believe it has a time or two over.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the money is not there, they can not get it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for that suggestion. That is the only thing that will stand them off, I think.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator offers a substitute?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand from reading the section that we are going to engage in giving prizes.

Mr. GORE. The substitute relates to another paragraph.

Mr. GALLINGER. We used to give chromos and now we are going to give money, I suppose, for certain experiments in agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS. Only in case the money is not otherwise appropriated. I do not think there is any danger of doing that.

Mr. GALLINGER. We may get some money in the Treasury—

Mr. OVERMAN. After the war is over.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the war is over; after the taxes which are becoming due are collected. Then we may have money.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GORE. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is very entertaining to hear the plaintive wailing begin the minute it is proposed to appropriate a little money to the farmers of this country. I did not hear any of it the other day when it was proposed to give the railroads very favorable terms for the period of the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator allow an interruption?

Mr. REED. As soon as I conclude the sentence. What we have been doing to the farmer up to this time is to take his market away from him, fix his prices, upset all his calculations, and leave him at the mercy of abnormal conditions made worse by the abnormal acts of some abnormal men. That goes without challenge, and when it is proposed to give a little money to help the agriculturist it arouses a great deal of comment.

But a few days ago, as I looked over the floor of this Chamber, it seemed to me that there was about the same enthusiasm in trying to take care of the railroads handsomely that you would find among the aspirants for a premium among a lot of bread makers at a country fair. Everybody was there to do his best. Now, I hope that even if there is no money otherwise appropriated from the Treasury we will not begin cutting down the farmer. Whether there is any money otherwise appropriated now or not, there will be plenty of money appropriated in this Chamber within the next 30 days, plenty of thousands of dollars, plenty of millions of dollars, and probably plenty of thousands of millions of dollars, and it will then be done in the high name of patriotism, and whoever dares hold out an arresting hand or raise a questioning voice will be classed as an enemy of his country. But when it is proposed to spend a few dollars with the farmer that may help to make better crops, produce more food for the world, it at once becomes the object of scorn and contemptuous remark.

I hope the bill will not be treated in that form.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri will recall that so far as I am concerned—

Mr. REED. Evidently, I did not mean my remarks to apply at all to the Senator from Colorado. I was referring to the general situation.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course I accept the Senator's explanation, but his remarks were of so sweeping a character that it called for a statement from myself.

Let me say, while I have the floor, that it is my intention to vote for every appropriation which I think is absolutely necessary for the prosecution of the war or for the proper conduct of the Government's business. My objection to many of the items of this bill is not a new one. I have opposed them in past years because I have felt that they were not essential.

I made the remark before the Senator from Missouri came in that I had become so accustomed to see every appropriation to which I objected pass the Senate that I was becoming somewhat discouraged. I have no doubt that my attempt in this regard will be another instance of love's labor lost. I am not objecting to any of these items because this is an agricultural bill any more than I objected to the very large rewards that were recently awarded to the railroads because the bill affected the railroads. In each instance my criticisms have been designed to center attention upon conditions which, in my judgment, in the one case did not warrant so high a return, and which in this case do not seem to be now essential, when of all times we should be frugal.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the proposed amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 92, after line 9, insert:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$250,000, to be used and expended by the Secretary of Agriculture as herein provided in offering and awarding prizes and premiums for the encouragement of the growing of staple foodstuffs on the farms throughout the country. The money appropriated by this paragraph shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the value of the farm products as shown by the last Federal census, and shall be expended under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of opposing any appropriation which I think will actually advance the agriculture of this country, but this particular appropriation, which I confess meets my view for the first time, as I was absent from the meeting of the committee at which the amendment was adopted, excites my curiosity and fails to excite my admiration.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has said something about a more liberal treatment of the farmers of the country. He has recited how their markets have been taken away to a large extent and their prices fixed in many articles, generally fixed in a downward direction. What he says is true. I do not think this appropriation, however, will move one inch toward curing that evil. Here it is proposed to spend \$250,000 to award prizes as a premium for the encouragement of the growing of staple foodstuffs. You might just as well appropriate 250 cents as \$250,000 to a country of this size and expect that it is going to increase the production of staple foodstuffs.

This reads to me like a pleasant little sop to the farmer, something handed to him that does not cost the Government very much, and which, it is hoped, will make him feel good when he reads about it. You might just as well throw the money out in the middle of the street.

Let me suggest that you do not fool the farmers with this kind of legislation. There is item after item in this appropriation bill that seems to assume that the people who live in the rural parts of the United States are children, little babies, and have to be taught the simplest things—how to conduct their daily life, how to conduct their business from morning until night, and here we have a suggestion in this time of war, when the farmer knows perfectly well what the trouble is—it does not need the Congress nor the Secretary of Agriculture nor anybody else to tell him—to soften his feelings with the distribution of \$250,000 in prizes. To my mind, it seems ridiculous.

I do not think there is any Senator here who will contend that the distribution of these prizes apportioned among the States in accordance with their relative production is going to encourage at this time the production of staple foodstuffs. The only thing that will encourage the production of staple foodstuffs at this time is a more liberal attitude on the part of the Food Administration, and nothing else. Had some of the Senators listened to the testimony that was given before the Committee on Agriculture within the last two weeks they would be, I am quite sure, deeply disturbed as to the food prospects in this country and in our allies' countries. The dis-

tribution of prizes, may I say to the Senator from Missouri, is not going to do any good. It is not going to make the farmer feel much better about it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to say at this point that I have been with the Banking and Currency Committee and had just come into the Chamber when I heard the remark made that occasioned my remark. I did not intend my remarks to apply to this question of prizes at all. I intended it to apply to the general cheese-paring policy that has been pursued here in regard to our agricultural bills in the Senate and the attitude that has been assumed so often. I am glad to have the opportunity to make that statement.

Now, while I am on my feet, if the Senator from New York will allow me, I wish to make a further statement. There is absolutely no question that the Senator from New York, so far as he has stated the case, has stated the absolute fact with regard to the conditions that confront the country.

I expect in a day or two to pay some attention to this policy that has produced a higher price for rye and barley and inferior grain than wheat is permitted to bring, to this policy that makes it more profitable for a farmer to plant rye and barley and oats than it does to plant wheat, and much more profitable to plant corn than either, to this policy that is causing thousands of immature hogs to be marketed because the corn is worth more in the bin than it is when it has been transformed into pork, to this policy of the Food Administration that has produced consternation among the farmers of this country from one end to the other, and that instead of giving us that stability which is necessary to investment and to labor has given us instability, to this policy which tells us for 8 or 10 months of the year to have meatless days, and then turns around and tells us all at once that we need to eat more meat in order to save wheat, this policy which tells us one day that there is wheat that can not be moved and that the railroads are to blame, and the next day when the cars are tendered back away from the proposition and then assigns, as it assigned this morning, as the cause of wheat shortage, that the wheat is not in the country, when everybody knows that there has been less wheat shipped abroad than has been shipped in normal years.

I think that statement is so everybody knows it. I feel confident of it. I have not looked it up, but this policy, I say, that gave us meatless days and prescribed that we should eat chicken, and then turned around and provided that we should have meat days and that chicken should not be marketed, to this foolish, idiotic policy which seems to think you can save food by eating all of a certain kind one day and all of another kind the next day, alternating in that manner, instead of eating in the ordinary and usual way that human beings have done until our friend came here from England to reform the world and change the habits of the American people and to introduce a good deal of confusion into American life, and who, according to the Chicago Tribune, has taken into his working force some representatives of the packers who have been drawing very large salaries and who are the occasion of examination by Mr. Heney.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I simply desire to express the hope that the Senate will save this \$250,000 and use it for something real.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not want to enter into any debate with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] concerning the Food Administration or the Food Administrator. What he said upon that subject is irrelevant to the present question under discussion. But I do want to answer something that was said by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The Senator from New York criticizes the appropriation which is made for this purpose of encouraging improved agriculture by prizes and premiums as being absolutely useless amongst a people of 100,000,000 with our agricultural production. If the Senator from New York means by that that the appropriation ought to be larger, I agree with him, but if he means by it that prizes to men in the agricultural business do not have any effect upon the production of agricultural products I beg leave to disagree with him, and my disagreement grows out of observation and experience.

The prizes offered to the boys' corn clubs in the South—every southerner here will bear me out—have led almost to a revolution in corn production in that part of the country. It has not been very long since nearly every southern State imported the major part of its food for man and beast, while it raised other things. It has not been very long since in my State an average crop of corn was 19 to 22 bushels per acre, depend-

ing upon the year. After the State and Federal agricultural agencies and other interests began giving prizes to boys in corn clubs and to girls in canning-food clubs, and all that, the production of corn per acre went up and the supply of vegetables for winter increased very much. Why? Because the boys made more corn? No. They did make more corn, but that could not affect the entire production in any appreciable percentage. They made more corn, I say, because in my county three or four boys made over 100 bushels to the acre, and a young fellow in South Carolina made 236 bushels, I believe, though I have forgotten the exact figures—anyhow, the largest production per acre in the Union. That was all in a country not regarded as a good corn country.

