

agricultural purposes or based on live-stock may extend to one year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 11087) to prescribe the personnel of the Army Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps and the conditions under which they may be retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11088) providing for the construction of ice piers in the harbor of Louisa, Ky., on the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNING: Resolution (H. Res. 292) to pay to John E. Nicol, clerk to the late John H. Capstick, a Representative in Congress, \$166.66; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution (H. Res. 293) providing for the immediate consideration of bills on the calendar from the Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 294) to pay Gardner Anthony, son of W. H. Anthony, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to six months' compensation; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 269) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1918 and 1919; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 11089) granting an increase of pension to George C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11091) granting an increase of pension to Stewart N. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11092) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Dysard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 11093) granting a pension to Edward B. Bangs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11094) granting an increase of Pension to William Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11095) granting an increase of pension to William Mitchell, alias William Terow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11096) granting an increase of pension to John T. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 11097) granting an increase of pension to Edward Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11098) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11099) granting a pension to Isabel B. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Milwaukee Association of Life Underwriters against tax in war revenue bill on certain life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the faculty of Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa, protesting against the second-class postage amendment to the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Roziene, president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, relative to unexpended balance of money granted the organization by the Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the Philadelphia Annual Conference pledging unswerving loyalty to the President and our country in the successful prosecution of the war; urging immediate war prohibition, the establishment of a dry zone in Philadelphia, and the enactment of laws meting out to German propagandists and traitorous Americans the full penalty of spies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the Shut-in Society of New York City, asking for the repeal of the periodical postage increase law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of Joel McCallister and C. A. Shank, of Clarkston, Wash., on maintaining chaplains in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Devils Lake Journal of Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Illinois Women's Clubs, favoring a kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of T. W. Fisher, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Warnock & Sons, of Loveland, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. Dawn, Ida B. Thompson, Mrs. W. E. Mason, Joy L. Reichelt, Mrs. W. B. Floyd, Mrs. Etta K. Siple, and 11 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of W. W. Scott and 50 men of the Kirkwood Presbyterian Church, of Bridgeport, Ohio, favoring closing American saloons during the present war, and to prevent export of grains to foreign countries to be used in manufacture of distilled or malt liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of certain farmers of the Northwest through the Farm, Stock, and Home, of Minneapolis, asking that the price of 1918 wheat be raised to \$2.75 per bushel; also asking that the draft be revised to the end that farm labor be largely exempted; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 28, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we lift up our souls unto Thee. In the midst of the world war we put our trust in Thee. At this critical hour in the awful conflict we look more steadfastly to Thee. O Thou God of battles, Thou God of Moses, and of Gideon, and of David in the battles of long ago, direct our cause, and let not our enemies triumph over us. O God, in Thy name we stand for the great principles which Thou hast projected in the world. We stand for justice and righteousness for all men and for all nations; and we look to Thee as the great Captain of our salvation to direct us aright.

O Thou, who art mighty in battle, save our cause. Give grace and wisdom and courage to all our leaders and lead on our armies to honor and to victory and to a lasting peace. Speed on the triumph of the day when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth and there shall be the resurrection of a new day, with peace on earth and good will to men. We ask it in the name of Christ, the Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in extra session, 1918, relative to the inclusion of the State of South Dakota in a list of certain States affected by legislation appropriating money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed, grain, and feed for stock. I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota assembled in extraordinary session at the State capital, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That whereas there has been a bill introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 7795) to appropriate money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed grain and feed for stock in certain enumerated Northwestern States, of which South Dakota is specifically named, as one needing such Government aid;

"And whereas South Dakota is now honestly advertising the prosperity of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislature now in extraordinary session, with representatives present from all sections of the State, singly and collectively declare that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, the farmers of South Dakota are not asking for Federal aid to procure seed and feed; and that the State is amply able and willing to aid, if necessary, any farmer who needs aid, and that the few individual or isolated cases that may exist, if any, can and will be taken care of either by township or county aid. And further that the advertising South Dakota has received through 'H. R. 7795' has done her a great injustice, as South Dakota has never been more prosperous than now, as proved by competent authority; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of the senate and delivered by United States mail to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota now serving in the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

W. H. McMASTER,
President of the Senate.
W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.
A. C. ROBERTS,
Speaker of the House.
C. W. GARDNER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a letter relative to the vote taken in the Senate last week on fixing the minimum price of wheat, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOLDEN, MISS., March 22, 1918.

HON. KENNETH D. McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: I read to-day with interest the vote in the Senate yesterday on fixing the minimum price of \$2.50 on wheat. I heartily congratulate you upon being amongst those 18 that voted against it, though I have the largest acreage in wheat in this section of the country (so a Government demonstration agent advised me). I can not see the justice in fixing such an exorbitant and extortionate price on this commodity. It strikes me as being willing to pay a premium on disloyalty. In fact, I believe the law of legitimate supply and demand should govern the prices of all farm products, especially staples. Wheat above everything else, is one of the cheapest crops grown, and good money is to be made out of wheat by the farmer at \$1.25 a bushel, with a normal yield, even taking into consideration the present high cost of living.

Again congratulating you on your vote,

Sincerely, yours,

CHAS. P. WOFFORD.

Mr. McNARY. I have a petition signed by several thousand citizens of Oregon asking that Congress forthwith take action to pass a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities. I ask that it be read omitting the names, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that a similar petition has just been read.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary without reading.

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

Petition of the people of the United States of America to the Congress at Washington.

Whereas the security of the United States and the success of our arms are endangered by the activities of disloyal persons and organizations within the border of our country.

We, the citizens of the United States whose names are hereto subscribed, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or for the publication of public utterances, tending to impede or to interfere with the operations or success of the United States in war, or recruiting or enlistments tending to hold the United States or any of our allies up to ridicule or obloquy, or to cause disloyalty or refusal of duty on the part of any person in connection with the war.

Mr. McNARY. I have another petition from members of the Southern Oregon Medical Association asking for the support of Senate bill 3748, giving advanced rank to officers in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army, which I move be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARDING. I present resolutions passed by the mayor's advisory war committee, of Cleveland, Ohio, asking for the enactment of the bill to rescind the charter of the German-American Alliance, and also a resolution from the Business Men's Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio, calling for more drastic treatment of enemy aliens and those in our country who violate American hospitality. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY OF CLEVELAND,
MAYOR'S ADVISORY WAR COMMITTEE,
Cleveland, March 22, 1918.

Upon motion of W. A. Greenlund, seconded by Charles A. Otis, the following resolution was presented to the executive committee of the mayor's advisory war committee and unanimously adopted:

Whereas there is a bill now pending in Congress to rescind the charter of the German-American Alliance:

Resolved, That the mayor's advisory war committee recommend the passage of this bill and ask the Members of Congress and Senators from Ohio to use every effort to accomplish this result.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Members of Congress from Ohio.

HARRY L. VAIL,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution of the Business Men's Club, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

Whereas we believe that there is in operation in this country to-day an extensive German spy system, consisting of not only military and political spies but also of that more detestable and dangerous type of spy, viz, destructionists, disease spreaders, industrial disorganizers, and pro-German propagandists—all posing as patriotic American citizens, and operating in the same manner and under the same direction as in Russia and other allied countries; and

Whereas this spy system is becoming more efficient and more active from day to day, and the "Hun within" constitutes a more dangerous and detestable enemy than the "Hun without"; and

Whereas it is our opinion that this vast and thoroughly organized menace can not be suppressed merely by internment, and the fresh air, three square meals, and entertainment features which accompany the same, or by mere arrest and subsequent parole on good behavior; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the time has come for a decisive and firm handling of this Hun menace, and a meting out to any and all offenders of the same measure of justice as is administered in Germany or Austria: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we hereby protest against the parole of any and all alien enemies violating our neutrality laws or regulations; that we respectfully recommend that all interned aliens be immediately put to work at some useful and productive occupation, and that treasonable violations of our neutrality laws or regulations be punished by ordering the violators before a firing squad; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, and our Representatives in Congress.

Mr. LODGE. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

BOSTON, MASS., March 24, 1918.

Senator WEEKS,
Hotel Touraine, Boston, Mass.:

Resolved, That this mass meeting held in the Park Square Theater, Boston, on March 24, call upon President Wilson and the Democratic administration to move effective support to the national suffrage amendment, thereby securing its immediate passage in the United States Senate; be it also

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President, the Vice President, Senator THOMAS MARTIN, majority leader of the Senate, and Senator JACOB GALLINGER, minority leader of the Senate, and to Senator JOHN W. WEEKS, with the request that he read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted unanimously.

OLIVE MILLS BELCHES,
State Chairman Massachusetts Branch
National Woman's Party.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, on behalf of the American Defense Society of South Dakota I present the following numerous signed petition by citizens of the State of South Dakota. I ask that the petition itself without the signatures may be read. It is short.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

[American Defense Society, State of South Dakota.]

Petition of the people of the United States of America to the Congress at Washington.

Whereas the security of the United States and the success of our arms are endangered by the activities of disloyal persons and organizations within the borders of our country, we, the citizens of the United States, whose names are hereto subscribed, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities or for the publication or public utterance of statements tending—

To impede or interfere with the operations or success of the United States in war or in recruiting or enlistment; or

To hold the Government of the United States or any of our allies up to ridicule or obloquy; or

To cause disloyalty or refusal of duty on the part of any person in connection with the war.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution just passed by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota. It relates to an important piece of legislation now pending in the House of Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent that it be read.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota assembled in extraordinary session at the State capital, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That whereas there has been a bill introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 7795) to appropriate money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed grain and feed for stock in certain enumerated Northwestern States, of which South Dakota is specifically named, as one needing such Government aid;

"And whereas South Dakota is now honestly advertising the prosperity of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the legislature now in extraordinary session, with representatives present from all sections of the State, singly and collectively declare that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, the farmers of South Dakota are not asking for Federal aid to procure seed and feed; and that the State is amply able and willing to aid, if necessary, any farmer who needs aid, and that the few individual or isolated cases that may exist, if any, can and will be taken care of either by township or county aid. And further that the advertising South Dakota has received through 'H. R. 7795' has done her a great injustice, as South Dakota has never been more prosperous than now, as proved by competent authority; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of the senate and delivered by United States mail to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota now serving in the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

W. H. McMASTER,
President of the Senate.
W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.
A. C. ROBERTS,
Speaker of the House.
C. W. GARDNER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Rockford, N. Dak., and a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tolley, N. Dak., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Houston and Galveston, in the State of Texas, 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. KENYON presented a petition of the Methodist Brotherhood of Britt, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the charter granted to the National German-American Alliance, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newton, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Albany, Oreg., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by sundry citizens of Burns, Oreg., favoring universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1847) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 335) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2714) authorizing the removal of stumps from cut-over Oregon and California lands, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 334) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment House concurrent resolution 39, to authorize the printing of 250,000 copies of the soldiers' and sailors' civil relief act, approved March 8, 1918, and so forth. I do not ask for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4202) authorizing the sale of lands situated within the Pierre Land District, State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 4203) granting an increase of pension to William K. Annis, jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4204) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Flournoy (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4205) granting a pension to Thomas Smith; and

A bill (S. 4206) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Owen Dennison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 4207) granting a pension to Sabara J. Swisher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4208) authorizing postage rates on aeroplane mail; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 4212) granting an increase of pension to Alfred L. Cain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have here three bills that I have been asked to introduce. They relate to matters of interest to the District of Columbia and to a very important subject. I have not had time to investigate fully the matters proposed in them; but I introduce the bills by request, so that I shall feel perfectly free to take whatever attitude I feel justified in taking hereafter with reference to them. I thought, however, that their introduction would give an opportunity to those who were interested in them to appear before the District of Columbia Committee to present their views with reference to them.

By Mr. JONES of Washington (by request):

A bill (S. 4209) to provide for the construction of safe and sanitary dwellings, to be leased at a moderate rental to persons residing in buildings erected in alleys in the District of Columbia, and to aid in carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress, approved September 25, 1914, entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys in the District of Columbia," and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 4210) to provide for the construction of safe and sanitary dwellings to be occupied by persons residing in buildings erected in alleys in the District of Columbia, and to aid in carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress, approved September 25, 1914, entitled "An act to provide, in the interest of public health, morals, and safety, for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in the alleys in the District of Columbia," and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4211) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the extension eastwardly of the Columbia Railway," approved June 13, 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF NATURALIZATION LAWS.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed.

THE SHIPPING SITUATION (S. DOC. NO. 210).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have here a copy of an address by Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the United States Shipping Board, delivered before the National Marine League of the United States of America, at Delmonico's, in New York, on the evening of March 26, giving a comprehensive analysis of the entire situation and hitherto unpublished data regarding the number of new shipyards and launching ways built and building, and the tonnage and types of vessels under construction and planned. There is attached to it an estimate of the cost of publication in accordance with the rule, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a public document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCUMBER. I first want to know definitely what it is. Is it the speech made by Mr. Hurley?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall not object to its being printed as a public document, but I want to say right now that there are statements in that speech which need explanation.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no doubt that an explanation can be given.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are many things in it that are expressed in broad language that indicate a state of affairs in our shipbuilding that is not realized in the actualities of the case.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a very important document and gives the latest information on this important subject.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will remember that yesterday the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH], in reading one paragraph of it evidently misunderstood or did not comprehend the full meaning of the sentences that were used in it, and a number of other Senators and Members are likewise mystified as to its meaning, and the press reports of it are so confusing that I think it rather conveys misinformation in some respects, although if it is carefully read and analyzed undoubtedly everything that is stated in it is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was not present when the Senator from Colorado quoted from it yesterday, but I think that, like almost any address, portions of it might be picked out and given a wrong impression, whereas the whole document itself would set forth clearly the accurate information. Therefore I think it ought to be printed as a whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to printing the address as a public document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE AND PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I present a document which I ask be referred to the Committee on Printing for publication as a public document entitled "The Electoral College and Presidential Suffrage," by Chief Justice Walter Clark, of North Carolina.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

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

On March 27, 1918:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

On March 28, 1918:

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3401) to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy, which were, in lines 3 and 4, to strike out "during the continuance of the present war" and insert "until August 1, 1921," and in line 4, to strike out "temporarily."

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

NAVAL OFFICERS ABSENT WITHOUT LEAVE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3404) to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any naval or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officers' reappointment, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any naval or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense punishable by confinement in the penitentiary by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officer's reappointment."

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PAY OF RETIRED OFFICERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3400) to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE SHIPPING SITUATION.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has just procured an order to have the speech of Mr. Hurley on the shipping situation published as a public document. At the time he made that request I suggested to him that there ought to be some explanation in connection with it.

I do not want to criticize the speech in the slightest degree. I will simply say that the speech does not show clearly just what we have accomplished in the matter of putting ships afloat. It does show that we have made contracts for over 8,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping, including the requisitioned vessels, and that we have proceeded 28 per cent toward their completion. Now, that does not convey very much real information to the average American citizen. I asked a member of the Committee on Commerce yesterday how many ships we

had actually put into service, and that member informed me that we had actually put afloat two.

I notice in the headlines of the morning paper this statement, and I think we ought to have the explanation of it if we can get it. This headline reads:

One hundred and three new vessels now in service.

One hundred and eighty-eight launched, declares Shipping Board to Senate critics.

And this is the way the context under that heading reads:

Since the Shipping Board began its work 188 vessels have been launched, of which 103 have been completed and put into service.

I want to know whether those 103 represent the efforts of the Shipping Board in new construction or whether those 103 are really the commandeered or requisitioned vessels, the German vessels, which were already built. There is nothing in the article to show what it is.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NELSON. I think nearly all the ships, with possibly two—it may be four by this time—exceptions, are ships that were commandeered or impressed into the service, and I do not think it includes the German ships. The Shipping Board did take over all ships that were under construction in our shipyards by foreign companies. They were mainly English and Norwegian ships. All those ships have been taken over and the increase in ships afloat comes from that source.

Two weeks ago it was admitted by a member of the Shipping Board that there were not over two that were completed of those that had been set out to be built by the Shipping Board. Since then probably there are two or three added. The bulk of those ships are commandeered ships or requisitioned ships started by the English and Norwegians.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Just let me finish my question, please.

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood, of course, that when we entered into this conflict there were a great many vessels being constructed in the United States for Great Britain and Norway, and possibly France and Italy, and that they were in different stages of completion. I understand, also, that we requisitioned all those vessels, and, of course, we appropriated for them and paid for them and they were completed. But what we are most interested in knowing is just what has been completed by the Shipping Board in addition to what was constructed or completed beforehand for private concerns. How many ships have the Shipping Board actually built and put afloat that are in use to-day? I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. The Senator says he would like to know just what has been accomplished by the Shipping Board. On the day before yesterday I received through the mail, and I suppose all Senators have received it, a copy of a statement made by Mr. Hurley—

Mr. McCUMBER. That has just been ordered to be printed as a public document, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and myself discussed that a short time ago.