It does not compare with the "Egypt" country in Illinois, nor Indiana, nor Iowa as a corn country. The real increase came from this, that when these boys had learned it it astonished their fathers, and their fathers got on the methods which the boys had been taught and which resulted in this miraculous added production. Their fathers took advantage of the lessons which their children had learned, and the consequence has been that the production per acre has been increased enormously. That is not all; the Senator from Missouri tells us that we have been "marketing immature hogs." That is also erroneous. Southern corn has not been going into hogs for the market hitherto. No southerner felt that he could make money at fattening hogs with corn, because the corn in the market was worth more than the hogs. But so far from that statement of marketing immature hogs being true, I saw the report yesterday or the day before that the average weight of hogs in the American market had gone up some 20 pounds this year over the year before, and that I think is very largely due to the fact that in the South more hogs were kept, and the hogs were better fed. Instead of being merely called up to be fed when we were ready to kill them they were fed pretty nearly all the year around, not upon corn always but upon products of various sorts.

The Senator from New York is mistaken in thinking that prizes given to men for increased production in agriculture stop with the prize maker. The achievement goes all over his neighborhood. It spreads from one neighborhood to another. "You say that John Martin's boy raised 102 bushels of corn to the acre!" "Yes; I do. I saw it gathered and measured." "In the name of Heaven how did he do it?" Then, the other fellow sits down and tells him how it happened, how he fertilized, what sort of seed corn was planted, what was the species of cultivation, and all about it, and then the inquirer goes home and attempts at any rate to imitate him, and the emulation or rivalry spreads all over the country.

Mr. President, there are all sorts of expenditures made by the Federal Government less profitable than this, and I do not speak of war expenditures, because as far as I am concerned I would drop the appropriations for almost everything in the world, if necessary to have money in order to win the war. My soul is so wrapped up in this war that if I thought the other side of the Chamber could bring it to a successful termination and this side could not, I would be willing to give that side full power. I am so wrapped up in the necessity of winning it, caused by the conviction upon my part that national life will not be worth living unless we do win it, that I would not take one dollar from military purposes, and if I thought this money was to be subtracted from military purposes I would not do that. I would not vote, and will not vote, for a single new building nor park nor monument, and I will not vote for anything useful merely for peace purposes that we can postpone until after the war. But here is a direct war purpose. Increase the production of corn; increase the production of cattle; increase the production of hogs, into which the corn and the other agricultural products go. How? By forcing the people to do it? You can not do that under a free government. By inducing them to do it is the answer. In the South I know that the process of inducing has been begun, and that it has been very highly successful.

I served for 10 years in the House of Representatives upon the Agricultural Committee with the father of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. His father was the chairman of the committee, and I was its senior Democratic member. We held appropriations down to a reasonable point all the time. I have never been extravagant about an Agricultural appropriation bill. His father and I together saved the Treasury from the expenditure of many a useless dollar that was put on the bill for the purpose of "farming the farmer," and not for the purpose of farming the land. In this particular case, however, the Senator from New York is mistaken. This is a matter of great importance and will result in great good. My only objection to

it is that, being of the utmost importance, we yet can not very well at this time appropriate any more than the bill now carries.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am going to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not consent to put this appropriation of \$250,000 in another portion of the bill, where it will bring practical results? I presume the Senator has had before him, and that there has been before the committee, some argument concerning the rust and the methods of meeting the rust. I notice that \$100,000 has been appropriated for that purpose.

Let me call the attention of the Senator in charge of this bill to the fact that three days of a change of weather in 1916 caused a loss in three States in the Union of very close to \$100,000,000 in the value of a crop. That was caused by the black rust. The black rust differs in no respect from the yellow rust, except that the spore are a little older. Several hundred years ago, in France, after a careful investigation, it was found that the origin of these spores was located and that they were always developed on a certain kind of vegetation, which is known here as the barberry bush. Scientists and those of the highest standing in biology tell us that the rust spores always originate from the barberry bush hedges, and so forth; that, at least, they have never been known to originate anywhere else; that they will travel with the wind, and in a single day may spread over a thousand miles from the place of their origin.

Now, it is proposed to appropriate \$100,000 for the eradication of the rust. The loss every year from that source will run into many millions of dollars; and, if the straw is exceptionally heavy and there is the likelihood of a moist season, the loss will even run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

These same scientists say that the only remedy now is to destroy the barberry bush, which is used for hedges in different cities and throughout the States. You can not destroy them by an act of Congress, because we can not reach by our legislation into the States and assume police authority, but we can act in conjunction with the several agricultural States. I do not believe there is an agricultural college in any one of the States that does not agree, and absolutely agree, with the assertion that the rust spores always originate in the barberry bush, and if you can destroy that you can probably destroy the ravages of rust.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I shall do so in just one moment.

This bill carries about \$28,000,000 or \$29,000,000, if I remember rightly, and here is a damage that is never less than twenty-eight or thirty or forty million dollars in a year, and it often runs very close to a hundred million dollars in a year.

There is no necessity of studying further as to the question of where the rust originates, because I understand that all scientists practically agree about that. So it is not simply a question of destruction. That being the case, you will do a hundred times as much good if you will take that extra \$250,000 that you now appropriate for prizes and provide that it may be used, in conjunction with the States, in the extermination of the barberry bush, from which originate the spores that destroy the crops of the Northwest.

I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desired to ask the Senator from North Dakota if it were possible, by spraying or other similar treatment, to destroy the insect, germ, or whatever it may be, that produces the rust. Is it necessary, in order to accomplish that object, to destroy the bush?

Mr. McCUMBER. When I state to the Senator from Mississippi that in a single day, if the wind is blowing in the right direction, those spores cover an acreage equivalent to three or four of the big States of the Union, he will see the impossibility of affording a remedy by spraying.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I did not ask the Senator if the spores could be killed by spraying after they fall on the wheat, but I asked the Senator if they could be destroyed by spraying the bush where they originate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, they might possibly be.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say to the Senator that I shall cheerfully vote to give him or the farmers of his section any amount that he thinks could be prudently and profitably expended for the destruction of that pest, and I think the money would be well invested if the appropriation should be made. Agriculture is the base, the substratum, upon which all permanent prosperity rests in this country, and I deem it a privilege as well as a patriotic duty to vote for every measure which has for its purpose and that I believe will promote the interest

and prosperity of the people who till the soil. I believe that any help to the farmers by the Government which increases their yield promotes the well-being of all classes of society.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there is a limit, of course, to our right to expend the people's money. We can not in any appropriation bill give everything that we should like to give. We ought, however, to appropriate the money which is raised by taxation in such manner that its use will do the greatest possible good; and I insist that this \$250,000, if it is used for the purpose of meeting the ravages of rust, will accomplish a thousandfold more good than it would be possible for it to accomplish in the matter of these prizes. I hope the chairman of the committee will be willing, if there can not be appropriated more than the amount which is provided for in this bill, to drop the provision which proposes to appropriate \$250,000 for the purpose of giving prizes, and use it in meeting the evil of the rust.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not underestimate the importance of the proposition which has been advanced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. The desirability of exterminating the source and origin of the rust must be obvious to every man. My recollection is that the committee gave what the department estimated upon that item. The Senator's argument has convinced me that the estimate was not sufficient. There is nothing binding about estimates. I shall not, therefore, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, hesitate to vote for an increase in that particular item.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask if the Senator knows whether or not the department made an estimate and advised the committee to place in the bill the item under consideration covering prizes?

Mr. GORE. No; I will say that it did not, Mr. President; and I will touch on that point in a moment. This was another instance where the committee felt that it had an opportunity to render some public service without a direct commission from the department to render that service.

I wish to say, in reference to the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that I think he put his finger on the fundamental aspects of the present situation. I think that the Food Administration has discouraged production. I think the production of wheat this year will be less than it would otherwise have been. I think that is a misfortune, which certainly may amount to a calamity.

I also agree with him that perhaps the Food Administration and perhaps the Senate do not appreciate the real gravity of the situation. The president of Cornell University, which is one of the largest agricultural institutions in America, recently declared that there was only a narrow margin between this country and an inferno of starvation. That is pretty strong language; I do not know whether I should use language so strong as that; but I do know that the situation is serious, and that we may before long be looking famine in the face, which we ought to have averted. It is incumbent upon us to avert not only the danger but the possibility of a shortage of foodstuffs in this country, so far as human foresight can anticipate conditions, and meet them looking to that end.

Evidence is accumulating as to the food crisis which is threatened. I hope that before long a report may be submitted to the Senate, or an argument may be presented to the Senate, which will impress the gravity of the situation upon each and every Member of this body.

One of the Senator's complaints was that the amount provided in this amendment was not enough. I think that is the only objection to which the amendment is liable. I do not think it is enough.

I do not agree with the Senator that the prospect of prizes and premiums would not stimulate increased production. The spirit of emulation is one of the strongest instincts and impulses of human nature. It has impelled men to feats of heroism which mere sordid gain could never inspire. This is not a matter of theory; it has been applied in many of the Southern States. The production of corn in the Southern States has been doubled, and in many localities it has been trebled by the prizes which have been offered on the part of voluntary organizations and associations. I have proved my faith by my works. For five years in my State I gave an annual premium of \$100 to the boys making the best record in contests between the boys' corn clubs in that State. Those contests, born of a spirit of emulation and

a desire to excel, have borne splendid fruit in many of the Southern States.

There are 46 State fairs in the United States; there are 2,000 or more county fairs; and I have no doubt that by wise administration and distribution of these prizes and premiums production can be greatly stimulated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether all of those State fairs and all of those county fairs are not giving prizes for the best exhibition of the products of the farm?

Mr. GORE. I think they are; but the Committee on Agriculture felt that this was a national problem—not a State problem and not a local problem. The Committee on Agriculture was not willing to be outrun in this great national service by the States, by the counties, or by mere local organizations of merchants and commercial clubs. We felt that we ought to have sufficient vision to appreciate the importance of this situation. The Committee on Agriculture feels that some responsibility devolves upon it to aid in arousing interest in the conditions as they relate to food and to food supply, and in recommending any wise means possible which may contribute to a satisfactory solution of that problem. If these prizes increase production a half million dollars only, we will have realized 100 per cent profit on our investment. That it will do so, if wisely administered through the various State and county fairs, I think there can not be the slightest possibility of doubt.

While much has happened under the Food Administration which might profitably have happened otherwise—and I shall not be diverted at this point to a discussion of that question—the fact that it has done some things it ought not to have done, that it has discouraged production, and that it may be beyond our power to remedy that situation, is no reason why we should not, so far as we can, meet our responsibility and discharge our duty at least by stimulating production. I hope the amendment will be adopted, and I have no doubt—

Mr. WILLIAMS. This will encourage States and counties and other organizations to offer additional prizes.

Mr. GORE. Undoubtedly it will, and the national prize, in addition to the State prize, would be an object worthy to be striven for and undoubtedly would be an object of ambition. Boys' corn clubs and boys' pig clubs and girls' poultry clubs throughout the country have contributed a great deal to increased production. Production, production, production is the supreme and paramount purpose to-day.

Some have minimized production by laying too much emphasis on distribution. I think that has been the fundamental defect in our policy up to this time. We have magnified the importance of distribution and have minimized the importance of production. A perfect system of distribution, the most elaborate and perfected machinery for distribution, would be utterly vain if there be nothing to distribute. We can not, Senators, overdo production this year. However much we may expand it, there will be an urgent and an insistent demand for more. We will hear from the lips of our allies the cry of the horse leech's daughter, worthily made, and it should be our desire to gratify it—more, more, more, and still more food. To meet that cry let us have more production, and in this instance let us resolve the doubt in favor of offering the prizes and premiums in the hope that it will stimulate production, and if it falls short of that result, if evil days come, if lean months come upon us in the future, let no one say that the Senate Committee on Agriculture at least was derelict in its duty. That is the theory upon which the committee acted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few moments, because I have been called to the Committee on Banking and Currency; but, in addition to what my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] has said, I desire to state that his estimate as to the loss from the black rust within one year alone is not high enough.

I desire to say to my colleague and to the Senate that we estimated in North Dakota in 1916 that we would produce 160,000,000 bushels of wheat, but, due to the black rust, as my colleague has stated, we raised only 39,000,000 bushels.

I have pleaded and pleaded with those in authority to make recommendations and ask for appropriations to destroy the barberry bush, because there is where the black-rust microbe originates. I have stood on this floor time and again asking Members of this body to take action, and calling the attention of the department to the necessity of increasing these appropriations in order to increase the production of grain, and I think we must all agree that that is highly necessary, especially at this time.

I am not opposed to this particular appropriation. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I

was present when the amendment was proposed. I said at that time to the other members who were present that, while I had no objection to it, I knew of other methods which would be far superior to this one to increase production, especially of wheat.

I am glad the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is here, because I want to read to him and to the Senate a statement which can not be controverted. I heard the Senator from Mississippi say the other day that prices could not be fixed by law, but that ultimately they would be regulated and fixed on a competitive basis under the law of supply and demand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not want to be misquoted.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not desire to misquote the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that prices could not be fixed, but I said if they were fixed the result would be either to disturb production if they were fixed too low or to encourage speculation if they were fixed too high.

Mr. GRONNA. That is absolutely true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course there is a psychological influence on an appeal to patriotism that might have some effect, but it is a natural economic law that governs, and there is no escape from it.

Mr. GRONNA. That is perfectly true. I wish at this point to read from a newspaper the quotations on different kinds of grain. On February 27 the market at Duluth, Minn., was, for No. 1 dark northern, \$2.21; for No. 1 northern, \$2.17; for No. 2 dark northern, \$2.18; for No. 2 northern, \$2.14; for No. 3 dark northern, \$2.14; for No. 3 northern, \$2.11; for No. 1 durum, \$2.11; for No. 2 durum, \$2.14; for No. 3 yellow corn, \$2.14 to \$2.15; for barley, \$1.83 to \$2.16; for rye, \$2.53.

A bushel of barley has to weigh only 48 pounds, and yet, Mr. President, a bushel of barley is worth more in the market than a bushel of wheat. Every sensible man knows that a bushel of barley is not as valuable for food as a bushel of wheat. Every sensible man knows that a bushel of rye, weighing 56 pounds, is not as valuable for bread and for food as a bushel of wheat. The economic conditions have been disarranged, and people in the agricultural sections of the country have been discouraged from producing wheat.

That is not the whole story. While we are talking about the microbes propagated on the barberry bush, let us refer also to the microbe at the other end which we have to confront every year, whether we have the barberry bush and the black rust or not, and that is some of the combinations and grain exchanges, also called chambers of commerce, which are always operating. I am going to take the time of the Senate when we reach the amendment which I introduced at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture, proposing that standardization of grades shall be fixed on milling tests, and he realizes now the importance of it. I will try to show the effects of the false standards now prevailing and also show the effects in the prices of grain. We will say that No. 1 hard wheat is mixed with 15 per cent of No. 1 winter wheat. One is as good and as valuable for flour as the other, but if there is a small percentage of this winter wheat mixed with the spring wheat it is reduced to No. 4. I have a sample of that kind on my desk. The difference in the price to the farmer is from 24 to 25 cents a bushel; and yet when we ask an appropriation of \$50,000 for a little flour mill—and it is not intended to erect a building, but to provide machinery in order to make tests—but when it is proposed to fix standards based upon the baking and milling qualities of grain we are laughed to scorn by some of the Senators here, although the reduction in grade involves millions and millions of dollars of loss to the farmers of this country. That is how production is discouraged.

I understand the item for the flour mill has been passed over; I was not here at the time because I was in attendance upon other business of the Senate, but I understand that item has been passed over.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that amendment has been accepted.

Mr. GRONNA. I refer to the item for a flour mill to make tests as to milling and baking properties, and I understand it was passed over. It was designed to enable the Agricultural Department to make tests to ascertain the value of different kinds of grain and then to make their standardization accordingly. Yet Senators on this floor say that it is an extravagance to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture or the Bureau of Standards to get the information which is needed in order to do justice not only to the

section of the country from which I come but to the entire country.

Now, Mr. President, I am not objecting to the appropriation of \$250,000 for prizes and premiums, as is proposed in this bill. I believe it will do some good and perhaps help to stimulate production; but why should we discriminate against the people in certain sections of the country, restrict the price on wheat, and discourage production, and then let the industries in the other sections of the country go unrestricted? The production of wheat can not be increased by any such method as is proposed here; I know that very well. Perhaps you can increase the production of vegetables and encourage some schoolmarm who has a few spare dollars to buy a pig and enter the new field of patriotic pig raising, or something of that sort, but you can not increase the production of wheat by promising such premiums as proposed in this amendment after having taken from the farmer his market, as you did a year ago.

What is the result? What did we have to do in my State this year? The governor of the State called the legislature together in extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting a law that would enable the counties in the State to issue bonds to buy seed and feed for the farmers and sell it to them on time. This is not a very good story to tell; it presents a gloomy picture, but it is true. It shows the financial condition of the wheat farmer. In my State there are many counties that have voted to bond themselves for upward of \$300,000, to be used in the purchase of seed, to be sold to the farmers on time. Does that indicate that these people have made an unduly large amount of money? On the other hand, does it not indicate that they have been discriminated against and that they are unable to go on with their farming operations simply because they have not received as much for the product as it has cost them to produce it?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying, but I wondered why the farmers did not have the seed wheat. Did they not raise enough wheat for seed or did they sell all the wheat they raised without reserving any for seed?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I think the State raised more than enough to meet the seed requirements. In the so-called Red River Valley we raised a good crop. In the western section of the State the farmers averaged about from 2 bushels to 3 bushels to the acre, and that would have been more than enough for seed. The quality was exceptionally good; we raised no poor wheat in our State this year because we had a dry season, but every bushel of wheat cost them a great deal more than they received for it. The average for the State was about 7 bushels, and any man who knows anything about the cost of cultivating an acre of ground in the West knows that it can not be done for \$14 an acre, without even taking into consideration the cost on the investment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What I am trying to get at is, why the farmers parted with their seed wheat? I supposed their primary duty was to keep enough wheat for next year's seed.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator that the reason why they parted with the seed was that they had to sell in order to meet certain obligations and in order to get something to eat, something to live on. That is the condition.