Mr. STONE. That was before I came in.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; that was before the Senator came in.

Mr. STONE. I thought, possibly, that if the Senator from North Dakota would examine this statement of the chairman of the Shipping Board organization he would get the information. I have gone over it somewhat hurriedly, because of other engagements as a member of the conference committee on the War Finance Corporation bill. I have read it so far as I could, but I suppose the information as to the achievements of the Shipping Board is fully set out in that document.

Mr. McCUMBER. As the Senator from Missouri has read the statement, will he tell me how many ships have actually been completed by the Shipping Board, according to the statement which has been made by Mr. Hurley?

Mr. STONE. I stated to the Senator that I had read it somewhat casually; but, so far as construction goes, seeing it as I did, Mr. Hurley gives a total tonnage of construction, separating that into two parts—that which had been completed under contract, which I take to be new construction, and that which had been in the way of perfecting, repairing, or preparing commandeered ships for service. He gives the tonnage of all of them, but I have not the statement before me.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator from Missouri has the same trouble that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] had yesterday, and which the public naturally will have from the use of the term "completed." I do not, from a closer analysis of the language used by Mr. Hurley, draw the conclusion

that anything has been completed. When you read the whole statement you find that he simply indicated that we had progressed 28 per cent toward the completion of the contracts entered into, including the requisitioned vessels.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, my present purpose was merely to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he had examined this statement?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have examined it very carefully.

Mr. STONE. Then my inquiry was superfluous.

Mr. McCUMBER. I thank the Senator, however, for the suggestion.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the situation is this: A number of ships were on the stocks under construction when the Emergency Fleet Corporation was organized and began its work. Last August they proceeded to requisition those vessels which were on the stocks—vessels of neutral countries and of the allies that were contracted for—and the Emergency Fleet Corporation took them over. The Emergency Fleet Corporation, as soon as possible, as soon as it could get up designs and plans, proceeded to make contracts for the construction of vessels, really beginning with the construction of the yards in many instances, so that the number of shipyards in this country has increased, I believe, to 118, though there were but 37 existing at the time when the Emergency Fleet Corporation began its program. Now, we are building ships in 118 yards, and some of the old yards have been expanded, and those old yards are all being utilized, of course.

Out of the requisitioned vessels at that time which were taken over by the Emergency Fleet Corporation 188 have been launched. Of those, 103 are not yet completed; that is, the machinery is not in them; but it is being put in right along; but all of the machinery, the motive power, has not been supplied.

Mr. McCUMBER. Those were all ships that were requisitioned, as I understand?

Mr. FLETCHER. Those were requisitioned ships. Eighty-five of them have been completed. When they use the term "completed," it means they are not only launched, but they have been outfitted and equipped with machinery and are in the service.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. So that there are 85 of those requisitioned ships in the service, and they have been completed, the Senator will understand, by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, because they took them over while they were under construction on the stocks in the yards.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is, they were completed by the companies which had the contracts to construct those ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; but after the Emergency Fleet Corporation had taken them over.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, the Shipping Board had nothing to do with that, except to say to the contractors, "Go ahead and finish these ships, and when they are completed we, instead of the original owners, will take them."

Mr. FLETCHER. That the Emergency Fleet Corporation instead of the original owners, would take the ships and would adjust the matter with the original owners.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. In addition to that, three of the ships which the Emergency Fleet Corporation designed, planned, and commenced from the very beginning, laid the keels and built the yards for them where necessary, are in the service; and I think only three up to this time that the Emergency Fleet Corporation undertook to build and made contracts for in the first instance and laid the keels for are now finished and in the service.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then the result of the efforts of the Shipping Board in ships actually completed and in the service, after nearly a year, has been three ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not only that—

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, that is outside of those that they have requisitioned and is in addition to the preparatory work for manufacturing or building ships on a very large scale?

Mr. FLETCHER. Well, not only the preparatory work, but there are vessels being constructed in all these yards; 28 per cent of completion has been reached up to this time in the other vessels. We could not say that the completion of three ships comprises the sole work of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. That merely indicates how far they have progressed; but in every yard in the country there are ships under way and being built.

Mr. McCUMBER. In order that we may understand each other, let me say to the Senator from Florida that if we have progressed in one year 28 per cent toward completion, there is

72 per cent of work yet to be completed before the ships will be turned out. At that rate it might take two or three years longer before the actual ships are completed and put in the water.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota let me ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Let me answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not think what the Senator from North Dakota says follows at all, because in many instances they had to begin with the building of the yard itself. Now, that work is finished, the ways are in shape, and they can turn out the product much quicker. The contract, for instance, at Hog Island is to complete 120 ships within 22 months; and six months of that time has passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, is not the work of building yards included in the 28 per cent of that completion?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I think not; that is 28 per cent of the completion of the ships.

Mr. McCUMBER. The speech of Mr. Hurley does not make that clear.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Florida a question, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that a great many of these ships were requisitioned. Were all of the ships that were requisitioned completed, or were not many of them completed after being requisitioned? Were they not requisitioned during the process of construction?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, yes; out of these 288 most of them were requisitioned ships, but only 85 of them have been completed to date. That statement is quite true. There were altogether 393 vessels dead-weight tons requisitioned, which are not yet completed. The tonnage amounted to 2,771,933; those have not all yet been completed, but they are in the process of completion. There were altogether 393 vessels requisitioned.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, Mr. President, that practically clears up some of the features of this situation. It appears now that we have completed of the requisitioned vessels, some of which were nearly completed at the time we entered into the war, about 85, and that, independent of this, the result of the Shipping Board's efforts has been, in addition to the construction of yards for the very much more rapid building of ships, to turn out three new ships, outside of the ships that have been requisitioned.

Mr. President, I think it ought to be stated right here and now that Mr. Hurley is doing everything possible to speed up ship construction. I think we have a man at the head of the Shipping Board now who has the energy and determination to put things through and to take some chances. I was gratified to read his speech, which, though it was not perfectly clear, at least showed that efforts are being put forth on a very large scale; but, Mr. President, the great trouble lies in the fact that we have not started on a large enough scale. We have a program which calls for the production of over 8,000,000 dead-weight tonnage, including requisitioned ships. I do not know when, under the contracts, this program is to be constructed, whether in 1918 or 1919. That means only a little over 4,500,000 tons gross, while the actual sinkings are about 500,000 tons a month. I wish that Senators and the American people would get that fact firmly established in their minds, but, while we propose to produce about 4,000,000 gross tons in the year, the present rate of sinkings is 500,000 tons in a month, or 6,000,000 tons in a year, at the least.

Now, as a matter of fact, the closer estimates will show that in all probability there will be lost by submarines, mines, and marine casualties in 1918 not less than 8,000,000 gross tons of shipping, and that Great Britain can not produce more than 2,000,000 gross tons. So if we produce 4,000,000 tons, making 6,000,000 in all, we would still be short two or three million tons at the end of the year—that much worse off than we are to-day.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], optimistic in his earnest patriotism, made this statement yesterday:

I want to bear my testimony to the fact that we are doing tremendous work to end the submarine peril. The American Navy has cooperated with the British Navy, and is sending the submarines to the bottom about as fast as the enemy can make them, and our Navy has done great work.

That may be all true; I do not know whether it is or not. I read headlines in the papers each day showing that one or two or three submarines have been sunk, but when I read the context it merely indicates a suspicion that possibly they might have been sunk. Here, however, is the answer to the view of the Senator from Iowa. The answer was given the same day that he made the utterance; and it comes from the British report of losses for the preceding week. The British report of

U-boat sinkings for the previous week shows that the number of merchantmen sunk was 28. Prior to that time the average was about 18; last week it was 28. Of those 28 vessels 16 were above 1,600 tons; 12 were below that tonnage; and they did not take into account a fishing vessel, which would make 29. During the same week—I think it was the same week, it comes within a week's report of U-boat losses—the Italian losses were: Steamers more than 1,500 tons, 3; sailing vessels over 100 tons, 2; sailing vessels under 100 tons, 3. That makes a loss of 8 for the Italians. The French shipping losses for the same week were 6, making altogether a total loss of 43 vessels. That is what the U-boats are doing, notwithstanding the fact that we have said we are destroying them as rapidly as they are being built. If they can continue at that rate—and we certainly must look at it from the most disastrous side—if they can continue at that rate, or anything like that rate, we are going to be three or four million tons worse off on January 1, 1919, than we were on January 1, 1918.

This is why I appeal to the Shipping Board not merely to be satisfied to produce 4,000,000 tons within the next year, but to extend, if possible, their efforts with the concrete ship, which I now believe has been established to be practically safe, and increase the tonnage by another four or five million tons in 1918. I believe that it can be done. We ought to approach this shipping situation with a determination to produce at least twice as much shipping in 1918 and 1919 as is now the program of the Shipping Board.

Mr. MARTIN and Mr. NELSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment to reply to the statements made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He takes a one-sided and partial view that makes the situation unnecessarily gloomy. The mere building of new ships or replacing lost ships does not reach the evil. Every time there is a ship sunk there goes down with it a cargo of supplies, food, and munitions that we send across the water. So the mere building of new ships and putting them afloat does not cure the evil.

I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the energy of the Government, through the Navy Department, is devoted to the purpose of building as many torpedo-boat destroyers as possible, and, to my mind, our chief remedy must come from that source. We want to stop these sinkings in order that our supplies may not find a place on the bottom of the sea, and our Navy Department is engaged now in building as rapidly as possible all kinds of torpedo-boat destroyers. We have an American admiral over there in command of the territory in the Irish Sea, where submarines seem to be very numerous, who has charge of that work. He has done good work, and many submarines have been sunk, and the peril is diminishing day by day. Instead of running into fads and urging us to build cement boats, which are simply in an experimental state, I think it is better to devote our energy to building torpedo-boat destroyers and stop the sinking of the vessels.

Merely replacing a vessel sunk with a new vessel does not cure the evil, because every time a ship is sunk the freight of that ship—the food, the munitions, the men in it—all go down to the bottom of the sea, and we lose not only the ships but all its valuable cargo. So I say that with us the greatest energy should be devoted to extinguishing the submarines and preventing their carrying on their campaign with the success with which it is now attended.

I can not see anything in going into this fad of cement ships. They are, as I have said, in an experimental state. A few small ships, two or three, have been built in Norway and two or three in Denmark—very small ships of two, three, or four hundred tons. They have not been tried at sea. We know in this emergency that ships built of iron and steel in the United States, if they are properly built, will be a success and seaworthy. We know that, and for the time being we ought to devote our energy to building ships of that kind instead of chasing false ideals and going into the realm of cement ships.

Ever since that matter came up—and I have ventured to oppose it—I have been getting letters from the cement manufacturers of the country calling my attention to the wicked stand I am taking in opposing the construction of cement ships. Why, the manufacturers of cement ships and the men who have been in the cement industry and engaged in erecting cement works are on the rampage. They want the Government to go into the building of cement ships because they want to keep their industry alive during the war. It is another way of reaching for Uncle Sam's pocket.

I do not find fault with the Senator from North Dakota for his stand in the matter. We are all liable to be hypnotized by some of these fads. I have been subject to them, and I can readily see how my good friend from North Dakota can be caught in the mesh. But let us in this emergency, for God's sake, Mr. President, exhibit American or English or Anglo-Saxon sanity, and let us put our great effort into building ships and inventing appliances that will extinguish the submarines. That is more important than merely building new ships.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am going to ask for the regular order. As much as I dislike to interrupt the discussion that is going on, there are one or two war measures that ought to be disposed of, and from present indications it is going to take a good while to do it.

I therefore ask for the regular order.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it is probably true that the Senator can do this, but he will not gain anything by taking up any order, because I intend to answer the Senator from Minnesota, and I intend to answer him whether another matter is brought up or not. The Senator can do just as he likes with reference to raising a point of order and bringing up any matter before the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I have no desire at all to stop this discussion; but I have been trying for two days in the morning hour to bring up this joint resolution for drafting young men who attain the age of 21 years, and it is very essential that that be done at some time. I do hope the Senator will feel that I am not undertaking to shut off any discussion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it is very essential; I agree with the Senator; but I want to tell the Senator that it is far more essential that we have ships to take those boys over there after we have included them in the draft, that we have ships to take over ammunition and food for them, and that we supply them with guns and ammunition. The greatest mistake that we made in this war was that we ignored the shipping situation at the beginning of the war, and gave our energies toward the building up of a mighty Army; and at the end of one year the Secretary of War informs us that he has 1,500,000 men that he can put into the field, but he has not any ships, and he does not know where he is going to get them. That situation ought not to continue any longer if it is possible to prevent it; and that ought to lead us to the conclusion that we ought to take up the shipping situation, that we ought to press that beyond and before anything else that is under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that we should build torpedo-boat destroyers; but Heaven knows that we should not cease building other ships to supply the ravages caused by the submarine. We are building torpedo-boat destroyers just as rapidly as we can, but they are not accomplishing the result; and we ought to build them upon a greater scale, if they can do anything, and at the same time we ought to increase the number of ships that will supply the ravages of the submarine. Both should be working together, and not one laid aside while the other is put in operation.

It is undoubtedly true that those who produce cement would be pleased to have a greater market for their product, but how does that detract from the merits of concrete ships? Do not the producers of steel and of lumber also want to sell their products? The only question is, Does the reinforced-concrete ship offer the opportunity to immensely increase our tonnage output in the immediate future—in 1918? If it offers that opportunity, we should grasp it with alacrity and enthusiasm; and the fact that it opens up a greater market for concrete ought not to influence the Senator or anyone else.

Mr. President, it was not my intention to speak of concrete ships only as a field wherein we could reach to supply the deficiency between the present construction of steel and wooden ships as compared with the present destruction of wooden and steel ships. That offers us a field of supply. When the Senator says that it has not been tried, that those who advocate it are hypnotized, let me say to the Senator that private enterprise has just floated in San Francisco a new concrete ship. Private individuals have put their money into it. Engineers testify that they know of no reason on earth why concrete ships should not be a success. The Lloyds have passed judgment upon them, as I understand, and made them insurable. Now, I do not need very much further testimony than that of the Lloyds, than that of shipbuilders, than that of engineers, all agreeing; and, Mr. President, even though it is possible that there may possibly be some unknown, undiscovered defect in concrete ships, we have reached a situation to-day in which we have got to take chances, and we can afford to take long chances. If we build the yards, the ways, for the construction of cement ships, we have not lost them. They are ready there to be used for the construction

of steel ships. We have lost nothing. It is worth twenty-five or forty or fifty million dollars to the United States to make the test, and make it right away. The chances are 9 out of 10 that it will be a complete success. The situation is so grave. The demand for ships is so great, that the Government should not fail to take the chance and to proceed with this construction, which promises to solve the question, promises to fill the gap caused by the submarine ravages, promises us the ships to transport our soldiers and our munitions.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, let me say just a word in this connection. I will take only a minute.

Of course, the Senator will understand that the Shipping Board is fully investigating the possibilities of concrete ships. That matter has been explained over and over again. It may be possible that that means or method or plan will be developed so that we can have ships quicker, faster, more adequately than we would otherwise get them. At any rate, there are three ships being built now by the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the concrete type by way of determining whether or not it is feasible and practicable to pursue the development in that direction. I do not believe there is any field of operation that is not being thoroughly considered and worked out by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, with a view of supplying ships in sufficient quantity to meet the emergency.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that his estimate is rather below that of those who are thoroughly posted as to what is going on in this country and in other countries regarding construction keeping up with destruction. Assuming that the destruction will continue about as it has been in the past year, we ought to have reached by August of this year the point when construction will equal destruction, and then after that we ought to pass rapidly beyond it. That is the estimate at this time—that by the coming August we will be building ships as fast as they are being sunk.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that he is mistaken about the year. It is August, 1919.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish the Senator would see the letter which I have, in which Mr. Piez corrects that statement. I have it on the desk now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, I have not seen that. I am just taking the statement made by Mr. Piez to the committee and the chart that he submitted.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is right; that was the statement; but I have a letter now—and I will show it to the Senator—a letter just recently received, in which he corrects that statement and places it in this year—August, 1918.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does he give the basis for the correction?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not sure that he gives details, but he desires to correct the former statement.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He ought to give the details, because his chart seemed to be carefully prepared.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me see if I understand the Senator. It is not always clear to state that one will equal another at a certain time. Does the Senator mean that in the month of August, 1918, there will be as many ships put afloat, ready to go on their journeys across the ocean, as will in all probability be sunk in the month of August, 1918?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; precisely.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has a big disappointment coming to him, then; and when August comes I want the Senator to remember what I say now.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well. I do not know that I quite understood the Senator's question. My statement is that by August of this year construction will equal destruction, not exclusively in our yards, but in all the yards that are building ships that can be used and that will be used for our benefit.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, if that means anything, it means that during the month of August, 1918, we will put into commission as many tons of shipping as will go down to the bottom of the ocean in August, 1918.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; I think that is true. I think that point will be reached. But, Mr. President, I want to say this, as long as this question has been raised, and I think it fair to say it just now:

The criticism regarding the lack of ships and the endeavor to fix upon the Shipping Board or the administration or those people who have that enterprise in hand the responsibility for

neglecting or failing to do that which was of vital importance to this country and to the world in this crisis, it seems to me, comes rather in poor grace from gentlemen who three and a half years ago on this floor engaged in the most stupendous filibuster in the whole history of the Senate against a bill to establish a Shipping Board and to begin the building of an American merchant marine.