Mr. President, as I said, I shall not oppose this amendment; but I believe, as my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] said, that we should have appropriated more money for the destruction of the barberry bush, and we should also change the language so that we could be sure that we could use the money for its destruction. The language of this provision is to enable the department to study and to learn something about these insects. Why, we know what is to be done. It is the same with the barberry bush as it is with the cattle tick. All you have to do is simply to get the men and means to do it, to eradicate it, to get ride of it. That is all there is to it; and I doubt whether the Agricultural Department will let us use any of this money for the real destruction of the barberry bush.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, then, the Senator wants to change the language so that it can be appropriated for the purpose of being used in cooperation with the State authorities for the destruction of the barberry bush. Is that it?

Mr. GRONNA. Exactly. That is what I should like to have done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it is known that that is the cause of this spore, it seems to me evident that there ought to be no

indefiniteness about the language which will prevent its being used for the purpose of reaching the evil.

Mr. GRONNA. That is exactly the truth. There is no need of further study of it, because, as my colleague has said, practically all the scientists agree that it originates in the barberry bush, and all we have to do to eradicate this evil is simply to destroy the barberry bush.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee again, I am not complaining at all against a proper appropriation to be expended in prizes. I agree that it may stimulate production to some extent, but I want the earnest and serious consideration of the chairman to this point:

He provides for an appropriation of \$250,000 to be expended in prizes to stimulate production. He thinks that that may stimulate production \$500,000, half a million dollars, in value. Possibly that is true; but what is more important than increasing the production half a million dollars is to decrease the destruction \$100,000,000; and he appropriates only \$100,000 to meet this great ravage, which, my colleague says, amounted in our State alone to more than \$100,000,000 in a single year, while he appropriates \$250,000, or two and a half times as much, to stimulate production which he himself thinks might produce half a million dollars more. It is the disproportion in the matter of these appropriations that appeals to me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. The Senator does not have to reason with me about the importance of this matter. I have no objection. I hope the language will be changed, if a change be necessary or even desirable, so as to authorize the use of this money for the extermination of the barberry bush. I will say to the Senator that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry increased the estimate for the rust \$50,000. We were venture some enough to increase that appropriation \$50,000 without any special permit to do so. If that is not enough, I am willing to go farther, and I am willing to go faster. I doubt if anybody will go farther or faster than I will go in advocacy of any proposition which really promises, on the one hand, to stimulate production, to increase production, or, on the other hand, to obviate the artificial, arbitrary, or accidental destruction of production. I think that both purposes ought to be studiously observed. They are the same in effect.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say to the Senator that I think the language of the bill as proposed is sufficient to cover destruction. I do not think it is absolutely necessary as a matter of fact, although I think it is preferable to insert the words "for the destruction," because the provision is that \$100,000 shall be set aside for the investigation and control of these diseases; and if the only method of control is the destruction of the barberry bush, where the germ originates, then I should think that that was broad enough to cover it. But I want to say to the Senator that before we get through with this bill I shall ask to have that \$100,000 increased to \$250,000, and I hope the Senator will agree also to an amendment that it shall be used in the investigation and the destruction of this particular bush. As I stated before, that can not be done without the assistance of the several States; but I do not know of a single agricultural State, in the spring-wheat section at least, that would not find means to assist in getting rid of every such bush in the State.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think it would be very short-sighted for the Senate to overlook anything which might carry out the Senator's object and stay the ravages of the spores originating with the barberry bush. The only point I was making is that we are associating here, in this debate, two things which have no relation to each other. It is desirable to have an abundance of milk available for infants and growing children. It is also desirable to find ways and means to eradicate infantile paralysis, but there is no reason to diminish the supply of available milk in order to eradicate the paralysis. Let us do both. Let us offer these prizes to stimulate production, and let us eradicate the barberry bush and eradicate the rust. It seems to me that the proposition which the Senator from North Dakota has advocated is not inferior to the proposition touching the cattle tick which was discussed here this afternoon. They are of equal importance; and it would be extremely short-sighted on the part of the Senate to practice an unwise or niggardly economy in arresting the prosecution of that work of eradication.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that if he will offer an amendment to carry out his views, I think—

Mr. GORE. We have not reached it yet.

Mr. GRONNA. My amendment would not be to the particular question now under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think if the question is put again, the Chair will be satisfied.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 92, after line 20, in lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma proposes the following substitute:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate plants for the drying or dehydration of vegetables, fruits, and other edible products, including the erection or rent of necessary buildings and cooperation—

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, is the Secretary reading the substitute or the amendment reported by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary is reading the substitute of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The SECRETARY (continuing)—

with plants maintained and operated for the manufacture of such products, to purchase raw material, to standardize, sell, or otherwise dispose of dried products, and for all necessary expenses including salaries in Washington and elsewhere, \$250,000, which sum shall be immediately available upon the passage of this act, and this fund may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Secretary has read the substitute, but I do not remember his having read the committee amendment for which it is a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the committee amendment may be read also?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment of the committee.

The SECRETARY. On page 92, after line 20, the committee proposes to insert the following:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish plants for the drying and dehydration of vegetables, fruits, and other edible products, in connection with the land grant colleges in the several States, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may establish such plant at some other location in any particular State whenever in his judgment the public interest would be subserved thereby: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, establish such plant in any particular State in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, individuals, or associations not organized for profit, in which case the Secretary of Agriculture shall not pay more than one-half of the cost of establishing such plant.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I had not heard the substitute until it was read and did not know the Senator from Oklahoma was going to offer it. I have prepared an amendment that I was going to offer to the committee amendment, but I will offer it to the substitute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's statement, I think it would be better to pass over this matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to ask that it be passed over when my amendment is offered, so that it will be printed together with the substitute, because I expect to address the Senate at some length on this question of dehydration. I am not prepared to do it this evening.

I offer to the substitute the amendment that I send to the desk. It may be that it will not exactly correspond, because, as I say, I have had no opportunity to examine it; but if it does not, I will correct it later on, when it comes up before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Is there objection to the request that the amendment go over?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I hope it will take that course; and I ought to say, in justification of offering the substitute, that it was prepared by the department. I offered it without conference with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a substitute for the committee amendment, but, as Senators know, I did not anticipate that the bill would come up for consideration this afternoon.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the amendment that I send to the desk be read by the Secretary.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; let it be read, and then I will ask that the whole matter be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this an amendment to an amendment or an amendment to a substitute for an amendment?

Mr. NORRIS. No; my amendment is offered as an amendment to the substitute. I have a right, as a matter of course, under the rules, to offer this amendment. A substitute is subject to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the further consideration of this amendment will be postponed for the day.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have my amendment read before it goes over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt as to whether the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is in order.

Mr. NORRIS. I can be read, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; let it be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the substitute proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, upon request of the President, to use all or any part of this appropriation for the establishment of such plant or plants at any place in the United States for the purpose of supplying food for the Army and Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the further consideration of this amendment will be passed over. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was on page 93, after line 9, to insert:

Farmers' National Congress and Pan-American International Farm and Live-Stock Exposition.—To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make and exhibit illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the United States at the Pan-American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition, to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in conjunction with the Florida State Fair and Exposition, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$10,000.

The President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the Farmers' National Congress, to be held at Jacksonville, Fla., in connection with said Pan-American International Farm and Live-Stock Exposition: *Provided, That no appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates.*

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will inquire of the Senator if this is the first appropriation that has been made by the Government to assist the Pan-American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition to hold a session in conjunction with the Florida State Fair and Exposition, or any other State fair?

Mr. GORE. I will say that so far as I know this is the first appropriation; but the precedent was found in the appropriation for the International Dry Farming Congress, for which a series of appropriations has been made, extending over some five or six or seven years. At that congress exhibits are made from the various arid and semiarid States, and the Federal Government has been appropriating about \$20,000 a year, I think, with the possible omission of last year, to make an exhibit representing the National Government at this international exposition. I believe this year it is to meet at Kansas City. So far as I know, this is the first appropriation for this particular purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Then hereafter we will have an annual appropriation, will we, for the Farmers' National Congress and Pan-American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition?

Mr. GORE. I should not imagine so.

Mr. SMOOT. I think we will, if we start it.