In December, 1914, I had the honor to report a bill providing for the foundation, at least, upon which we could construct an American mercantile marine. That bill was debated here almost continuously until the latter part of February, right up to the time when, by operation of law, that session of Congress had to come to an end. One session of the Senate during that debate lasted continuously, without recess, without adjournment, without interruption, for 65 hours. The most laborious effort that men ever exerted in this body was put forth in order that we might have ships to-day; and yet it was determinedly fought, day in and day out and night in and night out, by Senators on the other side, who now criticize these conditions and seek to fasten blame upon people for not having ships with which to carry on this war.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who labored so earnestly to blame, in a way, people who are now engaged in this work for not having ships, was one of the leaders in that opposition, and other Senators I might mention, without reference to the Senator from North Dakota, who voted against the motion to table the motion that was made to recommit that bill. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] also voted against it. Other Senators on that side—the Senator from Washington among them—also voted against it.

The yeas and nays had been ordered on the bill. I had the bill in charge, because the chairman of the committee was opposed to the legislation. The chairman of the committee arose here and made a motion to recommit that bill. A motion was made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to lay that motion on the table. The yeas and nays were ordered on that motion. If the motion to recommit was carried, it meant the death of the measure. If the motion to recommit was defeated, it meant that we would have had a vote upon the bill and the bill would have passed, probably by 1 vote. The motion to lay on the table the motion to recommit the bill was lost on a vote of 42 to 44—the motion and 44 against it.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I will.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator should be generous enough to say that that was hardly a partisan outcome, as Senators on both sides of the Chamber voted together.

Mr. FLETCHER. I realize that. The Record of February 1, 1915, is here before me, and I know precisely what the vote was. The motion was lost by a vote of 42 to 44. Of course, some Democrats joined the Senators on the other side, otherwise it would not have been lost.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. But I am saying now that a great deal would have been accomplished in the way of furnishing ships if we had passed that legislation—if we had done at that time what was urged then. I am mentioning it largely because I want to assure the Senator from North Dakota, who is pleading for ships now, that I can refer him to the Record to show that he can have no more earnest and sincere advocate of ships than the chairman of the Commerce Committee to-day. We could have had by this time 10,000,000 tons of shipping. I took that position three and a half years ago and have held it ever since.

It has been my one plea in this body to let us get busy and lay the foundation for building an American merchant marine. At that time—in 1914—I did not see, of course, and I do not claim to have foreseen, this world disaster, but the commercial conditions were perfectly plain. We needed the ships to carry on our foreign trade, to do our export and import business. The rates of freight were going up from 10 per cent to 1,000 per cent. Our commerce was being burdened by reason of the high rates that were being charged. It was perfectly plain that if we were to maintain ourselves upon any plane of prosperity as a manufacturing, producing, and commercial country, we must have our own ships. We were precisely in the position of a merchant on one corner doing business, who was dependent upon his competitor in business across the street to deliver his goods. From that standpoint it was perfectly plain that the Government must undertake to build ships, because private enterprise for 50 years, encouraged, nursed, and helped as it had been, had failed us utterly in that extremity, and we must go into that business.

But later on, when the war burst forth, when the thunderbolts were let loose in a deadly assault upon the democracy of the world, it became plain that in that situation we had to have ships, because the foreign shipowners upon whom we had been depending were not in a position to serve us. Between 1914 and 1916—in August, we will say, of those years—Great Britain had taken out of commission as merchant ships 12,000,000 tons. The world's tonnage in 1914 was about 45,000,000 tons. Of that, Great Britain had about 21,000,000. Between August, 1914, and August, 1916, Great Britain's mercantile tonnage had shrunk to 12,000,000 tons. Her tonnage had decreased 9,000,000 tons up to that time—not all lost, because a good many of her ships had been requisitioned for war purposes, for hospitals, for transports, and for other things. At any rate they were taken off the ocean, so far as commerce was concerned. So in September, 1916, Congress began to see that situation and finally passed the present law; but a great many of those who opposed the bill in 1914 still continued their opposition in 1916, and it was after a severe struggle that we were able to get the legislation under which we are working to-day and which constitutes the sheet anchor of our hopes in this great struggle.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has truly stated what the record shows, but the Senator has failed to state what the record did not fully disclose and that which governed the vote upon that proposition at that time. It was well understood, well believed, at least, by a great many Senators that a propaganda at that time was attempting to foist upon this Government the German ships that had been interned in our ports. We did not intend to let any propaganda get an option on them and sell them to the Government; and while that matter was under discussion, as I remember, two attempts were made to so amend the bill that it would prevent our purchase of those German ships. We did not need to purchase them. We have gotten them to-day without purchase, and the vote that really decided the question was that vote, which was influenced entirely by the question whether or not we should authorize the Government to buy those interned German vessels. The majority of the Senate refused to do that. If that had been cut out, if we had a bill even at that time saying that you shall proceed to construct new vessels and not buy vessels that we already owned, I think there would have been little difficulty.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. REED. I desire the privilege of asking the Senator from North Dakota whether, if we had bought those German ships and had paid for those German ships at that time, and obtained a delivery of them with a free, clear title, without any complications with England—and, of course, it goes without saying they would not have been purchased if there had been complications—if the ships would not have paid for themselves four or five times over before the time arrived when we actually did seize them?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can not tell how many times the ships would have paid for themselves, because I do not know what the exorbitant price would be which would be charged to the Government for them. We had the ships. It was not necessary for us to purchase them.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Florida will pardon me, we did not have the ships. We did not have any legal right to seize them. If we had seized them at that time it would have been an act of war. It would have been an act almost equivalent to piracy to have taken those ships. We had no right on earth to them. The right we finally got to those ships was the right we acquired as a belligerent after the war had arisen between us and Germany.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. There is not a Senator who took any part in the debate who does not know that England protested against the Government of the United States buying those German ships, and that France protested against the purchase of them by the United States Government. It will be found in the Record, and everybody understood it at the time.

Mr. REED. That is a different question from the one I am discussing.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in reference to the mere question as to what it would have been worth to us if we had purchased the ships, upon the basis of freight to-day those

ships would have earned \$5,000,000 every month. Five million dollars a month is what they would have earned in freight alone. But, Mr. President, outside of that I will state to the Senator from Utah, his statement with regard to the protest of France and Great Britain is altogether new to me. I never heard of it. I am quite clear that both England and France would have been perfectly willing for us to acquire German or any other ships. It was wholly unnecessary to obtain any expression from them, because we could not have bought the German ships if we had wanted to buy them. That testimony is before a committee of the Senate. If the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] were on the floor, he was chairman of the special committee, and he could state that the agent in New York of the Hamburg-American Line came here to Washington and testified before that committee that his Government had forbidden the sale of those ships to any power or any country or any person, and that they could not be bought under any circumstances. That evidence was before the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. If that is so then it is idle to talk about it and to talk about the great advantage it would have been to this Government.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly it is, and I am merely reinforcing what the Senator from Missouri suggested in answer to the objection of the Senator from North Dakota to the purchase of them. As a business proposition it would have paid us to do it if we could have done it, but I said in the outset it is idle to talk about it, because we could not have purchased or chartered the German ships, and that was known and opposing the bill because of such a fear was a mere pretense and an excuse, permit me to say to the gentlemen on the other side, urged at that time against that bill, because they had not any sort of evidence that it was possible for the Government to buy those ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. If it was a pretense and excuse on this side, it must have been a pretense and excuse on the part of some Senators on the other side also. But the Senator from Missouri predicated his argument upon the ground that we ought to have taken the ships and they would have paid for themselves over and over again. The Senator from Florida says we could not have gotten them, because Germany would not have sold them.

Mr. FLETCHER. We certainly could not have gotten them. That is absolutely true, and they swore before a committee of this body that they would not sell them; that their Government had forbidden the transfer of the ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. That disposes, then, of that question absolutely.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly; that is what I have always said, that there was nothing in that claim whatever, because it was out of our power to get them even if we wanted to get them. But nobody expected to buy them, so far as I know. I was unwilling, as far as I was concerned, having charge of the bill at that time, to strike out of the bill all authority to purchase ships, because I did not know where we might have the opportunity to get ships, without any regard to the German ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I remember the history of that contest, an amendment was offered on this side to exclude the purchase of those ships, and it was voted down by Democratic Senators.

SENATOR GALLINGER'S EIGHTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the presence of the Senator from New Hampshire at this time reminds me that this is his eighty-first birthday. He is the oldest Member of this body not only in point of years, which he bears so well and so gracefully, but the oldest in point of service, and he is also the most lovable of all the Members of the Senate. I wish to break in upon this storm of discussion for a brief moment to speak in the name of my brethren on this side of the Chamber and say that we all congratulate the Senator that he has arrived at that stage of life's journey when—

Age o'er his brow has wrinkles flung,
But his heart, his heart is ever young.

We, his colleagues, extend to him our congratulations, coupled with the earnest hope that he may be for many years spared to his family, his friends, the Senate of the United States, and to his country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, had I known that my good friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], had in mind to say a word that touches my heart very deeply I certainly

would not have engaged in the debate that was taking place when I entered the Chamber. It has been said that there are times when the tongue of man can not speak what the heart feels, and certainly this is to me an occasion of that kind.

If I can make myself believe, Mr. President, that I have the undivided respect and affection of the membership of this great body, and particularly the Members of the Democratic side of this Chamber, with whom I so often differ in debate, it is the highest possible reward that I could ask for a long service and for what I have endeavored to make a useful service.

I have had no controversy during the 27 years of my membership in the Senate with any Senator that lasted overnight. I have an affection for every Member of this body, and whether I shall be here a long or a short period in the future I trust that when the time comes for me to leave this body I shall leave it with the regard that the Senator from Colorado assures me I have to-day.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for his exceedingly kind and generous words. I thank the membership of the Senate for the many assurances that I have had from time to time of their good will. I certainly shall endeavor in the future, as I have in the past, to treat every Member of this great legislative body as I should wish to be treated myself, with a view of having their respect and affection, and with the hope that it may be merited on my part.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I hope it will not be considered presumptuous upon my part to assume to speak for this side of the Chamber under these circumstances.

The Senator from New Hampshire has most gracefully and feelingly expressed his high appreciation of the courtesy of the other side of the Chamber. I hope it is not amiss, Mr. President, for me, speaking for my fellow Republican Members of this Chamber, to say that we also deeply appreciate the courtesy, the breadth, and the kindness that inspired the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and that we wish to add an humble word to the expression of sympathy and the expression of appreciation which the beneficiary of your kindly act has just uttered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I did not, of course, anticipate the interruption of the discussion. It has taken such a turn that I shall not longer continue it. I think perhaps the main object of my rising at the time has been accomplished anyhow. I simply want to conclude by joining the Senator from Colorado in his remarks and in expressing with him the sentiments which he has better uttered than I could with reference to the senior Senator from New Hampshire, our friend upon the other side.

I have no animosities in this Chamber that I know of. On this side and the other my friendship extends individually and collectively to every Member. When I first came to the Senate it was my privilege to become closely acquainted with the senior Senator from New Hampshire. I served with him on various committees, and he does me the honor to pair with me in a general way, and it has been a source of very great delight and very great pleasure always to be engaged with him in the work which devolves upon us here.

Speaking with reference to all on the other side, I appreciate all their manifestations of courtesy and their cooperation, but I am sure my friends will excuse me when I say, with the best wishes for long life and continued health, our felicitations are extended now to "the noblest Roman of them all."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join in the congratulations and expressions of good will so fittingly presented by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and by the other Senators who have just spoken. In the excitement of debate and in the stress of political battle we say many things which afterwards are the occasion of regret. We gain prejudices of which we afterwards are sometimes ashamed. No man who amounts to anything in this world fails to arouse antagonisms. The man who counts must give and take blows. The Senator from New Hampshire is possessed of that high spirit which compels him to contend for the cause in which he is enlisted regardless of his personal fortunes. Always he has fought with a high degree of chivalry; nevertheless he has not escaped unjust and sometimes bitter criticism. Such is the fate of all who in the public forum play the part of men. On the occasion of this his eighty-first birthday I desire to say that while I seldom agree upon matters of policy with the Senator from New Hampshire, I nevertheless always have believed he has been inspired by a high order of patriotism and guided by unsullied honesty.

The reason we differ is simply because we are of different schools of thought. That, indeed, is, after all, the sole reason for the differences between the two sides of this Chamber.

There ought therefore to be no rancor or personal feeling in this body. I hope it will not often appear to disturb our counsels. In concluding what I have to say let me join in the hope that many more years of useful service to his country lie ahead of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and that when his services end, as all men's service must end some day, I am sure no honest man will ever say a word in any manner reflecting upon the honor, sincerity, or patriotism of Jacob H. GALLINGER, of New Hampshire.

Passing from that, I desire to say a word with reference to the controversy of yesterday, and I think it is a very appropriate time to say that word. I shall say it very briefly.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment in connection with what he has just said?

Mr. REED. What I have to say will be said in two or three or a half dozen sentences, and then I will yield the floor to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say a word in connection with what the Senator from Missouri has so appropriately and well said in regard to our colleague from New Hampshire. I did not want to allow the occasion to pass without a word from me, because I have served with him longer than has anyone else in the Senate.

Mr. REED. I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, Senator GALLINGER is the only Senator now in the Senate who was here when I entered it. We had previously been in the House of Representatives together. Our friendship is one that covers many years. It has been an unbroken friendship, and has grown stronger with every year that has passed.

We have here our differences of party principles, but this day, as we congratulate him on his reaching the age of 81 in such splendid condition, both mentally and physically, we think of him as a man and a friend, and there is nothing to exceed his devotion to the public through all these years. Whether the service was conspicuous or inconspicuous, it was for the public good. He has never spared himself. His honesty, his strength of conviction, his high character are known to all men.

I am not going to enter into a protracted eulogy of him. I only want to tell him what he knows without my saying it in public, that the affection I feel for him would not be satisfied if I did not express here, in the presence of all, my sense of his great public service and the value that his loyal friendship through all these years has been to me.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, very merited tributes have been justly paid to the ability and patriotism of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I merely wish to express in a word my appreciation of the uniform courtesy which has always governed his every action and association in this body, and to say that it has been highly appreciated by me and shall ever be most kindly remembered.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the people of the western part of our country and I, in common with them, have peculiar reasons to feel a great tenderness toward the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and to congratulate ourselves on his presence in the Senate of the United States.

The breadth of statesmanship displayed by him has been peculiar to himself, when his surroundings are considered. In all the fights for statehood which have been waged by the Western Territories, Senator GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, has always stood the champion of the Western people; and for the State of Arizona I desire to express here publicly its thanks to him for the warm, broad-minded, considerate manner in which he has constantly treated the ambitions of that struggling people.

Personally I know of no man in the Senate who is more deservedly popular than is the Senator from New Hampshire; and when that end shall come to us, which must come to all, I pray God for each and every one of us that we may lay down our burdens as unsullied, as unstained, and with hands as clean, as will the Senator from New Hampshire when he shall have appeared for the last time among us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have served now for nearly a quarter of a century as a national Federal legislator in one body or the other. The service of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has been synchronous with mine and preceding it. I never knew him to be even accidentally right upon any question of purely partisan politics. Somehow or other, even if an accident could intervene to persuade him

from a provincial or sectional standpoint to vote right incidentally, while he was wrong from my standpoint generally, he never availed himself of it.

I have never known a sweeter person, a man who was more of a real man, honest, true, faithful, and brave in the entertainment and expression of opinion than the Senator from New Hampshire. When a partially reconstructed rebel can say that about a down-east Yankee, that ought to go pretty far.

I have served with him on committees, I have served with him in this body, and I have never yet seen the day, as far apart as he and I were and are politically, when a statement of his about a matter of fact did not carry with me absolute verity, not verisimilitude, as statements of that sort coming from Representatives and Senators generally do, but absolute verity. I would no more doubt his word, I would no more doubt his integrity, intellectual or moral, than I would doubt my own.

It is a matter of great consequence to be able to say upon the eighty-first birthday of a "standpat" partisan Republican, notwithstanding all the outside uplifting and progressiveness of the universe, that nobody representing any faction of any party can bring forward a man who has been braver and truer and more honest from his standpoint—I started to say than Senator GALLINGER, but I will say than Dr. GALLINGER, because I believe he prefers to be called "doctor."