Mr. GORE. I do not know anything that justifies that apprehension.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator and to the Senate that this suggestion arises by reason of a very important meeting in Jacksonville, at the time of this State fair and exposition, of the Farmers' National Congress in conjunction with the Pan-American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition. The Farmers' National Congress and the Pan-American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition are all holding sessions on the exposition grounds, the exposition furnishing the buildings and all that sort of thing. This is a small appropriation to exhibit there what the Government has to offer, showing its investigations, products, and processes relating to agriculture, but mainly live stock and matters of interest both to the Farmers' National Congress and to this international exposition. It is a small appropriation of only \$10,000. I think the Government usually makes those exhibits anyhow, but it is directly in line with precedents where these conventions or congresses have been held in Western States. In such cases appropriations similar to this have been made, but of a larger amount. I think it is entirely appropriate, and will be of very great advantage, because this Farmers' National Congress is itself a very large organization, and has a large membership, and is doing splendid work; and then, in addition to that, the International Farm and Live Stock Congress is a large organization, doing splendid work in that field. This is simply to furnish an exhibit there of the result of the investigations and studies of the Department of Agriculture, which will thus be carried to the members of these organizations that happen to be holding their session now at this exposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not at all surprised at the appropriation. Not only do I expect that this association will ask for \$10,000 or more each year, but I expect that there will be new organizations established in the future, and, seeing that the Government appropriates annually certain amounts for

these associations to meet at different parts of the country, they will be added to annually hereafter.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have not been able to attend the session this afternoon. I should like to have the Senator from Utah tell me briefly of what advantage the Government is going to be to this exposition down in Jacksonville, Fla., for which this \$10,000 is to be appropriated?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the only advantage is that unless the Government of the United States appropriates this money, perhaps the Farmers' National Congress and Pan American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition could not make a show at that State fair. They, perhaps, could not collect enough money in order to have their representatives down there. I think that is all there is to it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the United States to make an exhibit there, or to do anything as a Government which would be beneficial to the farmers?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there has been no appropriation for that purpose, and I doubt whether the Government does make an exhibit there. I think this is a Florida State fair and exposition.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the Senator from Michigan that the Florida State Fair & Exposition Co. is holding a State fair at Jacksonville. That happens to be going on. That fair will be held irrespective of any appropriation, and it is asking nothing from the Government. The Farmers' National Congress is not a Florida organization or a southern organization. The Pan American International Farm and Live Stock Exposition is not a southern organization nor a Florida organization. This is no appropriation made to either of those associations. This is simply to cover the expense of the Government making an exhibit where these organizations are holding their conventions. They happen to be holding them this time in Florida. If they had been held anywhere else we would not have heard a word about the matter, because the Government has appropriated year after year \$20,000 for these congresses to be held in the semiarid States, and nobody has ever raised any objection to that action. It has been going on year after year. It happens now that the proposition is to appropriate \$10,000 to cover the expense of an exhibit in Florida, and we hear a great deal of talk about it, and raise a lot of questions about it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What kind of an exhibit will the Government make down there?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Government has been making investigations and studies for years and years relative to the subjects in which this farmers' congress and this international congress are interested. I do not know what the exhibit covers. It covers a great deal; the result of their studies and investigations, and the point is to bring that result home to the members of the associations that are holding their convention at this point.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator believe that will be brought home to them in any other way than through lecturers sent out, possibly, Government representatives, and publications?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no; they carry there the actual exhibits of what has resulted from their studies appertaining to the live-stock industry, all the diseases and ailments of animals, and that sort of thing. That is of immense educational value to the people engaged in those industries. They carry out those exhibits in cases. The exhibits are very considerable, I think, and very instructive. This is a place and an opportunity to bring these things home to the people who are engaged in those industries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated again.

The Secretary again stated the pending amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he will not insert, after the word "shall," on page 94, line 2, the word "hereafter," so as to read:

Provided, That no appropriation shall hereafter be granted or used for the expenses of delegates.

I think that is the language that is generally used in the provisions affecting legislation of this sort.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection at all to that amendment, if the Senator desires to offer it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I move that the word "hereafter" be inserted after the word "shall," on line 2, page 94.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 4, after the words "Department of Agriculture," to strike out "\$26,943,773" and insert "\$28,058,933," so as to make the clause read:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$28,058,933.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that will not be the correct amount of the total appropriation; but I take it for granted that it is understood that the clerks will have the right to put in the exact figures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to correct the total.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the entomologist of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi, treating of the sweet-potato weevil—a new bug to me, but it seems he has been busy in the sweet-potato business for some years, and has operated extensively in the States of Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama. He has been in Florida for very many years, and the people of the State of Florida have spent a great deal of money in the effort to exterminate this rapacious little bug. The importance of destroying the pests is seen in the fact that unless something is done to stop the ravages of this little insect it will materially reduce the great crop of potatoes, which amounts annually to something like \$90,000,000. The sweet potato is a valuable article of food, and at this time anything that interferes with its production is an evil to be feared. The matter calls for prompt and vigorous attention on the part of the Government.

I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD an amendment, which I shall offer to-morrow or when the bill comes up for consideration, carrying an appropriation of \$25,000 for the investigation and possible extermination of the pest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be included in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

MISSISSIPPI AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Agricultural College, Miss., February 21, 1918.

Senator JAMES K. VARDAMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VARDAMAN: I understand that an effort is being made to get an appropriation from Congress to be used in a campaign to eradicate the sweet-potato weevil, *Cylas formicarius*, from the Southern States, but that this item has been left out of the agricultural appropriation bill now before the Senate.

The sweet-potato weevil is by far the most serious insect pest of the sweet potato. From the nature of this insect it seems that it will not be a very difficult task to eradicate it. The insect seldom, if ever, flies, and is only known to feed upon the sweet potato and morning glory. At the present time our records show that this pest is only known to occur in four counties in Mississippi. These counties are Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, and Pearl River. We know of only 28 properties that are infested. There are probably many others that we do not know about. If steps are not taken to eradicate this pest, it will gradually spread to other properties until it becomes so generally distributed that eradication will be much more difficult. On one property in this State we found 99 per cent of the potatoes infested with these weevils, and on several other properties the infestations were as high as 85 to 90 per cent. In parts of Louisiana and Texas conditions are even worse, so far as this insect is concerned.

At this time, when we are in need of all kinds of foods, I believe that it is important that this pest be not allowed to spread further, and that every effort be made to eradicate it. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to carry on this work.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

R. W. HARNED, Entomologist.

The proposed amendment of Mr. VARDAMAN is as follows:

For applying such methods of eradication or control of the sweet-potato weevil as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, in cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$25,000, which shall be immediately available, and, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of sweet potatoes, sweet-potato plants, or other property injured or destroyed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent

in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., Monday, March 4, 1918), the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 5, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 2), 1918.

SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Ingwald C. Thoreson, of Utah, to be surveyor general of Utah. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Peter Hanson, of Utah, to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Albert F. Young, of Vernal, Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Vernal, Utah, vice Samuel L. Page, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

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

Lieut. Col. Edward A. Kreger, Judge Advocate.

TEMPORARY PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from August 5, 1917.

Maj. Lorenzo D. Gasser, Infantry.

To be major with rank from August 5, 1917.

Capt. Lorenzo D. Gasser, Infantry.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Frederick D. Sharp, Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from October 26 1917.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Mark A. Van Liew, Field Artillery, to be second lieutenant of Infantry with rank from October 26, 1917.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Edmund P. Lakeman to be postmaster at Haleyville, Ala., in place of W. H. Cleere, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

Archibald S. Rogers to be postmaster at Osceola, Ark., in place of Adah L. Roussan, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Elmer S. Slade to be postmaster at Callipatria, Cal., in place of Charles W. Brown, resigned.

Myrtle M. Crawford to be postmaster at Ceres, Cal., in place of C. H. Bronaugh, resigned.

COLORADO.

Marshall Q. Starr to be postmaster at Hayden, Colo., in place of Robert E. Norvell, resigned.

Cornelia C. Simpson to be postmaster at La Veta, Colo., in place of Fanny Hamilton Simpson, resigned.

FLORIDA.

Israel F. Titus to be postmaster at Lynn Haven, Fla., in place of Florida E. Gay, resigned.

GEORGIA.

Bessie Waldrop to be postmaster at Jackson, Ga., in place of I. J. Slaughter, resigned.

Joseph W. Osborn to be postmaster at Porterdale, Ga., in place of John A. Cowan, resigned.

HAWAII.

M. G. Santos to be postmaster at Lihue, Hawaii, in place of L. D. Timmons, not commissioned.

IDAHO.

Lida Cox to be postmaster at Rigby, Idaho, in place of Edmund Ellsworth, jr., resigned.

INDIANA.

Harry C. Harness to be postmaster at Hamlet, Ind., in place of George H. Weninger, resigned.

KANSAS.

Roy F. Santner to be postmaster at Glen Elder, Kans., in place of Alice W. Lee, removed.

KENTUCKY.

Henry H. Caudill to be postmaster at Morehead, Ky., in place of J. D. Caudill, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Floyd Sanford to be postmaster at Addison, Mich., in place of Herbert E. Iveson, resigned.

Frank G. Hamilton to be postmaster at Mesick, Mich., in place of Charles E. Dean, resigned.

William D. Colegrove to be postmaster at Remus, Mich., in place of Frederick H. Miller, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

Mabel C. Benson to be postmaster at Clara City, Minn., in place of Cornelius Berghuis, removed.

MISSISSIPPI.

Grey Jack to be postmaster at Scooba, Miss., in place of Elisha E. Jack, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Willard N. Bledsoe to be postmaster at Atlanta, Mo., in place of John H. Lyda, removed.

MONTANA.

Louis C. Bade to be postmaster at Bigtimber, Mont., in place of Augusta C. Sheridan, resigned.

Chauncey W. Griffin to be postmaster at Dodson, Mont., in place of Ovid J. Gagnon, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Clarence R. Miller to be postmaster at Circle, Mont., in place of Earl L. McClatchie, resigned. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

James S. Honnold to be postmaster at Joliet, Mont., in place of John B. Farrell, resigned.