When I look back over all the long legislation for the improvement of the sanitary conditions of the District of Columbia and the efforts of the Senator from New Hampshire as a member of the District Committee and other committees dealing with those matters, when I see how great an improvement there has been since a quarter of a century ago, when I first came here, and when I remember that most of it has come about by his initiative, I think that the whole people of the United States owe it to themselves to render God thanks—not him—that he has reached his eighty-first birthday.

Of course I know the Senator from New Hampshire well enough to know that if he could have escaped this occasion, he would have done so; but, under the providence of God, he can not escape it; he just had to live this long; God decreed it years ago.

Mr. President, my temperament is such that I either love men or hate them; nobody is indifferent to me. I hate men when I hate them because I think they are untrue, I think they are insincere, I think that they camouflage; and I love men when I love them because I think they are true and do not camouflage and are not insincere. I love an open enemy who fights me to the hilt of the dagger very much more than I love a fellow with velvet gloves who seeks an aperture under my fifth rib without advising me beforehand that he is going to seek it. I think that Senator GALLINGER falls within the lines of the people whom I love, and whom I have a right to love and do love, because they are honest and because I try to be honest.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On behalf of the committee of conference I submit to the Senate a report of the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to Senate joint resolution 133.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia submits a conference report, which will be read.

The Secretary read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
HOKE SMITH,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. W. SIMS,
SAM RAYBURN,
A. E. WINSLOW,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will inquire if the Senate has been informed as to whether the House has taken action on the report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that there has been no message as yet from the House of Representatives regarding the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In connection with presenting this report I desire to withdraw the separate report made on yesterday by the Senate conferees. On yesterday, for the Senate conferees alone, I presented a statement that we had conceded all the House amendments in conference, and that therefore no conference report was necessary, we having yielded entirely to the House. We came in the Senate and asked that the Senate recede from its disagreement and concur in the House amendments. There was some discussion upon the subject; and while I still entertain the view that either plan is entirely satisfactory, I myself from the first preferred the plan of a formal report from the conferees. Since I presented the action of the Senate conferees the conferees have met and have agreed upon a joint report that has gone to the House, and I present it now to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; the conference report must be acted upon by the other House first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was the Chair's first understanding, but the Secretary informed the Chair that the Senator from Georgia had presented a conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I merely send it to the desk and ask to withdraw the formal resolution which I offered yesterday, as the conferees have agreed in giving this direction to the matter and submit a formal conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is granted. The Chair hears no objection, and the conference report will lie on the table for the present.

SENATORIAL ELECTION IN WISCONSIN.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish, without taking up the time of the Senate by requesting that the Secretary read it at the desk, to request, in lieu of that, that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Ask LENROOT to withdraw. Republican organs in State ask union on Davies. Leading German-language organ of Milwaukee among G. O. P. papers"—"G. O. P." means the good old party—"now supporting President's choice."

I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the same paper on March 25 entitled "Duty of LENROOT. Indiana Republican organ says it is to withdraw."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think this is absolutely unnecessary, and I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has not concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also ask that there be inserted in the RECORD, appearing upon page 3 of the same paper, an article entitled "Why LENROOT is unavailable. Chicago Republican paper calls Chairman West's bluff. Chance Wisconsin would take with LENROOT as Senator. Chairman West passes the lie, and now it is up to him to show who is telling a lie."

I ask that, upon the second column of that same paper, there be printed a communication of Chairman West denying certain charges against Mr. LENROOT, so that both sides of the controversy may appear in parallel columns in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I object, and I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made by the Senator from Utah to the request of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Hand it to me, then, and I will stand here in my place and read it all. It will take about three hours.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah demands the regular order. We are still in the morning business, and reports of committees only are in order at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not know any rule of this body that forbids a Senator who has acquired the recognition of the Chair from talking as long as he pleases upon any subject.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall therefore proceed to talk, and talk upon this particular subject, by reading these articles.

Mr. KENYON. Regular order!

Mr. SMOOT. Regular order, Mr. President!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for, and in the morning hour the Chair thinks that the regular order, being demanded, must be followed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, but I am within the regular order. I am now talking about the regular order, and I am going to continue to talk about the regular order. I do not know of any rule of this body—I have tried to find a rule very many times—that could shut a Senator off from talking when he wanted to talk. I think it would be very valuable if the Chair could find a rule of that sort, but I have never discovered it, and I do not think there is any rule of that sort; and if I am to be made a martyr in order that a rule of that sort may be established I shall be very glad of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Regular order!

Mr. KENYON. Regular order!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, having addressed myself to the Chair and having been recognized, I shall proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to rule that the Senator from Mississippi is not in order. There is nothing before the Senate at the present time. There is no report of a committee before the Senate, which is the regular order; and the regular order is that prescribed in the procedure for the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand that the Chair has finally ruled that there is some limitation to a Senator's right to talk; because, if that is true, I shall be very glad of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair will make that ruling during the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. I am doubly glad that the Senator from Delaware happens to be the presiding officer of this august body. I have been waiting for years for some assertion that at some time, somewhere, somehow, a Senator might be cut short from talking indefinitely; and I am glad to welcome the fact that I am the Senator who has been cut short.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Later on, when we get out of the morning hour, I shall assume the floor once more, and then I do not believe that even the Senator from Utah can cut me off from talking indefinitely, indescribably, foolishly, or otherwise, just as I please, as other Senators have done from time immemorial.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are still in the morning business. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

After the presentation of certain bills and joint resolutions, which appear under the appropriate heading,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, the morning business is closed.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 124.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is that of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

PUNISHMENT OF ESPIONAGE.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to open a political debate. What I have to say I hope will not arouse any antagonism or partisanship.

Mr. President, I am in favor of pitiless publicity when it is the truth. I favor criticism when it is just. I deplore criticism when it is unjust. I am going to unfold, I think, a tale which is true, which I believe some of the Senators who arose on this floor and criticized the Aircraft Board and the administration will regret, and I desire that it be given pitiless publicity.

I am not here to defend the Aircraft Board. I know very little about their work. But on yesterday afternoon, after the Congress had adjourned, I had a meeting of the subcommittee, in which certain amendments adopted by the House were requested by the Attorney General not to be agreed to—amendments to a bill that has passed the Senate making it a crime to injure property

of the United States in the interest of the enemy. It went to the House of Representatives, and they amended it by making it read "injuring by violence," when, Mr. President, a great deal of injurious work has been done through spies that was not done by violence. They also provided that it must be done with intent, when we had one case where a mechanic in one of the great Government arsenals, in using a piece of pasteboard to separate the component parts that go into the shells, instead of using the pasteboard threw it aside, not, as he says, for the purpose or with the intent of injuring the United States for the benefit of the enemy, but in order that he might make more money from a commercial standpoint. He was making them by the piece, and he could make 10 without the pasteboard to 1 with the pasteboard; and therefore, in order to make money, he left it out and thousands and thousands of shells had to be thrown away.

Then, Mr. President, in order to give a hearing on this matter, there came into my office a very prominent man in the United States, who is on the detective force. He brought with him this bracket which I hold in my hand. It is a bracket which goes on each side of the Bristow fighting machine. It holds the radiator rod that goes through here upon the machine. He brought me that to show what German spies had done. I stated upon this floor when the espionage bill was up—and I was criticized for making extravagant statements—that there are 100,000 spies in this country, and I am here to say now that I believe, instead of 100,000, there are 400,000.

What has been done? Why have we no fighting machines in France? Why have we not carried out our schedule in furnishing on the 1st day of April two or three hundred Bristow fighting machines? That was the contract. They were to be furnished. Why was it not done? Because a German spy, as any Senator can see, had cut the steel in two and filled it with lead and then painted it over, and when the first machine was tried out it fell to the ground. A British officer, an inspector of that great plant, in order to see what was the matter, found that this piece of steel had been tampered with. That delayed the building of the Bristow machines for more than two months. Why? Because every machine had to be examined, and these pieces had to be made over again. An investigation had to be made, because the men making the machines did not know how these machines had been interfered with and what other devilish work had been done.

Mr. President, if I were Secretary of War or the President of the United States, I would commandeer the Curtiss plant and turn out every man in that plant and hire only loyal Americans and dispense with those under suspicion. I want to say, in passing, that some of the leading men in that plant have German names. I make no charge upon those men; they may be innocent men, but they have strange names to me. But we do know that spies are in that plant, and they have delayed the furnishing of the Bristow machines or fighting planes on time to Pershing, and that is the cause of it. Any man can examine that.

I desire to give the name of this detective to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and let him look at the maps showing where this probably was done, in the paint shop—they have not discovered the man yet—and let him have these men here and examine them, and then they will find out why fighting machines have not been sent to Gen. Pershing. I accidentally caught on to it by an examination of this witness before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. To have sent these machines to France probably would have meant the death of every young man who has gone or will go to France to fly and fight for his country.

This is an answer to some of the criticisms made on this floor on Tuesday. Let us stop fighting among ourselves and fight the war.

REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] a few moments ago asked me to yield to him I was about to say that it is with very great regret I learn of the bitter political debate which occurred in the Senate on yesterday. Since the war began we have heard very little of politics upon this floor. The one or two outbursts that have come have

been occasioned by matters arising outside of the Chamber. The debate of yesterday appears to be an unfortunate exception.

A battle is raging in Europe that may involve the fate of civilization for a thousand years. English and French and American soldiers are dying side by side. They are falling by the hundreds, by the thousands, by the tens of thousands, their blood uniting in one common stream and mingling with the trampled dust of the battlefield is forming a crimson cement that should forever unite the lovers of liberty, the defenders of democracy. In contrast with that battle which covers a field that stretches for hundreds of miles, every foot of which is lurid with flames belched from the mouths of innumerable cannon and wrapped in a smoke shroud that rolls from the millions of rifles; a battle that is being carried on by men who burrow deep beneath the earth and by men who fly 25,000 feet above its surface; a battle where deeds of heroism are being hourly done that outrival the glory of Marathon and the deathless valor of Thermopylae; while our own sons and brothers, at death grips with the legions of autocracy, are being forced back step by step, stubbornly fighting, gallantly dying, how small, how contemptible appears the performance in this Chamber on yesterday when the Senate, turning aside from the world tragedy, spent the day in political bickerings over a bye election about to be held in the State of Wisconsin.

Most pitiable of all was the spirit of recrimination manifested. The world is given to understand that the aisle between the Republican side and the Democratic side marks a separation between American citizens; that the election of a Democrat in the State of Wisconsin or the election of a Republican in Wisconsin will have a tremendous effect upon this war, because, forsooth, there is a difference in the character of the loyalty of Republicans and Democrats. I utterly repudiate that doctrine.

It will be conceded without argument that I have been, perhaps, as bitter a partisan Democrat as has sat in this Chamber for many years. I have found but little I could agree with in the matter of mere domestic policies that were advanced by my Republican brethren. I said this morning, and I repeat, we are of different schools of political thought. I abominate the ideas and theories you may have advanced with reference to your protective tariff. I have not agreed with your financial policies; I can not accept your theories of banking and currency; upon all questions of that kind I am in disagreement with you. I can unhesitatingly stand here and contend with you over them. But, when it comes to a question of loyalty to this Government, I deny that there can be drawn a line between a loyal Democrat and a loyal Republican.

I have watched the course of affairs in the Senate and I know as I look across this aisle that I am looking into the faces of men whose sons are, some of them, upon the battle line, some of them in training camps, some of them upon the blue waves of the ocean, either upon battleships or upon those wasps of the sea that are seeking to destroy the submarines that menace our communication with our allies. As I look upon this side I see men whose sons are engaged in the same loyal service. As I look into the hearts of all here I know that each man would give his last drop of blood that surges through his veins if he could bring victory to our arms and a glorious fruition to our hopes.

So I appeal to the Senate that we shall have done with these miserable little political bickerings. Let the election go on in Wisconsin. Let us go on with our business here. I say as a Democrat if I were a voter in Wisconsin I would vote for the Democratic candidate, but I also say as a Democrat that if either one of the leading candidates is returned a loyal man will be sworn in at yonder desk.

Now, I appeal for another thing. I appeal that Senators shall keep their heads in all matters. The sentiment was expressed this morning by my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] in words better than I have employed. There have been mistakes made, disappointments have come to us and will come, and wherever a mistake is made it is the duty of loyal men to point out that mistake. If a man is doing something which a Senator believes will injure the country, he ought instantly to call attention to it. Any other policy is a policy of suicide. It is also a policy of imbecility. But when we find a mistake has been made it ought not to be overstated. The fact ought to be given and not something that is a gross exaggeration of the fact.

The matter that led me to take the floor this morning was the remark just made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. He called attention to some trouble with aeroplanes. I think I ought to say to the Senate that I have taken occasion to look somewhat into the situation with reference to our aeroplane program. We are not up to that program, it is true, but statements have been made upon the floor of the Senate to the effect that the Liberty motor is a failure; that our

whole aeroplane effort is broken down. The impression is given to many Senators and to the country that all we have done in the way of an air program has ignominiously failed.

Mr. President, the Liberty motor is not a failure. I talked on yesterday with the expert the British Government has sent here, the man whose business it has been for nearly three years to create the motors for the air service of England. I saw the cable in which English governmental officers were insisting upon the speediest delivery to them of 3,000 of these motors.

Now, will any man claim that the British Government, with its expert upon the ground, and perhaps the greatest expert in the world, is insistent upon having 3,000 worthless motors?

The French Government, according to the best information I have, has ordered a large number of these motors. The Italian, I am informed, has ordered a large number, I was told 3,000 or more. Those Governments are not ordering a worthless machine. They know a good machine. They have tried this question out upon the battle field in actual contest. The answer I make to all these criticisms is this: Although we may have met with some disappointments it is not fair, it is not right, to say that the Liberty motor is a failure.

Senators are sometimes misled, as are other people. The question is raised whether we have a motor which is employed in the type of machine that is to be used only by a few great expert fliers and fighters. It is probably true that the British have one type of machine, which is made almost entirely by hand and which can only be made slowly, that is superior to the Liberty motor, and will therefore be employed in the very highest class of fighting machines as a preferential engine.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I share with the view expressed by the Senator from Missouri in regard to the construction of motors and unifying construction, but I am sure the Senator does not wish to be misunderstood in his statement in respect to the Liberty motor. I have listened with great interest to what has been said on the floor of the Senate upon that subject, because I was somewhat startled by rumors I had heard in regard to it. As I gathered the statement, it amounted to this, that the lighter machines which were designed for the battle planes had turned out to be practically a failure and have been discarded, but the larger machines were found to be entirely effective and efficient for driving what they call bombing planes. Now, if that is correct, I think the statements made by the Senator from Missouri are somewhat misleading, because I do not understand that the charge was generally against the Liberty motor, but specifically as to the lighter motor for battle planes.

Mr. REED. I was not referring to a statement that might have been made by any particular individual on any particular day. I am referring to general statements that have been floating around. Some expressions I have heard made upon the floor at different times have been quite as broad as I have put the case. I want the Senator from Pennsylvania to understand I was not referring to something somebody might have said on yesterday.

Mr. President, I do not think the statement, as finally made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, will be found to be quite in accordance with all that has been accomplished. My understanding is that we started in to make a light plane, and that in the rapid development of the airplane business it was found we had passed rather beyond that. The same motor is now used but with more cylinders.

The original plan of this motor was to build it so that units could be added. The first machine I saw contemplated a 12-cylinder motor. My understanding is that this motor will drive a machine that can be used not only for bombing purposes, but it will drive a really fine fighting machine, and it will answer every purpose, except, it may be said, that the English have a motor enough superior so that it will be employed upon the very highest class of fighting machine where there are only one or two men who ride the machine. In other words, I think the situation is much more hopeful than it has been presented.

Now, a word more about the motor and I am through with this statement.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator answer just one question there, and I am asking it for information?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is there any reason in the world why we can not produce a motor equal in efficiency to that used in France or in Great Britain?

Mr. REED. Let me answer that in this way. We are engaged in a quantitative production, a production that when it is under way will mean that vast quantities of these motors will

be turned out by machinery. The tooling, the finishing, practically everything, is done by machinery. The English make a motor for the very highest class of fighting machine that is made almost entirely by hand. It requires infinite labor and fitting and time, and there are only a limited number of men capable of that particular class of work. Of course, in time we will perhaps reach a point even better than the motors that are now being made by any country. But understand, this motor had to be designed, it had to be built, it had to be worked out in the factories, and we started in on the plan of quantity production.

I think I can say that, while we have been delayed and have not made as much headway as we hoped, many of the delays which have come were unavoidable. There were nearly a thousand changes, first and last, made in this motor, most of them small, most of them trifling. There have been some delays, and I say to you frankly I believe that one great trouble has been in the War and Navy Departments, for it has not been the Aircraft Board that has had the construction of these machines. It has been done through the War and Navy Departments, and I think there are delays there. I think there can be reforms there that will be of great benefit.