NEW MEXICO.

Robert J. Lentz to be postmaster at Magdalene, N. Mex., in place of H. A. Hodges, resigned.

NEW YORK.

Lewis O. Wilson to be postmaster at Long Beach, N. Y., in place of Clinton A. Parsons, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Bessie F. Nicholson to be postmaster at Maxton, N. C., in place of O. C. Nicholson, deceased.

OHIO.

Fred W. Pace to be postmaster at Roseville, Ohio, in place of J. W. Stoneburner, resigned.

OREGON.

Charles M. Crittenden to be postmaster at Hubbard, Oreg., in place of Kenneth B. Grimm, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frederic P. Laub to be postmaster at Bath, Pa., in place of John J. Remaly, resigned.

Loyal G. Hoffman to be postmaster at Boswell, Pa., in place of Thomas J. McClelland, resigned.

John F. Henry to be postmaster at Cresco, Pa., in place of John A. Seguire, resigned.

Iva S. Martin to be postmaster at Masontown, Pa., in place of C. C. Sterling, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND.

James A. Wright to be postmaster at Wakefield, R. I., in place of J. Elmer Thewlis, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Jean C. Sloan to be postmaster at Pendleton, S. C., in place of Paul H. E. Sloan, jr., deceased.

Robert R. Miley to be postmaster at Walterboro, S. C., in place of J. Mitchell Witsell, resigned.

Richard W. Adams to be postmaster at Ridgeway, S. C., in place of H. W. Des Portes. Incumbent's commission expired August 6, 1916.

TEXAS.

Robert E. Watson to be postmaster at Crowell, Tex., in place of J. G. Witherspoon, resigned.

Grace Lemmon to be postmaster at Garland, Tex., in place of Nora Lemmon. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Hoyte H. Burchard to be postmaster at Harlingen, Tex., in place of Hugo J. Letzerich, removed.

Florence K. Winsett to be postmaster at Higgins, Tex., in place of J. W. Winsett, deceased.

William J. Hamlett to be postmaster at Milford, Tex., in place of Z. T. Bundy, deceased.

Sallie P. Lunday to be postmaster at Naples, Tex., in place of James M. Kennedy, deceased.

Ben B. Ward to be postmaster at Newcastle, Tex., in place of Henry C. Williams, resigned.

Annie Kilpatrick to be postmaster at Ratcliff, Tex., in place of Joe Green, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

G. C. Turner to be postmaster at Dante, Va., in place of R. W. Ervin, resigned.

Ethel V. Vaughan to be postmaster at Timberville, Va., in place of Charles E. Fahrney, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William E. McDowell to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W. Va., in place of J. Frank Grimet, resigned.

Armistead S. Lucas to be postmaster at Shepherdstown, W. Va., in place of William L. Reinhart, deceased.

WYOMING.

J. Arthur Mecham to be postmaster at Afton, Wyo., in place of William H. Cazier, removed.

Edith E. Sumner to be postmaster at Glenrock, Wyo., in place of Kinsler H. Padden, resigned.

Walter E. Patterson to be postmaster at Wheatland, Wyo., in place of Malcolm R. Merrill, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 2), 1918.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

William C. Hammer to be United States attorney, western district of North Carolina.

Francis H. Weston to be United States attorney, eastern district of South Carolina.

William W. Ray to be United States attorney, district of Utah.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Henry M. Cox to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky.

Aquila Nebeker to be United States marshal, district of Utah.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Marion Flint Haralson to be assistant surgeon.

John Friend Mahoney to be assistant surgeon.

Hugh David Ward to be assistant surgeon.

POSTMASTER.

ILLINOIS.

Patrick H. Fitzgerald, Tiskilwa.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders:

Eddie J. Estess,
James D. Moore,
William W. Wilson,
William H. Stiles, jr.,
Victor D. Herbster,
David F. Ducey,
Donald T. Hunter,
Cary W. Magruder,
Edmund W. Strother,
William H. Pashley,
Fred T. Berry,
William R. Purnell,
Edwin Guthrie,
James D. Smith,
Frederic T. Van Auker,
Marshall Collins,
Kinchin L. Hill,
Thomas C. Kinkaid,
Lee P. Warren,
Ernest F. Buck,
Allan G. Olson,
Charles M. James,
Ralph G. Walling,
Selah M. La Bounty,
Henry E. Parsons,
Harry G. Donald,
Abner M. Steckel,
John L. Schaffer,
Leland Jordan, jr.,
Edward G. Blakeslee,
John H. Everson,
Worrall R. Carter,
James G. Stevens,
Robert R. M. Emmet,
John C. Jennings,
Henry B. Le Bourgeois,
Paul J. Peyton,
Laurence S. Stewart,

Guy C. Barnes,
 William A. Hodgman,
 Cleveland McCauley,
 Martin J. Peterson,
 Robert E. Rogers,
 Samuel S. Payne,
 Leslie C. Davis,
 Harry H. Forgas,
 Franklin P. Conger,
 Raymond G. Thomas,
 Aquilla G. Dibrell,
 Henry D. McGuire,
 Edward H. Connor,
 William B. Cothran,
 Theodore S. Wilkinson, jr.,
 William W. Smith,
 David I. Hedrick,
 Olaf M. Hustvedt,
 Harold T. Smith,
 Cummings L. Lothrop, jr.,
 Preston B. Haines,
 Gerard Bradford,
 Mark L. Hersey, jr.,
 Frank T. Leighton,
 Alva D. Bernhard,
 Chester S. Roberts,
 Penn L. Carroll,
 Benjamin V. McCandlish,
 Daniel A. McElduff,
 Arthur S. Dysart,
 Hugh P. Le Clair,
 Edmund S. R. Brandt,
 Harold S. Burdick,
 James D. Maloney,
 Alan G. Kirk,
 Fitzhugh Green,
 Levi B. Bye,
 Granville B. Hoey,
 Tracy L. McCauley,
 Francis W. Scanland,
 Joel W. Bunkley,
 Max B. De Mott,
 Ernest J. Blankenship,
 John J. Saxer,
 Leo L. Lindley,
 Harold C. Train,
 Wallace L. Lind,
 Richard McC. Elliot, jr.,
 Lee P. Johnson,
 Monroe Kelly,
 Marion C. Robertson,
 Edward C. Raguet,
 Ward W. Waddell,
 Charles C. Davis,
 Robert R. Paunack,
 Frank D. Manock,
 George K. Stoddard,
 Williams C. Wickham,
 Freeland A. Daubin,
 Hugh V. McCabe, and
 Claude S. Gillette.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

James A. Scott,
 Julius W. Simms,
 William E. Miller,
 George F. Chapline,
 Douglas C. Woodward,
 William J. Forrestel,
 Armistead C. Rogers,
 John S. Roberts,
 John D. Price,
 Norman O. Wynkoop,
 James B. Ryan,
 William W. Schott,
 Sidney W. Kirtland,
 Joseph H. Lawson,
 Stanwix G. Mayfield, jr.,
 Richard E. Webb,
 Edwin F. Cochran,
 Charles T. Gilliam,
 Gilbert C. Hoover,
 Thomas V. Cooper,
 Walter S. Carrington,
 Newbold T. Lawrence, jr.,

Roy K. Jones,
 Martin B. Stonestreet,
 Herman J. Redfield,
 Richard H. Jones,
 Lowell Cooper,
 Linton Herndon,
 Andrew C. McFall,
 Leon F. Brown,
 Herbert S. Jones,
 Herbert J. Grassie,
 Robert N. Kennedy,
 Isaiah Parker,
 Carl H. Hilton,
 Chaplin E. Evans,
 James K. Davis,
 George D. Price,
 Cassin Young,
 Carlyle Craig,
 Knefler McGinnis,
 James P. Compton,
 George G. Robertson,
 Fred W. Connor,
 Dallas Wait,
 Frederick E. Haeberle,
 John E. Ostrander, jr.,
 Edmund E. Brady, jr.,
 Houston L. Maples,
 George W. McIver, jr.,
 Henry R. Oster,
 Randall E. Dees,
 Colin Campbell,
 Paul W. F. Huschke,
 Theodore L. Schumacher,
 Clarence W. Johnson,
 Douglas W. Coe,
 Frank G. Fahrion,
 Albert Noble,
 Norborne L. Rawlings,
 Ingolf N. Kiland,
 Frank H. Dean,
 Edward A. Mitchell,
 Harold S. Klein,
 Alexander D. Douglas,
 Lawrence Wainwright,
 Homer N. Wallin,
 Donald B. Duncan,
 Sydney J. Wynne,
 Earle E. Muschitz,
 Robert B. Dashiell,
 Julian L. Woodruff,
 John O'D. Richmond,
 David C. Fox,
 Andrew G. Shepard,
 Simon P. Pullinwider,
 Lisle F. Small,
 William P. O. Clarke,
 Edmund B. Caldwell,
 Jay K. Allen,
 Nicholas Vytlačil,
 Stanton H. Wooster,
 Edward B. Rogers,
 George T. Howard,
 Charles L. Hayden,
 Robert L. Randolph, jr.,
 Robert G. Tobin,
 Theodore M. Waldschmidt,
 Herbert B. Knowles,
 Adolph P. Schneider,
 Anson A. Bigelow,
 Robert R. Ogg,
 John C. Tyler,
 Harold B. Sallada,
 Benjamin Buchalter,
 George R. Fairlamb, jr.,
 Joseph W. Gregory,
 John R. Cruse,
 John T. Metcalf,
 Ross F. Collins,
 Benjamin F. Staud,
 Paul F. Shortridge,
 Francis C. Denebrink,
 John J. Twomey,
 Felix B. Stump,
 Robert B. Matthews,
 Hugh St. C. Sense,