Whatever those objections are, they ought to be met, but I am trying to give the impression which I think is the truthful one, that in a very short time we will be turning out vast quantities of these motors and that they will be a most useful part of the war machinery.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I just ask the Senator a question, because I think he will agree with me. We ought not to send to Europe for our boys' use a machine that will be inferior to the machine of the enemy. We ought to secure a better one if possible. I do not think the Senator would suggest that we should even start in with a machine, whether it is machine made or hand made, that is not equivalent at least to the best machine used by the enemy against us.

Mr. REED. Of course, from one viewpoint what the Senator said is correct, but let me present it to him in this way. Let us assume that there are about four different types of machine that must constantly be in use. There is a training machine. It can be made in quantities. There is a scouting machine. Our motor does the work for that in fine shape. There is a bombing machine. Our motor does the work for that in splendid shape. Then, we have a fighting machine that is not as good as the very best, but still is a machine that is of very great practical power. Suppose we can make vast quantities of these machines for the first three types I have named and leave some British and French machine shops to make the highest class of fighting machines; is it not wise to go on and produce a quantity and to do that as rapidly as possible? I am not saying they are perfection. I am simply saying I think we ought to get the right viewpoint.

There has been great complaint made about delay in producing the finished machines. There are some facts with reference to that the Senate ought to know which I learned by conversation with these gentlemen. I am not sure that it is new to anybody; it was new to me.

When we started to build aeroplanes we were talking, to a large extent, about the ordinary aeroplanes. It is, outside the motor, a simple device. A modern plane is a very complicated machine that is changing every day, almost every moment. I am told a modern fighting aeroplane, aside from the motor, carries an aerial telephone, an aerial telegraph outfit, a great number of the most delicate instruments, a photographic appliance of the most perfect character, so that pictures can be taken from 20,000 feet in the air; it carries oxygen gas, so that the aviator can breathe at great altitudes; also an appliance by which he can warm his body by turning in an electric current and warm his hands and his feet. It is, in short, a most complicated, intricate, and delicate machine. In fact, it is several complicated and intricate machines, all made of the lightest possible material, all so arranged that it will not interfere with the almost lightninglike evolution that the aviator must perform in battle. In addition to what I have said, it carries from one to three guns, and these rapid-fire guns have to be so artfully timed they will fire between the propeller blades when revolving with the rapidity of lightning without striking the propeller.

Now, to make a thing like that takes time. It means the greatest conceivable difficulties. So if we find there are some delays in the machine we ought not to lose heart; we ought not to be hypercritical; we should always require that the best foot be put forward and the best and highest talent of the country be employed. I do not claim there have been no mistakes, but I hope the facts I have stated may in some respect tend to clear up certain misunderstandings.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

During the speech of Mr. REED, The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

After the conclusion of Mr. REED's speech, The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of House bill 8696.

Mr. ASHURST. Yesterday when the bill was under consideration a point of order was made and was sustained as to the amendment proposed by the committee on pages 5 and 6.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President— The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], I think, has corrected that matter.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well, then.

Mr. GRONNA. It was corrected when the Senator from Arizona was not in his seat.

Mr. ASHURST. In order that I may understand the situation on the point of order that was made against the amendment on page 5, I ask if the point of order that was made against the amendment on page 5 simply struck from the bill that part of the amendment commencing after the word "Provided," on line 21, page 5, and extending down to and including the word "further," on page 6, line 4?

Mr. GRONNA. I will state to the Senator it is my understanding that the point of order was made against peyote, but not against the provision for the prosecution of people who might bring liquor into an Indian reservation.

Mr. ASHURST. That is what I wished to be correctly informed upon.

Mr. GRONNA. There are two provisos in the amendment, or rather there are two amendments, and it was against the first amendment the Senator from Oklahoma made a point of order. That has been corrected, I understand. If I am mistaken, I wish the Chair would inform me.

Mr. ASHURST. Let the Secretary read, beginning on page 5, the item for suppressing the liquor traffic so that we will be able to understand what action was taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The part stricken out on a point of order commenced on page 5, line 21, after the numerals "\$150,000," and is in the following words:

Provided, That the sale of anhalonium or peyote to an Indian, or its introduction into the Indian country, shall be, and is hereby, declared to be a violation of the acts of July 23, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 260), and January 30, 1897 (29 Stat. L., p. 506), and punishable in accordance with the penalties provided for therein.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well. Then I simply move to strike out the word "further," in line 4, page 6, after the word "Provided," so as to read:

Provided, That possession by a person of intoxicating liquors in the country where the introduction is prohibited by treaty or Federal statute shall be an offense and punished in accordance with the provisions of the acts of July 23, 1892 (27 Stat. L., p. 260), and January 30, 1897 (29 Stat. L., p. 506).

I ask that amendment to the amendment be made.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, according to the record I have kept, that concludes the committee amendments. I ask the Chair if that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. The matter now pending is the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] which has been read, and it is before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have it read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 66, after line 4, at the end of the item relating to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, from funds on deposit to the credit of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, the sum of \$15,000 to be used for construction and equipment of dormitories at the Murray

State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla., and to be immediately available in addition to the sum of \$50,000 provided for the same use by section 18 of the Indian appropriation act of March 2, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I understand, that is the same amendment that was offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], as to which he said that the Indians themselves requested this appropriation.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true. It is not an appropriation out of the Treasury, but out of Indian funds.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood that it was out of the Indian funds.

Mr. ASHURST. And they wish it to be made.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona rose.

Mr. ASHURST. If my colleague will yield to me for a moment before we leave the question of peyote, I wish to ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, without reading them, a telegram from the governor of the State of Utah and one also from the governor of the State of Nevada on the subject of peyote. These telegrams are in the nature of petitions, and that is the reason I ask that they be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The telegrams referred to are as follows:

SALT LAKE, UTAH, February 27, 1918.

CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I wish to urge the passage by Congress of a measure prohibiting the use of peyote, a drug used extensively by Indians with particularly vicious results. Utah now has a law prohibiting use of the drug.

SIMON BAMBERGER, Governor.

CARSON CITY, NEV., February 20, 1918.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.:

Understanding that bill prohibiting interstate shipments of the drug peyote has been introduced and is to come before your committee, I take the liberty of most respectfully urging you to report this bill favorably. Nevada has passed a law prohibiting the sale of this drug, and we need the interstate prohibition act to protect our Indians. We consider this a matter of very great importance.

EMMETT D. BOYLE,
Governor of Nevada.

Mr. GORE rose.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendments have been disposed of, and I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has not yet been disposed of and is now before the Senate for action. The question is on that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I wish to say I had risen to make an inquiry as to whether or not the amendment had been disposed of. My understanding was that it had not been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has now been agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 25, line 13, it is proposed to add the following:

That hereafter no Indian reservation shall be created nor shall any additions be made to one heretofore created within the limits of the States of New Mexico and Arizona, except by act of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I wish to detain the Senate but one minute about this amendment. States other than the States of New Mexico and Arizona have been protected as proposed by the amendment. Only last year there was created an enormous Indian reservation, for which there was no earthly need, in the county in which I live. It is now threatened by Executive order to enlarge other reserves affecting both New Mexico and Arizona. Notwithstanding, as I am informed, the Indians now have something like 10,000 acres of land apiece for every member of the tribe, this policy has been pursued to a point which makes us feel that when we make an appropriation from the Treasury we must have the guarantee of an act of Congress to make it good. There is no limitation on the power of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to recommend the extension to any distance or for any length of these Indian reservations in our State for the enlargement of which there is no earthly necessity.

Any one who will look at conditions in that State and at the map will know, I think, before any more public land is taken away from the people who have got to meet conditions subsequent to this war, when the Indians are so amply provided for, that it would be an outrage on the people not only of that State,

but upon all who are interested in the public lands of the United States.

In connection with this matter I have prepared an exhibit, and I have had my secretary make it a little bigger, showing the areas which are devoted to Indian and forest reservations. There [indicating] are the Indian reserves which have already been made in my State, which are shown in red; the green indicates the forest reserves, and the white indicates the desert and mountain lands; all that is left. There has been taken from that State nearly half of the best land in the State. It has been dedicated to the balance of the United States in the shape of forest reserves. The department has given the land which is indicated on this map by red to the Indians, when there are 20 white men to one Indian in the State. That land [indicating] is all that is left to the State of Arizona with which to pay taxes to support its government. Then it is sought on behalf of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to run across the line into New Mexico. Senators will observe from the map that in connection with the Navajo Reservation the yellow area goes clear into the adjoining State of New Mexico. To make these enlargements either in Arizona or New Mexico is contrary to all common sense and reason.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will maintain its dignity by saying that no more public lands of the United States, which will be badly needed by and by, shall be carried out of the possession of the people of the United States by mere Executive order.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. I heard the Senator's amendment read only hurriedly, but, as I understand, it only applies to the States of Arizona and New Mexico.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It applies to Arizona and to New Mexico only because the other States are protected. Arizona and New Mexico have the right to that protection, and they have got to come to Congress for it. Those two States have been left out. It is only proposed to give those States the right which other States already have.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me further, the Senator also discussed the question of the public lands. The Senator's amendment does not have reference to public lands, but simply has reference to the Indians; it has reference to the enlargement of Indian reservations.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The amendment provides that no other Indian reservation shall be created or that no Indian reservation now in existence shall be enlarged without being authorized by an act of Congress. That is all. It proposes to retain what Congress ought always to have kept—the right of disposition of the public lands.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I hope the amendment which has been proposed by my colleague will be adopted. I speak with familiarity as to the Indian reservations in Arizona and New Mexico. The reservations in those two States are large enough now, and even as I speak I have before me a letter from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in which I am advised that the Interior Department has under consideration the question of making a large addition to a certain reservation in New Mexico and Arizona.

There was a tribe of Indians in Arizona, to wit, the Papagoes, which the Arizona delegation in Congress felt ought to have some small additions made to their reservation to take care of the watering places used by those Indians; indeed, we went so far in 1916 as to ask the department to set aside a proper area as an addition to their reservation, but when the Executive order came down we found to our amazement that instead of a few thousand acres being set aside, over 2,000,000 acres were set aside, and it required months for us to correct the error.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ASHURST. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does not the Senator from Arizona think that under the circumstances it would be wise to insert a provision in this amendment to the effect that any reserve created by Executive order shall be considered unlawfully created after this date, or something like that, to prevent the establishment of a reserve by Executive order before this bill goes into effect?

Mr. ASHURST. I think that is a very wise plan, and I hope my colleague will give his attention to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It will be done, if they contemplate doing it, before this bill goes into effect. I suggest whether it would not be possible to insert a provision in this

bill to make unlawful the creation of such reservations after this date? I merely make the suggestion for consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think I shall take the opportunity of adopting that suggestion, though I do not think the department will do anything contrary to the spirit of the amendment proposed. As will be remembered, however, as the Senator suggests, when some years ago a bill was passed here declaring that no further reservations should be made in certain States, the President, before the bill became a law, made reservations as big as he pleased, and then signed the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is why I suggested that there should be some such provision in the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I desire, if I possibly can, to stop that policy, because it is so manifestly unjust, but I think the department, or at least the President of the United States, on the proper showing by this map of these conditions, will consent that no more public lands shall be disposed of without the sanction of Congress being obtained before the disposition.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words with relation to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

We in the West have had a large and unfortunate experience relative to the withdrawal of public lands from entry. The manner in which these reserves have been made by the Government has become almost unendurable. There is hardly a Western State in which millions and millions of acres of land have not been set aside as forest reserves. The policy became of such a serious nature that Congress passed an act that no longer should there be withdrawals of public lands for forest purposes without the consent of Congress.

Mr. President, reference has been made here to the passage of that bill 10 or 12 years ago. It passed the House and then passed the Senate, and before the conference committee could report upon it there were forest reserves equal to about 40,000,000 acres created by the proclamation of the then President of the United States. He knew, or should have known, that there was about to be passed in Congress a bill which would prevent the creation of forest reserves, and thus his action was an evasion not appreciated by the West.

Mr. President, in my opinion, Arizona has too many Indian reservations. The creation of a reserve deprives a State of the right to tax the land within its borders and is an interference with the rights of the State. It is an outrage that millions of acres of land in a sovereign State of this Union should be set aside and forever held without the right of taxation by the State. That never was in contemplation by the framers of the Constitution, because the National Government, if it should carry that principle to the extreme, would have the power to almost annihilate a State by withdrawing great portions of the land of the State from taxation.

Mr. President, it seems to me if there is no provision of law prohibiting the setting aside of Indian reservations that we ought to adopt such a provision now and have it in force as quickly as possible, so that the rights of the States may be protected against the encroachments of the Federal Government in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. I send to the desk an amendment proposing to quiet titles in eastern Oklahoma. I will say to the Senate that it comes with a unanimous report from the committee; that it was drawn by the Interior Department in conjunction with the Oklahoma delegation, and is asked for at the request of the attorney representing the farm-loan bank of Wichita, who has found some difficulty with the titles in eastern Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

That a determination of the question of fact as to who are the heirs of any deceased citizen allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians who may die or may have heretofore died, leaving restricted heirs, by the probate court of the State of Oklahoma having jurisdiction to settle the estate of said deceased, conducted in the manner provided by the laws of said State for the determination of heirship in closing up the estates of deceased persons, shall be conclusive of said question, and when such proceedings have heretofore been conducted in compliance with the laws of said State then in force, the judgment and final order therein entered shall have like effect as of the date of its entry: *Provided*, That an appeal may be taken in the manner and to the court provided by law in cases of appeal in probate matters generally: *Provided further*, That where the time limited by the laws of said State for the institution of administration proceedings has elapsed without their institution, as well as in cases where there exists no lawful ground for the institution of administration proceedings in said courts, a petition may be filed therein having for its object a determination of such heirship and the case shall proceed in all respects as if administration proceedings upon other proper grounds had been regularly begun: *Provided further*, That said petition shall be verified, and in all cases arising

hereunder service by publication may be had on all unknown heirs, the service to be in accordance with the method of serving nonresident defendants in civil suits in the district courts of said State; and if any person so served by publication does not appear and move to be heard within six months from the date of the final order, he shall be concluded equally with parties personally served or voluntarily appearing.

That the lands of full-blood members of any of the Five Civilized Tribes are hereby made subject to the laws of the State of Oklahoma, providing for the partition of real estate. Any land allotted in such proceedings to a full-blood Indian or conveyed to him upon his election to take the same at the appraisal, shall remain subject to all restrictions upon alienation and taxation obtaining prior to such partition. In case of a sale under any decree, or partition, the conveyance thereunder shall operate to relieve the land described of all restrictions of every character.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move to strike out the last word.

Now, Mr. President, I ask, in support of the motion I have just made, not wishing to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily, to have inserted in the Record, without reading, an editorial appearing upon page 3 of the Milwaukee Journal of March 25 entitled "Why LENROOT is unavailable," followed by the subtitle "Chicago Republican paper calls Chairman West's bluff. Chance Wisconsin would take with LENROOT as Senator."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we can not hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi speak a little louder?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thought it rather immaterial that I should be heard. How far does the Senator from North Dakota want me to go back in my remarks?

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator does not need to go back, if he will let us hear the remainder.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The editorial is headed "Why LENROOT is unavailable." Chicago Republican paper calls Chairman West's bluff. Chance Wisconsin would take with LENROOT as Senator. Chairman West passes the lie, and now it is up to him to show who is telling it."

Then I ask that there be inserted in the Record following that, Chairman West's statement headed "Who is telling a lie?" so that the two statements may appear, one correcting the other as far as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to speak a moment with respect to this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Let us have a vote on the pending bill.

Mr. ASHURST. There is no request the Senator from Mississippi could make of me that I would object to; but, Mr. President, let me say now that we could have passed the Indian appropriation bill in 30 minutes yesterday had it not been for the miserable twaddle that Senators indulged in respecting politics. Let us in this great crisis show that we are men, and act as becomes men. Let us do the business of the country, instead of talking about something that has no relation to the subject. Now, I give warning that if any more of this political twaddle is brought into this Chamber while the bill which I have in charge is under consideration, I will move to adjourn in order that the country may know that the Senate of the United States has degraded to such a low estate that it can not do its own routine business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Arizona, I have only to state that the Senate's "routine business" is a very contemptible thing in comparison with the war situation and the world situation as we are faced with it to-day, and what I am proposing to put in the Record has something to do with the war situation and the world situation. I am, of course, sorry to receive a lecture from the Senator from Arizona, and I feel absolutely reduced to insignificance by the power and force of it; but, at the same time, I believe I know something about my duties as an American citizen and something about my duties as a Member of the Senate, and I am pursuing those duties to the best of my ability.

I have not brought any politics upon this floor; I have not been guilty of any "political twaddle," as the Senator from Arizona has appeared to say. I am merely answering certain things that came out in the debate on March 26, when the troops of the allies were fighting like heroes in Europe and when we were being criticized here.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for just a moment, when I characterized the performance of yesterday as "miserable twaddle" I did not have in mind the Senator. The Senator knows I would not characterize any-

thing he could say in that way. There was no reference to him. I was humiliated, as were all true Americans, by the spectacle of yesterday; and, so far as in me lies, it is not going to be repeated again to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator has stated that he was humiliated by what occurred day before yesterday, he would have been about right.

Mr. ASHURST. I was, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But he was confining his observations to what occurred yesterday, and I am replying to what occurred day before yesterday.

Now, Mr. President, I ask consent that there also be published in the RECORD an article appearing in the first column of the Milwaukee Journal dated Monday, March 25, entitled "Ask LENROOT to withdraw. Republican organs in State ask union on Davies. Leading German-language organ of Milwaukee among G. O. P. papers now supporting the President's choice."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Mississippi to make all of his requests at once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator from Mississippi to make all of the requests for the insertion of matter in the RECORD at one time, so that the whole matter may be before the Senate at once. I understand that he has a number of articles for insertion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I choose to select my own course of procedure without very much suggestion from the Senator from Utah. Ordinarily, of course, I would be very glad to receive suggestions from him, but I have proffered that request and I should like to know what has become of it, because, if not granted, of course I will have to read the articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi to insert in the RECORD certain articles which he has named?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not believe that there is a Senator who approves of the course of the Senator from Mississippi, but I recognize that he can take the time of the Senate to read the articles into the RECORD; and for that reason I am not going to object.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very thankful to the Senator from Utah. Do I understand, Mr. President, that the request has been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not believe that in the United States Senate we should thrash out the political question which is now being fought out in Wisconsin. This is not the proper forum to try that question; and to attempt to do so is to take advantage of the candidates, because neither of them is on the floor to answer for himself. For these reasons I feel that I ought to do what I can to prevent such a proceeding. All I can do is to object to this discussion in the shape of editorials and writings being placed in the RECORD. I do not think they ought to be in the RECORD, and, therefore, I object. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Mississippi can himself read the articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator having objected, in my own time I will read what follows the headings I have already indicated. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish that the reading could be a little louder. Evidently from their response, the galleries can hear, but Senators can not hear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have stated that, of course, the Senator can read the articles; no one can prevent that; but I hope they will be read loud enough so that we can hear them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will attempt, in accordance with the demand of my friend from North Dakota, to raise my voice so loud that even the angels in heaven can hear if they want to listen. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. McCUMBER. The angels in heaven evidently have heard. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the galleries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is at least one angel in heaven very much indisposed to hear, and that is the Senator from North Dakota. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the Senator from North Dakota hopes to hear the reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily, therefore I will read very rapidly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I insist upon order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The first article which I desire to read is as follows:

ASK LENROOT TO WITHDRAW—REPUBLICAN ORGANS IN STATE ASK UNION ON DAVIES—LEADING GERMAN-LANGUAGE ORGAN OF MILWAUKEE AMONG G. O. P. PAPERS NOW SUPPORTING PRESIDENT'S CHOICE.

Public opinion continues to assert itself against Congressman LENROOT as senatorial candidate—

That is from a Republican paper—

The report from Eau Claire, published in the Journal Sunday, is finding an echo everywhere. The fact that President Wilson has said almost in so many words that Mr. LENROOT is not satisfactory to the Government in this crisis is having wide influence, for men know that the President is the leader and that upon him depends whether this country loses or wins the war. Republicans without number, no matter what their criticisms of the Government may be, recognize this fact and are opposing Mr. LENROOT. C. J. Wells, editor of the conservative Republican Tomah Monitor-Herald, expresses what is in many minds when he says in his paper: "I do not want a Congress that throws crowbars into the Government's machinery."

To-day the Germania-Herald, Milwaukee, the chief German-American Republican organ in the Northwest, comes out strongly for Davies, declaring that it is the duty of all citizens to support the Government in these trying times. It says:

"We can not deny the right of the free ballot even in war time, but we can and we do most earnestly urge upon every voter of this State the beneficent effect that the hearty support of the indicated wish of the President will have in strengthening the position of this country before the outside world. War time establishes unusual conditions, and to meet the wish of the head of the Government at this time constitutes an expression of confidence. Furthermore, whatever strengthens the hand of our leader will result in the earliest possible decision and a successful outcome of our present contest with our powerful opponent."

"We urge upon the voters such an expression of confidence and such a strengthening of the hand of our President by the support of one whose close personal contact with the President places him in a natural position to be of great assistance to the head of the Nation."

"In our editorials of the last few days we have made clear to the readers the supreme necessity of the internal unity of a nation at war. Now we urge upon our readers the hearty support of Joseph E. Davies for United States Senator."

So much of that comes from this German-American Republican newspaper. Now, to go ahead with the language of the Milwaukee Journal:

Other Republican newspapers in the State have espoused the cause of Mr. Davies for reasons similar to those given by the Germania-Herald. The Eau Claire Telegram, one of the leading Republican organs of the State, referring to the Republican effort to have Mr. Davies withdraw from the race, says:

"Republican leaders might with better countenance ask Davies to withdraw if Republican leadership in the State were not chargeable with giving Wisconsin the Republican Senator who has made most of the trouble—

Of course, that refers to the present Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who ought to be expelled from this body—with giving Wisconsin Representatives in Congress who at the most critical time were blind and deaf to the war; with giving Wisconsin a governor whose passiveness toward or concessions to antiwar elements at certain times, no matter how good his intentions, produced only bad results; whose aid to LA FOLLETTE in the latter's fight against enactment of the conscription law was only one among several errors. Chickens have come home to roost, and leaders of a party which has had such a narrow escape from being plastered on its own primary ticket with the lemon-colored tag of unbelief in the Nation's cause are in no position to demand that Davies haul down his colors and march off the ground in favor of their candidate, estimable as he is conceded to be—

And I want to add that he is estimable personally. I served with him in the House for years. I have no sort of personal feeling against him. He is a very clean, upstanding, square, straight fellow personally—

Expert politicians say that LENROOT is going to be elected; that the Republican is the "dominant party" in the State—

Listen to the partisan note in all that, will you?—

that Republicans will not vote for a Democrat, and so on. But if any of them can tell why, in view of the record, the people ought to rush to save the Republican Party machine in this loyalty campaign, let it be told, and that quickly. It has not yet been divulged. We make no prediction. But we believe that this is a time to give the national administration the utmost possible encouragement and support, and that the way to do it, in view of the developments of the primary and since is to vote for Davies.

That is from the Eau Claire Telegram, one of the leading Republican organs of the State of Wisconsin, and therefore it can not be accused of partisanship:

The editor of the Tomah Monitor-Herald (conservative Republican) expresses his conviction that Mr. Davies is the best candidate in the following terms:

"I have a son in the Army, and there are thousands of others who have sons in the Army, and those sons in the Army need and must have food, munitions, clothing, supplies, and the fathers and mothers of those sons in the Army want a Congress—a Senate—that will give them quick action. If a soldier doesn't get his food, supplies, and ammunition, he can't fight and will soon be under the slab, 'Died for his country'—

This is a Republican paper—

"I do not want a Congress that throws crowbars into the Government's machinery; that fights for delays on appropriations; that continually opposes the President; that takes up the time of the war boards in petty investigations; that is continually finding fault and

hindering the men who are striving to push and thus delaying the game; that is 50-50 on the German proposition because there are German votes.

"I and thousands of other fathers of soldiers do want a 100 per cent American in the Senate and Joe Davies is the 100 per cent American on the ticket in this election. Joe Davies will not delay action; Joe Davies will not hamper the President—he is with him all the way through. Joe Davies has been tried and not found wanting. Joe Davies gave up a \$10,000-a-year job to campaign for the office of United States Senator in Wisconsin because Wisconsin had a black eye in the eyes of the whole United States and because his friends in both political parties thought he was the man to lead Wisconsin back into the fold of loyal States.

"Joseph E. Davies is a close personal friend of President Wilson, the greatest man of the world to-day—

And that is what he is. Say whatever you please; criticize his administration as you will; with the possible exception of David Lloyd-George, he is the greatest man in the world to-day—

"It would be an honor the State of Wisconsin could do the President in no other way, to send Joe Davies to the Senate, and the President would profusely thank the people of Wisconsin for their loyalty in doing it.

"Joe Davies would be a greater help to the President now in his hour of need than any other man in Wisconsin, and there are thousands of fathers of soldiers that know it and will vote for him for the United States Senate on April 2."

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, without reading it, an article in the fourth column of the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "Duty of LENROOT—Indiana Republican organ says it is to withdraw—McLemore resolution vote fair cause of criticism why he should get out of the field."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The senior Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He does? Then, Mr. President, I will continue to read, because my reading is of the very finest quality, you know, and what I read will sink into the apparent deafness of the Republican Members of the Senate, even more than if I had inserted it in the RECORD—not that they really are deaf, of course.

Mr. President, the Indianapolis Star, the organ of the Republican State organization in Indianapolis, says editorially, under the heading "LENROOT'S Unenviable Position," what I am about to read.

Now, what I want to enforce upon the Senate and upon the Republican minority here is this: This country is no longer composed of Democrats and Republicans. It is composed of patriots and loyalists on one side and pro-Germans and lukewarm men upon the other side. Party politics have fallen into innocuous desuetude. I am not talking from the standpoint of any Democratic or Republican partisan bias, although I am talking with partisan bias. I am talking with the partisan bias of a pro-American and an anti-German, a lover of America and a hater of the Kaiser; and I will recognize no man as fit to keep step with me in the politics of the United States who does not frankly tell me that he hates the Kaiser, and hates the junkerdom, and hates the whole business, and would murder it if he knew how.

This comes from the Republican organ of the State of Indiana:

Few things are more to be desired from every point of view, patriotic, political, and military, than the most decisive defeat possible for Berger.

Berger is this pro-German pacifist-socialist candidate out there—

The defeat of Thompson renders it highly probable that a heavy proportion of his vote will go to Berger in the election.

Now, think of that! Here are men so false to America, so false to civilization, so false to the cause of democracy throughout the world, that they will indicate their partisan bias by voting for Berger, of Milwaukee, under indictment now for pro-German and anti-American utterances, a man who ought to be interned to-day! I started to say something stronger than that, but I will not; but he ought at least to be interned—and the counterplay of combining the opposing vote to achieve this result naturally suggest itself.

In the State of Wisconsin there were over 100,000 men, daring to call themselves Americans, who voted against America in the primaries, either for Thompson or for Berger; and they dare yet to permit themselves to live upon American soil. They have not the manhood to go out and commit suicide. They have not the manhood to ask to be deported from American shores, subject only to the possibility of being sunk by a German submarine. Who are these people? And yet that situation presented itself in Wisconsin, and we are dividing the

loyal American vote by two while we let these people concentrate upon one.

Mr. President, no State ought ever to permit a man to be nominated for office or elected to office by a plurality. Mississippi does not do it. A man must have a majority to be elected, not a plurality. If this were a case of a majority, we would have easy sailing in Wisconsin, because a majority of the population of Wisconsin is patriotic and American and anti-German; but we have split up the vote, and Davies has been called upon to withdraw, and this is the utterance of a Republican State organ in Indiana:

Unfortunately for LENROOT, he appears in a disadvantageous situation as the rallying point for the union of patriotic Democrats and Republicans upon himself, for before our entrance upon the war he was found in bad company in the support of measures that had the enthusiastic support of every pro-German in the land. Any man who voted for the McLemore resolution is the object of suspicion. Justly or unjustly, he is under a cloud.

It might truthfully be said that the test of for or against Great Britain before we entered the war was not conclusive as to loyalty and has no binding force to-day. We expect, and for the most part we receive, both theoretical and practical win-the-war service from those who sympathized with Germany and with those who championed England. We had no right to demand loyalty to England in the early stages of the war, but we have that right now that Great Britain is our ally. The administration at Washington puts out a letter which descends to politics in the shrewd reference to LENROOT's vulnerable record; but, aside from any question of good taste in such an out-giving, it must be said that this form of attack from the supporters of Davies is natural, unavoidable, and probably within his fair rights and privilege.

The demand will grow for LENROOT to step aside in the interest of a united front against Berger, and LENROOT's defense is likely to grow less cogent and convincing as time wears on. The ammunition that McGovern patriotically laid aside is not beyond reach of the Democrats, and they will not scruple to make the most of it. It need not occasion surprise if LENROOT has to withdraw; and if it is going to come to that, the sooner he does so the better.

That is from a Republican paper, and I hope you will mark the fact that I have read nothing from a Democrat newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, without reading it, an article appearing on page 14 of the Milwaukee Journal of March 25 entitled "Party rule is breaking down. G. O. P. leaders think that LENROOT should withdraw. Leaders in Chippewa Valley come out strongly in support of the Democratic candidate. Fear Berger's strength."

I submit that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right, Mr. President. My voice is still tolerably good.

Eau Claire, Wis.

There is a political situation at Eau Claire—in fact, in the whole Chippewa Valley—that defies all precedents in Wisconsin politics. Party labels are no longer an index to political strength or weakness. Americanism is the criterion on which candidates for the senatorship will rise or fall in this section. There are some who hold steadfastly to political faiths under whose flags they fought before this war began, and who are still thinking in terms of party success, but leaders here agree that the size of this element is waning, and the bonds that have held men together in strict party allegiance are breaking.

HAVE THREE REASONS.

There is apparently a landslide of loyal Republicans here to Joseph E. Davies, Democratic nominee. A large number of Republicans, who told the Journal that they supported Mr. LENROOT in the primary, have announced that they are back of Mr. Davies now. Those who have come over from other parties give three reasons for their change: First, that they believe there is no question of Mr. Davies' loyalty; second, that Mr. LENROOT is already a Member of Congress and has just as big an opportunity to render patriotic service in his present position as he would have in the Senate; third, that they believe Mr. Davies has a better chance to defeat Victor Berger than Mr. LENROOT, and they do not want to run any risk of throwing their vote away when the welfare of the Nation and the reputation of Wisconsin hangs in the balance.

A number of prominent Republicans of Eau Claire told the Journal they thought Mr. LENROOT ought to withdraw.

LENROOT SHOULD WITHDRAW.

Earle S. Welch, former Republican postmaster, said: "If it appears that either Mr. LENROOT or Mr. Davies must withdraw to win the fight, then, in my opinion, Mr. LENROOT is the man to withdraw. Mr. LENROOT is entrenched firmly in the House, and he can do as much good there as he could do in the Senate. I am very friendly to the candidacy of Mr. Davies and would not be sorry to see him elected."

Glen O. Linderman, Republican, lawyer, and manufacturer, said: "The one thing that I want to do in this campaign is to vote for and support a loyal man. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or Republican. I hope to see one of the candidates withdraw. I sincerely hope that Mr. LENROOT will withdraw because he could go back to Congress and do just as good work in the House as he could do in the Senate. If Mr. LENROOT does not withdraw it is a question in my mind as to which will be the stronger to defeat Victor Berger. I do not approve of Mr. LENROOT's stand on the McLemore resolution. I did not approve of it at that time, and I feel very much stronger against it now."

TIME FOR ACTION.

Some of the Republicans felt chagrined over the vote received by James Thompson and Victor Berger in the German sections of the Chippewa Valley. C. H. Henry said: "Considering the vote cast for LA FOLLETTE's candidate, James Thompson, and for Mr. Berger, it is about time for the people to do something—

An appeal to the people of Wisconsin to do something, with over 100,000 of them pronounced anti-Americans, antiloyalists, and antipatriots—

I was in hopes of a union on one candidate. I did not approve of Mr. LENROOT's vote on the McLemore resolution. I was with the President and there was nobody from Wisconsin right on that proposition but Senator HUSTING.

One remarkable feature of the primary in Eau Claire County was the vote cast for Mr. Thompson by old-time German Democrats.

The Germans are not paying any attention to partisan politics. The old-time German Democrats are voting for Republican candidates, provided only that they be untrue to America and faithful to the Kaiser. You and I stand here like whipped dogs, like sheared sheep, while they are going on with all that, and you and I are accused of partisanship if we say one word about it—

This was evidenced by the vote in the town of Lincoln, the village of Fall Creek, and the village of Augusta. The town of Lincoln was for many years the rockbound Democratic stronghold of Eau Claire County. It never wavered in its democracy, no matter how dark the outlook, until Republican leaders carried it for Mr. Hughes. Last Tuesday this town of Lincoln gave 101 votes to Mr. Thompson, 1 to Mr. LENROOT, and 8 to Mr. Davies. Its population is almost exclusively German. A prominent Democrat of Augusta, who was present at the Davies's meeting at Eau Claire Friday night, said: "The Republican leaders in the last presidential campaign set influences to work to turn this German vote over to the Republican Party. Fall Creek, another German stronghold, which was formerly Democratic, gave 83 votes to Thompson, 5 to LENROOT, and 18 to Davies."

SIXTY PER CENT FOR VICTOR BERGER.