Walter C. Calhoun,
 Carl F. Holden,
 Lester J. Hudson,
 Kingsland Dunwoody,
 Samuel B. Brewer,
 Vincent J. Moore,
 Frank W. Lively,
 James H. Conyne,
 Davenport Browne,
 Frederic W. Neilson,
 Franklin S. Irby,
 Allen I. Price,
 Colin DeV. Headlee,
 Byron K. Presnell,
 Merrill Comstock,
 Robert W. McReynolds, jr.,
 Richard W. Gruelick,
 Harrison Avery,
 Paul U. Tevis,
 Leonard Doughty, jr.,
 Wilbur V. Shown,
 Hanson E. Ely, jr.,
 George K. Weber,
 Ralph U. Hyde,
 William F. Dietrich,
 Ralph Wyman,
 Andrew G. Reaves,
 George C. Cummings,
 Richard H. Harper,
 George M. Keller,
 John B. Heffernan,
 Edward J. Moran,
 Harry C. Blodgett,
 John H. Keefe,
 Elliott M. Senn,
 Francis W. Benson,
 Thomas R. Cooley, jr.,
 Vernon F. Grant,
 George L. Harriess,
 Francis T. Spellman,
 Homer W. Clark,
 Carl L. Hansen,
 Edward Sparrow,
 Ben H. Wyatt,
 Robert L. Porter, jr.,
 Ward P. Davis,
 Guido F. Forster,
 Volney O. Clark,
 Edward H. Jones,
 Gaile A. Poindexter,
 Earl W. Morris,
 Robert W. Fleming,
 Thomas B. Hendley,
 William J. Morcock,
 Kenneth L. Coontz,
 Karl Keller,
 Howard F. Council,
 Robert E. Keating,
 Philip W. Warren,
 John N. Walton,
 Earl S. Hurlbut,
 Allan R. McCann,
 Evan G. Hanson,
 Herbert W. Anderson,
 William G. Ludlow, jr.,
 Carl W. Brewington,
 Leonard B. Austin,
 Chester McK. Holton,
 John H. Jenkins,
 Leonard P. Wessell,
 Emile Topp,
 Frank L. Worden,
 Donald R. Evans,
 Frank J. Hanafée,
 Andrew R. Mack,
 John G. M. Stone,
 Ralph F. Skylstead,
 Clarence O. Ward,
 Guy W. Clark,
 Thomas D. Ross,
 James P. Conover, jr.,
 John V. Murphy,
 Francis A. Smith,
 Peyton H. Park,
 Conrad L. Jacobsen,

Kenneth Floyd-Jones,
 William McK. Reifel,
 William H. Ball,
 Laurence P. Sargent,
 Seabury Cook,
 Constantine N. Perkins,
 Rollin V. A. Failing,
 Benjamin O. Wells,
 Laurence E. Kelly,
 Herbert V. Wiley,
 Douglas A. Spencer,
 John J. Bartholdi,
 Charles W. Weitzel,
 Harold F. Ely,
 Isidore Lehrfeld,
 Stephen E. Dillon,
 John H. Forshe, jr.,
 William S. B. Claude,
 William S. Heath,
 Guy B. Hoover,
 Kenneth M. Hoeffel,
 Joseph W. Paige,
 Forrest P. Sherman,
 William R. Nichols,
 Ernest B. Colton,
 Joseph W. Fowler,
 William H. Hopkins, jr.,
 William J. Malone,
 Oscar H. Holtmann,
 Lawrence B. Richardson,
 James Fife, jr.,
 Moses B. Byington, jr.,
 Frank R. Dodge,
 George T. Cuddihy,
 William W. Warlick,
 Vincent R. Murphy,
 Ralph S. McDowell,
 Henry A. Hutchins, jr.,
 Charles W. Styer,
 Thomas L. Sprague,
 Owen E. Grimm,
 Einar R. Johnson,
 Martin J. Connolly,
 Pal L. Meadows,
 John D. Crecca,
 Frederick L. Douthit,
 Frederick S. Holmes,
 Thomas B. Inglis,
 Earl E. Stone,
 James D. Jacobs,
 John J. Ballentine,
 Edwin H. Price,
 Everett B. Browne,
 John R. Sullivan,
 James V. B. Lawyer,
 John D. Alvis,
 John N. Whelan,
 Daniel W. Tomlinson, 4th,
 Edward F. McCartin,
 Hayden H. Smith, and
 Donald A. Green.
 The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
 Emory F. Hosmer,
 Ernest Hellmann,
 Otto J. W. Haltnorth,
 Percy H. Bierce,
 Franklin E. Chester,
 Frank G. Mehling,
 James J. O'Brien,
 Edward Crouch,
 William DeFries,
 John B. Hupp,
 Daniel Dowling,
 Edward C. Wurster,
 Arthur B. Dorsey,
 Arthur D. Freshman,
 Gustav C. Tanske,
 Leroy Rodd,
 Charles W. A. Campbell,
 Edward Wenk,
 Frank C. Wisker,
 Louis M. Wegat,
 Harry E. Stevens,
 David P. Henderson,
 Harry A. Pinkerton,

Herman Kossler,
 Oscar E. Anderson,
 Henry McEvoy,
 Lawrence Wittmann,
 Alvin E. Skinner,
 Joseph Chamberlin,
 Newton R. George,
 Ralph G. Moody,
 John McN. D. Knowles,
 Robert G. Greenleaf,
 Charles F. Beecher,
 Frank R. King,
 William H. Hubbard,
 James MacIntyre,
 Ernest W. Dohle,
 Stephen H. Badgett,
 Jonathan H. Warman,
 Walter M. Shipley,
 John C. Parker,
 Charles O. Hathaway,
 James M. Berlin,
 Walter Lau,
 Robert B. Sanford, jr.,
 Charles D. Welker,
 Rufus H. Bush,
 John E. Burger,
 Patrick J. Solon,
 Francis A. Pippo,
 Joseph W. Bettens,
 Frank Bruce,
 Michael J. Conlon,
 Henry W. Stratton,
 Clyde Keene,
 George C. Smith,
 William Seyford,
 Gottlieb Sherer,
 George E. Maynard,
 Arthur B. McCrary,
 Axel Lindblad,
 Seldon L. Almon,
 William E. O'Connor,
 William Twigg, jr.,
 Frederick R. Kalde,
 Burton W. Lambert,
 Allen I. Seaman,
 William D. Dadd,
 Charles Swanberg,
 Malcolm C. Davis,
 William H. Muehlhause,
 Leroy Neil,
 Oscar D. Parker,
 John A. Ward,
 John C. Hines,
 John Gallagher,
 George W. Robbins,
 Cyrus S. Hansel,
 Ernest A. Healy,
 Frederick G. Keyes,
 William Eberlin,
 Frederick Petry,
 John Meyer,
 Frederick Evans,
 Godfrey P. Schurz,
 Clarence L. Tibbals,
 Thomas J. Bristol,
 William Taylor,
 Daniel F. Mulvihill,
 Michael J. Bresnahan,
 Lafayette P. Guy,
 Edmond Delavy,
 Frank J. Mayer,
 Horace de B. Dougherty,
 James J. Joyce,
 Fred Rasmussen,
 Warner K. Bigger,
 Frank Schultz,
 Joseph Sperl,
 Daniel J. Sullivan,
 David F. Mead,
 Edwin W. Hill,
 Henry A. Lowell,
 Charles Antrobus,
 Oliver T. Miller,
 August Logan,
 John J. Coyle,