The question of where the Thompson vote will go on election day is one of the burning problems here. Those who claim to know say that the bulk of it will go to Victor Berger. A local newspaper man who has been watching the trend of political movements in this country divided the Thompson vote into two classes. About 60 per cent of the people who voted for Thompson, he said, were Germans who were dissatisfied with the war. These, he thought, would vote solidly for Victor Berger. He estimated that about 40 per cent of the Thompson vote came from Norwegians, who did not look upon the war as the predominant issue. "These," he said, "thought only in terms of economic issues. They thought that LA FOLLETTE had served their economic interests in the past, and they did not want to desert him now. I do not think that many of the Norwegians will vote for Victor Berger."

Others in Eau Claire estimate that a much larger percentage of the Thompson vote will go to Mr. Berger. Some think that the pacifist editor of the Milwaukee Leader will get over 90 per cent of the votes cast for the La Follette candidate. Mr. Thompson received 1,056 in Eau Claire County. It is even surmised that a very small part of the Thompson vote will be cast for Mr. Davies on election day by La Follette supporters, who feel bitter toward Mr. LENROOT because "he threw Mr. LA FOLLETTE after Mr. LA FOLLETTE had given him a place in the sun."

DAVIES PROPER MAN.

Other opinions from leaders in Eau Claire and the Chippewa Valley follow:

James Joyce, Eau Claire, banker: "I think Davies is the proper man for the position. There is no question about Mr. Davies's loyalty."

A. J. Brandstad, Eau Claire, Republican: I am going to vote for Mr. Davies, because I think it is the right and proper thing to do to back up the President.

Guy Spiers, Eau Claire, Republican, who signed the Lenroot call and vigorously supported LENROOT in the primary: I consider Joseph E. Davies the administration man closest to the President and I am going to support him.

A. J. Sutherland, attorney, Eau Claire: A great many Republicans have told me that they will vote for Mr. Davies. Some of these even voted for Mr. LENROOT in the primary. They tell me that they believe that there is no question of Mr. Davies's loyalty; that even if Mr. LENROOT does not get this position, he is still in Congress, and that they consider it time for all loyal men to get together and support Joe Davies. The Republicans think he has a better chance of being elected than Mr. LENROOT.

J. A. Stip, paper manufacturer, Eau Claire: All that I can say is that I am strong for Joe Davies. I know of many Republicans who voted for Mr. LENROOT in the primary who will vote for Mr. Davies in the election.

W. H. Frawley, attorney, Eau Claire: At least 50 per cent of the Republicans who voted for Mr. LENROOT in the primary will vote for Mr. Davies on election day.

J. E. Davey, Eau Claire: I think that over 50 per cent of the total Republican vote here will be for Mr. Davies. There is no doubt that he will carry this county. The Germans who voted for James Thompson will probably vote for Victor Berger. The others will split.

J. J. Ott, vice president and general manager of the John H. Kaiser Lumber Co., Eau Claire: I supported Mr. LENROOT in the primary, but I am supporting Mr. Davies now, because I think he harmonizes closer with the family of the administration.

Mayor John R. Barron, Eau Claire: I am for Mr. Davies. I think he will get a considerable vote from Republicans in this city.

F. C. Waltersdorf, Democratic State central committeeman, Eau Claire: Many Republicans are going to vote for Mr. Davies, even some who voted for Mr. LENROOT in the primary in order to defeat James Thompson. Mr. Thompson's vote came largely from the Germans and about 95 per cent of it will go to Mr. Berger.

D. E. Kiser, Eau Claire: A considerable number who voted for Mr. LENROOT in the primary have openly come out for Joe Davies. They realize that Mr. Davies is the President's choice and feel that Mr. LENROOT should withdraw.

LIKE ELECTION OF '64.

A. W. Goff, Eau Claire, whose name was printed as a member of the local Lenroot committee, wrote a letter stating that his name was used without his authority, and that although he was a Republican he would support Mr. Davies because he believed Mr. Davies had proved his capability and his Americanism.

L. A. Brace likened the present political situation in Wisconsin to that existing in the country during the Civil War. Mr. Brace said: "I was a Democrat during the Civil War. I loved Gen. McClellan, and

I served under him for four years, but I voted for Mr. Lincoln in 1864, because I thought it the only right thing to do, and because I did not want to change horses in the middle of the stream. I think that the Republicans in Wisconsin should feel the same way about the Davies candidacy as I felt about President Lincoln in 1864."

Mr. President, upon yesterday I was arraigned on the other side of the Chamber for saying that Mr. LENROOT's loyalty was lukewarm. I am tired of the camouflage; I am tired of the Republican velvet glove, of the way in which they say, "We do not mean anything," but meanwhile, every now and then, with preconceived harmony of action and unity of purpose, they bounce all over the Democratic administration on one day.

I have here 10 questions which Mr. LENROOT has been asked to answer. Can I get unanimous consent to insert them in the Record, or must I read them? I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, nobody is so persistent in his objections as my friend from New Mexico; and I think it is not because he really objects to this but because he likes to hear my voice. In fact, I happen to know very well that he is dead in love with my voice, and he wants to hear it. Then I will read a part of these questions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has indicated his opinion of my purpose in making the objection, that it was from love for his dulcet tones.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The dulcet tones of my voice; yes.

Mr. FALL. That is not the only reason. If I were as partisan as he has charged the Republicans with being, I should desire the continuance of the present exhibition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was that? I did not quite hear it.

Mr. FALL. I said that not only did I love the dulcet tones of the Senator but if I were as partisan as he accuses this side of being, I should desire a continuance of the present performance or exhibition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Now, Mr. President, I knew that that sort of sweet recognition would come, sooner or later, from the Senator from New Mexico. I love him, and he loves me, and I knew that sooner or later he would pay me some compliment like that. Of course the condition which he makes is negligible, because he knows as well as I do that what I am now inflicting is well deserved; so I will read so much of this as I think worth while, and I will omit so much as I think is not worth while.

Omitting question No. 1, which I think has nothing in it, I read:

2. Why did you not firmly and wholeheartedly support President Wilson when he called on you and all other Members of Congress to maintain American rights?

Those were the rights of American citizens to sail upon the high seas, even in ships owned by the citizens or subjects of belligerent nations.

3. Why did you vote to ask Americans to surrender their rights to sail upon any merchant ship of whatever nationality?

4. Why did you join with the pro-German propagandists and disloyal organizations in advocating an embargo on shipments of arms and ammunition?

Ah, Mr. President, that question might have gone further, because that petition for an embargo was not only a protest against the shipment of arms and munitions, but was a protest against the shipment of food and fuel, American wheat and American corn and American rice and American sugar; so that question remains to be answered.

5. Why did you, in the summer of 1916, less than a year before America was forced into the war, vote against the plan to enlarge the Navy upon the basis of a three-year continuous building program?

Which was a substitute for the five-year building program. Again:

6. Why, although you voted for the war resolution against Germany, did you say that America should not send troops to Europe, but should make war upon Germany only upon the sea?

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] corrected me yesterday and said that Mr. LENROOT had not voted against the declaration of war against Germany. I, thinking that he knew what he was talking about, surrendered at once to the assertion which he made. I now find that he is partially right and partially wrong, and that Mr. LENROOT did vote for the declaration of war, but that he voted for it with an explanation that we were by all means not to send any troops to France nor to put any of our boys in the trenches; that it must be purely a naval

warfare and purely a defensive warfare upon American shores. In other words, when I had a deadly fight to defend my family against attack, I could defend them within the inclosure of my own front yard but I must not go outside; I must not anticipate the act of the enemy. I must not go to France and go into the trenches and fight where the enemy was, but I could remain in America all I pleased, the enemy not being here, and there being no war here and no danger here; and then we might take our chances upon the high seas as best we could. So I withdraw so much of my apology to the Senator from Utah yesterday as included a misapprehension on that point.

9. Why did you fail to vote at all on the espionage bill, a measure which provided means for unearthing and punishing German propagandists and others who plotted against America or destroyed its industries?—

"Or destroyed its industries," Mr. President—remember that! These infernal scoundrels were putting bombs with time fuses upon our merchant ships. They have blown up our manufactories. One of them tried to blow up this Capitol. Not one word of denunciation of those men appears in this man's record.

9. Why did you fail to vote at all on the espionage bill, a measure which provided means for unearthing and punishing German propagandists and others who plotted against America or destroyed its industries? Where were you when the vote upon this all-important measure was taken?

10. Why did you fail to vote at all upon the war-risk insurance bill, the beneficent law proposed by the President to provide insurance at low cost to soldiers and sailors; to compensate them for injuries and to provide maintenance for their dependents?

Mr. President, we have come to this point in America, and as far as I am concerned I want it distinctly understood. There is no Democratic Party and there is no Republican Party here any more. There is a loyalist, pro-American, aggressively and if necessary offensively pro-American party, and a party which is pro-German or lukewarm in its Americanism. Those who are not with us are against us, and let them take their medicine; and if the law does not give them their medicine the people will, and the people are beginning to wake up.

Let not any man over there dare accuse me of Democratic partisanship. That I had it, yes; that I have it now, no. I am nothing to-day except one with my boys in the field. I have no object under the sun except to win this war. I will vote to expel from this body any man who has not been true and who has been lukewarm. I will vote to elect to this body any man of whatsoever party who has been aggressively pro-American and anti-German, and a hater of the Kaiser and all that, and he must show that to satisfy me. Then I am for him, but I am against anybody who falls short of that full measure of American requirement in behalf of civilization and the cause of freedom and the cause of democracy throughout the world. I can not be with those boys in body, because I would be a liability rather than an asset of the United States Government. If I undertook to serve in the trenches I would have to be carried away, I reckon, but I am with them in spirit and soul and heart, and every criticism directed against the American governmental machinery unless it is absolutely necessary and fully justified meets with my contempt.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong this discussion or engage in any controversy with the Senator from Mississippi over Wisconsin politics. I am going, however, to state a fact that quite likely the Senate might like to know, and which I presume the Senator from Mississippi does not know. The Milwaukee Journal has been paraded as a great Republican newspaper—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; I never said so. The Milwaukee Journal quoted from a lot of Republican newspapers, and I quoted what they said.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Milwaukee Journal is a bitter, partisan Democratic organ.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never said the Milwaukee Journal was a Republican paper. I knew better, and have known it for years.

Mr. KELLOGG. It has been the mouthpiece of the administration. I am making no complaint, but editorials from that bitter, hostile journal ought not to be quoted as editorials from Republican newspapers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator mean to say that I quoted any editorial from the Milwaukee Journal as an editorial from a Republican newspaper?

Mr. KELLOGG. I so understood the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator totally misunderstood me. The Milwaukee Journal quoted these editorials from Republican papers and I quoted the publication of them in the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. KELLOGG. I can give the Senator a great many—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not mean to say that the Milwaukee Journal mispublished those editorials?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know anything about that. The Senator from Mississippi heard what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, any statement to the effect that I said the Milwaukee Journal was a Republican paper was purely erroneous, not to go further.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Mississippi to say that he quoted from Republican papers through the Milwaukee Journal, as he now claims, but I think the Senator has forgotten—

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

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment I will be through.

Mr. ASHURST. I am afraid one sentence will start the Senator from Mississippi again.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say it will not start the Senator from Mississippi again, as far as I am concerned, because I am not going to answer his tirade. No one will approve the course that has been taken by the Senator from Mississippi. I expect to make a short statement not to exceed seven lines.

I wish to say that some of the papers the Senator quoted from are German papers rather than Republican papers. I now quote from a letter received from Wisconsin, as follows:

Last Monday, the 20th, a conference was called by committee of Loyalty Legion, between chairmen of State central committees, Davies, and Mr. LENROOT, to consider the subject of the withdrawal of either Davies or Mr. LENROOT, but Davies skipped to Chicago about an hour before the conference, so he did not show up. Mr. LENROOT issued a stinging statement of his action and stated he would fight to a finish.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to make a point of order against the pending amendment. I am confident the Senator from Oklahoma did not realize when he introduced it just how far the amendment goes. It is general legislation, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. OWEN. I have heretofore said that this amendment was the result of a conference between the Oklahoma delegation and the Secretary of the Interior, and was in effect drawn by the office of the Secretary of the Interior, using as a basis a proposal sent to me as a Senator from Oklahoma by the attorney representing the Farm Loan Board in Wichita, who had had difficulty in determining the personnel of heirs. I understand the measure to relate only to determining who the heirs are and that it does not affect the title, as the Senator from Kansas thinks it might.

I think it is obviously open to a point of order, because it does seem to be general legislation on the appropriation bill, and I shall not make any parliamentary objection when it is made.

Mr. CURTIS. Before the Chair passes on it I wish to say that I will gladly join the Senator from Oklahoma in preparing a measure that will cover the point as a separate bill later, so that some relief may be given.

Mr. OWEN. I think we might perhaps let the amendment have a provision attached to it that it shall not affect any title by any court proceeding of a previous date.

Mr. CURTIS. I would rather not at this time. I think it is general legislation, and we had better take care of it in a separate measure. I therefore insist on my point of order.

Mr. OWEN. It is certainly open to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read:

The SECRETARY. After line 10, on page 37, insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$200,000 of any tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Crow Indians in the State of Montana, and to expend the same for making necessary improvements to the irrigation systems in the Big Horn Valley on the Crow Indian Reservation, in Montana, said sum, or such part thereof as may be used for the purpose indicated, to be reimbursed to the tribe under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in support of the amendment I will read a letter, addressed to the chairman of the committee, by the Secretary of the Interior:

MARCH 25, 1918.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I attach hereto copy of a proposed amendment to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 9696), authorizing the withdrawal of the sum of \$200,000 of tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Crow Indians and the expenditure thereof for making necessary improvements to the irrigation systems in the Big Horn Valley, on the Crow Reservation, in Montana.

Negotiations have been completed for the leasing of all unused Indian lands in the Big Horn Valley, on the Crow Reservation, Mont. This land is under irrigation projects, and in order that water may be conveyed thereto efficiently there must be some improvement of the laterals and main canals and extension of laterals. In addition to the construction of necessary new laterals many of the old wooden structures must be replaced with concrete. The acreage involved is approximately

20,000 acres, and it is estimated that the proposed improvements will cost in the neighborhood of \$10 per acre, or a total of \$200,000. Owing to the fact that after July 1, 1918, no tribal funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury without the specific authority of Congress, and as no other money will be available for this purpose, it is recommended that the proposed amendment be included in the bill upon final passage.

The chief benefits to be derived from this proposition will be to aid in meeting the war need for increased wheat production to the extent of approximately 600,000 bushels per annum; an increased annual acreage income to the allottees from about 20 cents per acre as grazing land to from \$6 to \$12 per acre as agricultural; safeguarding the water rights; the increased value of the land; and the strong possibility that the intensive cultivation of this large new area will mean the building of a steam or electric railroad from Hardin up the Big Horn Valley.

In view of the circumstances set forth above, I recommend that the item receive favorable consideration.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand the reading of the letter, a lease has already been made for this uncultivated land. Is that true?

Mr. MYERS. I so understand.

Negotiations have been completed for the leasing of all unused Indian lands in the Big Horn Valley, on the Crow Reservation, Mont.

Mr. CURTIS. Can the Senator advise the Senate for what purpose the lease has been made; whether it is for beet sugar, or wheat growing, or general farming, or for what purpose?

Mr. MYERS. It is my understanding that there have been leases for general farming, principally grain growing. It may be that the leases are dependent upon the contingency of this appropriation being made putting water on the land. The Secretary appears to consider it very essential, in view of these leases, that water shall be put on the land. I have answered the Senator to the best of my ability.

Mr. President, in support of this amendment I will say that it does not seek to appropriate any money of the United States Government. It is not an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States of any money belonging to the Federal Government.

The Crow Indians, I am informed, have about \$1,000,000 to their credit in cash on deposit in the Federal Treasury, and this proposed legislation is intended to withdraw \$200,000 of the Indian money and devote it to the extension of the project for the benefit of the Indians. It is not to take a dollar belonging to the Federal Government. It is Indian money that is intended to be expended for their benefit.

I will say further that there are no white people who own any of this land it is intended to put water on or who are in anywise interested in it. There can be no question raised that it is for the benefit of white people. This land is owned entirely by the Indians. It is Indian land, and it is Indian money, and the intention is to expend Indian money on Indian land for the benefit of the Indian. Of course if the land is leased out to white farmers there will be white people cultivating the land, paying adequate rental for it to the Indians, and that will be the extent to which any white man will be interested.

The Secretary of the Interior tells us that it will be the means of increasing the rental of these lands from about 20 cents per acre as dry lands for grazing purposes to from \$6 to \$12 per acre per annum as farming lands, and the Indians will get the benefit of the increased rental.

This amendment did not originate with me. It is one in which I have no particular or individual interest. It originated with the Department of the Interior, and I am offering it as a departmental amendment at the request of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course this is in the Senator's own State, and I know he has as much, if not more, interest in the growth of his State and in the progress of the Indians than any other Senator, but it does seem to me it is somewhat unfair to bring such an amendment as the Senator has proposed here without giving the committee an opportunity to discuss it and to make an investigation. I think I might say it is also unfair to the Crow Indians.