George F. Blass,
 Walter S. Belknap,
 George C. Lacock,
 Anton Hengst,
 John W. Boldt,
 Fred San Soucie,
 Claude S. Padgett,
 Howard H. Chambers,
 Percy R. Abrams,
 Vincent F. LeVerne,
 Charles E. Briggs,
 George B. Llewellyn,
 William C. Milligan,
 Frederick J. Legere,
 James Reilly,
 John H. MacDonald,
 William A. James,
 William A. Fulkerson,
 Jerry C. Holmes,
 Conrad T. Goertz,
 Edwin R. Wroughton,
 William E. Cook,
 Lewis H. Cutting,
 Ernest L. Jones,
 William C. Carpenter,
 Murry Wollfe,
 Charles L. Greene,
 Arthur T. Brill,
 Ward T. Hall,
 Michael Garland,
 Erich Richter,
 John C. Heck,
 James L. McKenna,
 George W. Waldo,
 Anthony E. Bentfeld,
 Arthur Boquett,
 John Harder,
 Sigvart Thompson,
 Stephen A. Farrell,
 William A. Vick,
 John J. Welch,
 Arthur S. Rollins,
 Charles C. Stotz,
 John C. Maxon,
 Bailey E. Rigg,
 Walter A. Buckley,
 Frank E. Nelson,
 Norman McL. McDonald,
 Philip S. Flint,
 Charles W. Wagner,
 Henry A. Reynolds,
 George F. Veth,
 James E. Kemmer,
 James A. Newell,
 William W. Holton,
 Fred C. Wolf,
 Charles J. Naprstek,
 Max Bayer,
 Paxton Hotchkiss,
 Leon W. Knight,
 Harry M. Peaco,
 Henry H. Beck,
 Frank F. Webster,
 John Reber,
 Charles N. Koch,
 Fred T. Rider,
 William S. Evans,
 Sofus K. Sorensen,
 George J. Romulus,
 Arthur L. Heeykell,
 Charles King,
 Quintus R. Thomson, jr.,
 Ora A. Martin,
 John A. Pierce,
 Stephen Ingham,
 William R. Spear,
 William T. Shaw,
 Roy K. Madill,
 William R. McFarlane,
 Nils Anderson,
 Melvin C. Kent,
 John E. Armstrong,
 Albert C. Fraenzel,
 William A. Martin,
 Ralph B. Wallace,

James Roberts,
Joseph D. Glick,
Anthony Prastka,
Joseph W. Birk,
Edmund D. Duckett,
Raymond A. Walker,
Hermann Jorgensen,
Charles F. Dame,
Arthur J. Holton,
Vincent Benedict,
Ola D. Butler,
Edgar C. Wortman,
Joseph G. N. Johnson,
David Duffy,
Clyde H. McLellon,
Noel Chatillon,
William F. Schlegel,
Lee W. Drisco,
James J. Delany,
William H. Stephenson,
Arthur E. Rice,
John P. Millon,
Frank L. Elkins,
Sol Shaw,
Ernest J. Leonard,
Thomas J. Sullivan,
John P. Sasse,
Will Mueller,
John H. Chase,
Will S. Holloway,
George J. Blessing,
James D. Brown,
Patrick H. Cassidy,
Frank A. Manuel,
Frank Flaherty,
Arthur A. F. Alm,
Bennett McC. Proctor,
James Donaldson,
John A. Silva,
James Hauser,
John E. Sullivan,
Charles A. Armstrong,
Chauncey R. Doll,
James S. Trayer,
Gregoire F. J. Labelle,
Theodore Andersen,
Henry Hartley,
Eugene J. Friele,
Philip J. Kelly,
Alfred Doucet,
William E. Benson,
Fred C. A. Plagemann,
Peter J. Gundlach,
Albert M. Hinman,
Leon W. Becker,
William Cox,
Stephen A. Loftus,
Herman C. Schrader,
Asa V. B. Watson,
William A. Eaton,
James M. MacDonnell,
Herbert R. Mytinger,
Harold A. Turner,
Charles B. Bradley,
Curry E. Eason,
Samuel C. Washington,
Brice H. Mack,
James A. Featherston,
Walter N. Fanning,
Herbert J. Meneratti,
Niels Drustrup,
Abraham DeSomer,
George Bradley,
Donald McDonald,
Warren E. Magee,
Robert J. Kingsmill,
Charles F. Merrill,
Charles B. Shackelton,
Benjamin F. Ranger,
Robert C. McClure,
Carl S. Chapman,
George C. Martin,
Wilmer W. Weber,
Mark Strosk,
William W. Wilkins,

Helge Ohlsson,
Elroy G. True,
James W. O'Leary,
Warren H. Langdon,
Andrew C. Skinner,
Emery Smith,
Benjamin F. Maddox,
George Keeser,
John A. Rogers,
Alfred E. Raue,
John C. Richards,
Frank W. Yurasko,
Albert H. Mellien,
Philip A. Astoria,
Thomas A. Graham,
William A. Mason,
Everest A. Whited,
John F. Murphy,
Charles A. Kohls,
Clarence R. Rockwell,
Paul E. Kuter,
William E. Snyder,
David McWhorter, jr.,
George H. Kellogg,
Elery A. Zehner,
Samuel E. Lee,
Frank Stinchcomb,
Simon L. Shade,
Ludwig W. Gumz,
Wildon A. Ott,
Hugh W. Nimmo,
Junius G. Sanders,
Frederick B. Webber,
George T. Campbell,
Charles A. Dannemann,
Harold G. Billings,
Albert E. Freed,
Frank Kinne,
Andrew N. Anderson,
Frank C. Nigg,
Frank Kerr,
Arthur H. Cummings,
Harry J. Hansen,
Rony Snyder,
Newcomb L. Damon,
Jack K. Campbell,
George Kleinsmith,
Albert G. Martin,
Daniel McCallum,
John M. Buckley,
John J. Madden,
Robert Semple,
Henry H. Fowler,
Stanley H. Sacker,
Elmer J. McCluen,
John M. Kirkpatrick,
Clyde Lovelace,
Claude B. Arney,
Martin Dickinson,
Jesse J. Alexander,
John J. Enders,
Jesse J. Oettinger,
William H. Farrel,
Thomas M. Buck,
John Shottroff,
John Whalen,
Raymond C. McDuffie,
Oscar Benson,
William Martin,
John S. Conover,
Fayette Myers,
John G. M. Johnson,
Frederick Clifford,
Alexander Anderson,
Frederick T. Walling,
Charles V. Kane,
Joseph M. Gately,
Joseph H. Gerrior,
George S. Dean,
Ralph A. Laird, and
Charles F. Fielding.

Capt. Arthur B. Owens to be a major in the Marine Corps.
Capt. Clarke H. Wells to be a major in the Marine Corps.
The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the
Marine Corps:

Harry Paul, and
William Workman.
The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants
in the Marine Corps:
Frank R. Armstead, and
Lee H. Brown.
First Lieut. Ethelbert Talbot to be a captain in the Marine
Corps.
Francis B. Reed to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *March 4, 1918.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, source of all good, help us to concentrate our wisdom, power, and influence, with our allies, with whom we are associated, against the powers of evil; that we may overcome their machinations and inhuman desires; and bring order out of chaos, peace out of war, righteousness out of evil, and establish liberty, truth, justice, righteousness in the heart of mankind; that Thy Kingdom may come in all its fullness, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journals of the proceedings of Saturday, March 2, and Sunday, March 3, 1918, were read and approved.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. This is Unanimous-Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will report the first bill on that calendar.

RESERVE OF THE PUBLIC-HEALTH SERVICE.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was S. J. Res. 63, to establish a reserve of the Public-Health Service.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think that where bills have been passed over twice already they ought to go to the foot of the calendar. They ought not to be allowed to clog the calendar, and I suggest that if this joint resolution is passed over it be with that understanding—that it go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. BORLAND. Why is it to be passed over? This is a very important measure, and it seems to me we might pass it.

Mr. COADY. It is a very important measure, but I understand there is objection to it on the part of some Members.

Mr. BORLAND. The need for this public-health reserve is critical right now.

Mr. COADY. I agree with the gentleman. I would have it considered now if I felt that there would be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland to pass this joint resolution over without prejudice?

Mr. FOSTER. If it goes to the foot of the calendar I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Yes; but there is no rule to put it at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to the matter being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. But the trouble about that is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] does have objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is hardly fair that a bill should be passed over day after day and retain its position at the head of the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in that particular? If the Chair will indulge me just a moment, I think there is considerable merit in the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]. I think that the Committee on Rules should bring in a rule providing for the consideration of bills on Unanimous-Consent Calendar day, so that the call of committees shall begin where it left off on the last preceding unanimous-consent day. Under the existing practice we rarely get to the bills that have been recently placed on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. All this is out of order. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] objected to the present consideration of this joint resolution, and it will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 294) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Missouri.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over and put at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. I object to the consideration of the bill, and also to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects to the whole thing. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was Senate joint resolution 110, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education," approved February 23, 1917.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over informally.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent that joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida allow me?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The matter covered by this joint resolution was taken care of in the deficiency appropriation bill that recently passed the House, and there can be no need of it in case the item is agreed to in the Senate as it passed the House. I have no objection, however, to letting this matter go over until it is known whether the Senate agrees to the provision as incorporated in the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. To take its place at the foot of the line, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is all right, Mr. Speaker. We understand each other.

The SPEAKER. To be placed at the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will allow me, I think there ought not to be any blanket authority granted to any officer of the Government to go where he pleases and when he pleases to put up buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We are not talking about buildings. This is the educational matter.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought it was the building bill. This is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to passing this joint resolution over and putting it at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to state my reason. It will take only a moment to do it.

My colleague [Mr. SEARS] is interested in the joint resolution and made the report. He is before a very important meeting of the Committee on Agriculture. I want it passed until he can be here on the floor.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over temporarily, so that it may be called up again to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST OFFICES AT GLENDALE AND ALHAMBRA, CAL.

The next business on the calendar for unanimous consent was the bill (H. R. 7230) to amend the postal laws.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to reestablish two post offices in California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I feel inclined from the information I now have in my possession to