The Senator knows better than I do the serious opposition the Crow Indians have made to the taking of any of their tribal funds for irrigation purposes. I believe it would have been only fair to have given the Crow Indian Tribe an opportunity to appear before our committee and to be heard before we take \$200,000 out of their funds.

I wish to ask the Senator another question, if he will permit me. Is it contemplated to lease this land for, I understood the Senator to say, a million dollars, and was it taken into consideration that it was necessary to appropriate \$200,000 in order to bring water on the land? Does that enter into the contract, I ask the Senator?

Mr. MYERS. That is my understanding.

Mr. GRONNA. But that matter has never been brought to the attention of the committee, as far as I know, either by the Senator or by the department.

Mr. MYERS. I have not the honor of being a member of that committee. I formerly was upon it, but my State is represented now on the committee by my colleague [Mr. WALSH]. He is the member of the committee from my State.

I have something here on the attitude of the Indians, if the Senator wants information on that point, and I would be glad to give it.

Mr. GRONNA. It seems to me it is rather unfair to propose to take \$200,000 out of the Indian fund, something that has never been proposed in the committee, and now to be compelled to vote upon this proposition without making the slightest investigation and without having had an opportunity to give the Indians a chance to be heard.

Mr. MYERS. I have given them an opportunity to be heard, and I will submit some information I have on the subject.

Mr. GRONNA. Can the Senator inform the Senate as to whether the Crow Indians are in favor of this amendment or whether they are opposed to it?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I intend to submit information on that subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MYERS. With pleasure.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not care to ask the Senator a question. I want to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I do not yield the floor for that purpose. I want to complete my statement first and lay it before the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not want to be unfair in the matter. I have no disposition to do anything that is unfair, and if I thought the offering of this amendment was unfair to anybody I would not offer it, but I think it is fair or else I would not have offered it.

As I said, this is a departmental amendment which originated with the department. Why the department did not originate it sooner I do not know. It did not originate with me. I have no particular or personal interest in the amendment.

I am offering it at the request of the Department of the Interior. Their request came to me only within the last few days that the bill has been before the Senate, and I investigated the matter before I would consent to offer it. When presented to me I said I would not offer it until I would make some investigation of it. I did investigate it, and I concluded it was fair and right and proper, and I will give my reasons for my conclusion. Thereupon I offered it.

As I said, this land belongs to the Indians. The money belongs to the Indians. The Government is the guardian of the Indians, and it is for Congress to say what is the wise manner in which to handle these trust funds. Shall it let them lie idle in the Treasury of the United States, bearing no interest, or shall it allot them so much per capita to the Indians and pay it out to them, which, I believe, can not be done until they are declared competent, or will it be best to take a part of it and put it into improvements of the Indian lands so that they will get a benefit out of it? It is for Congress to say. If Congress thinks wise to so appropriate this money, it should do so. If Congress thinks it is not wise to do it, it need not do so.

The matter having been submitted to my colleague and myself, we consulted together and we took some steps to ascertain whether it would be justifiable to offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate. We wanted to be enlightened. We did not want to do it, not knowing what we were doing. So my colleague sent a telegram to Mr. Robert Yellowtail, a representative Crow Indian on the reservation. I understand there is on the reservation a committee of Indians intended to represent the Indians in matters of their own interest, in legislation and departmental matters, matters before Congress and before the committees. They, I believe, constitute a committee for that purpose with authority to speak. The committee, I understand, is composed of Robert Yellowtail, Frank Yarlott, and Richard Cummins. My colleague telegraphed to Robert Yellowtail to know what the Indians thought about this matter. He

acquainted him with the nature of the proposed amendment and asked his advice about it, and here is the reply:

WYOLA, MONT., March 26, 1918.

HON. THOMAS J. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' appropriation—

He got it—\$250,000—but it is only \$200,000—

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars' appropriation asked for by department desirable if same be expended in actual construction for completion of Little Horn ditch No. 2, Lodge Grass No. 2, Reno ditch, and extension of agency ditch; also maintenance of Big Horn ditch. Guard against use of this in way of salaries.

ROBERT YELLOWTAIL,
FRANK YARLOTT,
RICHARD CUMMINS.

As I said, I understand those gentlemen to be a sort of a business committee to represent the Crow Indians. I know Mr. Yellowtail well. He often comes down here and appears before the Committee on Indian Affairs and the department and is one of the leading and most intelligent and most reliable of all the Crow Indians, and I place considerable confidence in his judgment. I will say that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] is in favor of this amendment, as I am. We are as one in support of it. He is a member of the committee and would probably have offered the amendment if he had been here to-day. It was agreed between us that one of us should offer it. He is not here and therefore I offered it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course I do not mean to intimate that the Senator would attempt anything that was unfair.

Mr. MYERS. I understand the Senator. He was just expressing his judgment about the advisability of the appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wanted to inform the Senate that the matter had not been considered by the Senate committee.

Mr. MYERS. That is true. I would much rather it had been considered by the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. So far as I am personally concerned I will say to the Senator if the chairman of the committee will assure me that he will make an investigation of it I am perfectly willing to let it go to conference.

Mr. MYERS. I have no personal interest in it, and I say I would much rather it had been submitted to the committee. When it was first presented to me I was in doubt whether I would offer it, because it had not been submitted to the committee, but when I investigated the source which I have read here and other sources I concluded that it was justified and all right.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota, that if the chairman of the committee will promise to look into this matter, as far as I am concerned I have personally no objection to its going in, and I make that statement for this reason: I hold in my hand the statement issued by the irrigation division of the Interior Department, and it shows there are now upon that reservation 26,154 acres of land under the ditch not cultivated. If the lease is to cover only 20,000 acres, they could still make a lease for 20,000 acres and have 6,000 acres left. I think if that fact is demonstrated before the conferees on the part of the Senate they should not insist upon the amendment. Here is the latest report, and it does show that there are 26,154 acres of land under the ditch not cultivated.

Mr. MYERS. I will say that I am not prepared to account for that, and if it goes in the bill I think the chairman of the committee should investigate it before it is finally passed. I have been advised not only by these three Indians but by other sources which I consider reliable that this is a just and legitimate appropriation and that it would result in benefit to the Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I think I can very briefly state to the Senate the information and all the information that I possess in respect to this item.

On the 25th of this month, about three days ago, I received a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, which communication has been read by the senior Senator from Montana. Therefore I will not again read that letter. In substance, however, it was a letter urging an appropriation of \$200,000, not out of the Treasury of the United States but out of the tribal funds on deposit to the credit of the Crow Indians, and the letter went on to state that the chief benefit to be derived from this proposition would be to aid to meet the war

needs for increased wheat production and that approximately 600,000 bushels per annum would be raised on this land.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee and as an individual Senator, I have the highest regard and respect for the Secretary of the Interior, and I am sure I speak the unanimous judgment of every Senator here; but I do not like the idea of sending to the chairman of the committee a proposition for a large appropriation after the bill has been reported to the Senate. I expressed my disapprobation of that procedure in rather strong terms to the Indian Office, and the reply they gave me was that the failure to send in this item so that the same could be considered by your committee was because at the time the committee was in session negotiations had not been completed looking toward the leasing of the lands that they wished to lease. In other words, the bill was reported on February 16 of this year; and up to and including that date negotiations which they hoped to make had not been made.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to propose a line of action with respect to this amendment which I think will be conservative, and which I think can be adopted. Let the point of order be made and let the Senator from Montana introduce this as a separate bill. We can convene the committee to-morrow; we can hear the representatives of the department on Saturday; and I am sure the Senate will give us an opportunity to pass it as a substantive bill on next Monday. I have that much faith in the Senate to believe that it will allow us to pass this as a substantive bill on next Monday. All I know about it is comprehended within the two pages of the letter which I hold in my hand.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask for what this money is to be used?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me read the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, which is dated March 25 of this year. It states:

Negotiations have been completed for the leasing of all unused Indian lands in the Big Horn Valley, on the Crow Reservation, Mont. This land is under irrigation projects, and in order that water may be conveyed thereto efficiently, there must be some improvement of the laterals and main canals and extension of laterals. In addition to the construction of necessary new laterals, many of the old wooden structures must be replaced with concrete. The acreage involved is approximately 20,000 acres, and it is estimated that the proposed improvements will cost in the neighborhood of \$10 per acre, or a total of \$200,000. Owing to the fact that after July 1, 1918, no tribal funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury without the specific authority of Congress, and as no other money will be available for this purpose, it is recommended that the proposed amendment be included in the bill upon final passage.

Now, answering the Senator from Oklahoma:

The chief benefits to be derived from this proposition will be to aid in meeting the war need for increased wheat production to the extent of approximately 600,000 bushels per annum; an increased annual acreage income to the allottees from about 20 cents per acre as grazing land to from \$6 to \$12 per acre as agricultural—

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I do not think that the argument is very convincing with 26,000 acres unemployed during the last year, with 60,000 acres unemployed on another one of these projects, and with large areas on another of these projects unemployed, the committee, finding itself compelled to cut down this appropriation because of that, does not seem very convincing to me.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator from Arizona yield to me a minute? I should like to explain this to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. This is not money which is to come out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. OWEN. It does not make any difference whether it comes from the United States Treasury or from the funds of this Indian tribe. I think that, if it is not justified as an appropriation from the Federal Treasury it is less justified from Indian money.

Mr. MYERS. Certainly. I thought the Senator was referring to getting Government appropriations.

Mr. OWEN. Not at all. If the argument does not justify the larger appropriation out of Government funds for this great enterprise in which I take a deep interest, and which I should like to see expended—

Mr. MYERS. I know that.

Mr. OWEN. I do not think that the Indian funds ought to be used unless there is some different argument made.

Mr. MYERS. I should like to be heard a minute further when the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] concludes.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, let me conclude at once, by stating that the impression that I have formed concerning this matter is distinctly favorable, Mr. President, from two viewpoints. Where the Indian allottees are now receiving only 20 cents per acre each year, it may be—and I am inclined to think it is true—that they will receive from six to twelve dollars per acre. I am

rather favorably impressed with the proposition; but I do think that a matter involving \$200,000, sent to our committee after it had adjourned, ought to be considered in all its details, and that the representatives of the department should come before the committee. We can pass this as a substantive bill in two hours.

Mr. OWEN. As I understand the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, it is to the effect that they hope to lease this land, not that they have leased it, for agricultural purposes.

Mr. ASHURST. The statement is that negotiations have been completed.

Mr. OWEN. For the leasing?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; so says the letter.

Mr. OWEN. I think it is high time that the Interior Department were exercising its energies to make productive these lands which the United States has spent millions of dollars in developing; and I think the department is not justified in coming to Congress and asking for further appropriations when people are living within these large areas of land which is unproductive. Now, with this statement, that they have actually gotten to the point that they can use these lands, can get somebody to cultivate them, I should not insist upon the point of order. I am willing to leave it to the chairman of the committee; but I think there ought to be a good reason when we have laid down a principle and fail to follow it.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, again stating that the impression I have gleaned from my very cursory and necessarily very incomplete investigation of this matter, is one distinctly favorable I desire to say that I can see that much good may come to the Indians; but I am able to perceive that it is possible that there may be grown, probably not this year, but surely next year, the amount of wheat stated by the Secretary of the Interior, but I wish to deprecate the idea of sending in a request for large appropriations after the committee has had extended hearings and has adjourned.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have purposely avoided taking up any time whatever in the discussion during the consideration of this bill. I have done so because I am very much interested in having the bill passed and become a law as speedily as possible. The members of the committee know that there are many items in this bill involving appropriations which must be used by the Indian Bureau in the purchase of seed grain, and I believe that it ought to be passed at the earliest practicable moment.

I am also interested in increasing food production; and the amendment which is now proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] appeals to me. I want to ask the indulgence of the Senate for only a few minutes in discussing this question, and I want to read from the Weekly News Letter of the United States Department of Agriculture a sentence or two under the heading "The farmers may be depended upon by the Secretary of Agriculture," which reads as follows:

The war has served to exhibit to the country at large, as the country never quite realized before, its dependence upon agriculture and the manifold problems which beset our primary industry. There is reason to believe therefore that during the coming year agriculture will have the active sympathy and cooperation of all citizens and classes who are in position to render aid. The farmers of the United States will not fail to do all they can in this emergency and, with favorable seasons, they will produce enough to sustain the civil population, to keep our Army and Navy in full fighting vigor, and to supplement the depleted resources of the allies. Every facility that the Department of Agriculture can command to assist them will be freely placed at their disposal.

Mr. President, I believe that the Department of Agriculture is doing everything in its power to stimulate the production of food, but there is, of course, a limit to what it may be able to do. I can remember about a year ago when this body passed a measure known as the food bill—I think it was passed in this Chamber on the 31st day of May last—and it was held up somewhere between this body and the other body for more than two months; it was never acted upon. I see before me now the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. GORE], and I want to ask him what is being done with the Agricultural appropriation bill, which passed this body on March 21? In that bill there was included a provision for a price of \$2.50 per bushel on wheat? I should like to know from the chairman of the committee what has been done; if the conference committee has been appointed on the bill, or where the bill now is?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will say, in response to the Senator's question, that I have made inquiry nearly every day since the Agricultural appropriation bill passed the Senate, and I was to-day advised that the measure is still on the Clerk's desk in the other House. It has not been called up, as I am informed; it has neither been sent to conference nor sent to the Committee on Agriculture. So far as I know, nothing has been done, and my advices are only two or three hours old.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that the same course is being pursued upon that particular bill which was taken a year ago upon the food bill, when the welfare of the people of the entire country was at stake. There were many who thought that that bill was passed only for the benefit of the farmer. That was not true then and it is not true now as to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Oklahoma and which was voted into that bill by an overwhelming vote of 48 to 22 to suspend the rules and by a vote of 49 to 18 or 19 on the final passage. I want to say, Mr. President, that so far as the Senate is concerned, it has done its duty.

While I am on that subject, I ask to have read by the Secretary a letter calling attention to the importance of this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

BROCKETT, N. DAK., March 23, 1918.

HON. A. J. GRONNA.

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRONNA: I have for a long time intended to write you to tell you the sentiment of our neighborhood as the time for crop seeding is approaching. The sentiment here seems to be that not much wheat will be seeded unless Congress raises the price of wheat without delay. The cost of production may exceed the market price of the wheat, depending largely upon the season and the labor conditions. We will seed more barley and oats, and we already have a fair quantity of winter rye seeded. Farming machinery is much higher now than a year ago, and all of these things should be taken into consideration.

Another matter to which I wish to call your attention, of which you may be already well aware, and that is that most of our young men are being drafted into the Army. They are all loyal, as we all are, and willing to go when called, but they will be missed on the farm very much. They have a special skill in operating farm machinery and they naturally take greater interest in the success of the farming than would the foreign labor. We can not replace them by unskilled and unwilling, disloyal labor. We anticipate a great handicap with such labor by our next thrashing season. We do not like to assume the risk of seeding a large crop and to be dependent upon unskilled and disloyal I. W. W. labor to harvest our crop. We have experience of their threats to strike and destroy our crop when we want our crops harvested and taken care of. We will be helpless if we are left to depend upon that class of labor entirely.

We feel that you already know these things, but I write you, as you expect all of your constituents to write you, to keep you in touch with the going sentiment of your State. We wish that Congress will take immediate action to raise the price of wheat, so that we may know where we are at, and also that the War Department will modify the rules of the selective-service law so that our young men, whom we necessarily need to take charge of the farm machinery and the farming in general, would be exempted from service so as to protect us from this disloyal element.

Yours, very truly,

ERIK KYLLONEN.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the writer of that letter is one of my neighbors; I know him personally. He is both a scientific and a practical farmer. Some 30 years ago he came to this country from the Province of Finland, in the Empire of Russia. He came here practically without means; in fact, I might say practically without a dollar; but by genius and physical strength he has forged ahead until to-day he owns one of the model farms of the West. He owns and operates some 5,000 acres. His farming is done under the most modern and improved methods, and the main work on the farm is being done under the direction of himself and his four sons. I might say, also, that this letter is typical of thousands of letters I have received.

Mr. President, the farmers in my section of the country have already begun their seeding operations, and it is very important that they shall know as speedily as possible what the Congress of the United States will do with reference to the price of wheat. It is true, as the writer of the letter states, that they are all loyal; they are willing to do all that is in their power; but I believe, sir, that more food will be produced if the bill which was passed by this body the other day is enacted into law. I believe, sir, that a larger percentage of wheat will be sown in all the spring wheat States if that bill becomes a law, because it will be an encouragement to the farmers; and it will make it possible for them to pay for labor the high prices which they are now compelled to pay.

The great increase in the price of labor may not be apparent to all Senators. Not only has there been an increase of from 100 to 150 per cent in the wage scale, but the hours of labor have been reduced so that, instead of working 12 hours per day, the laborer now refuses to work more than 8, which increases the price of wages the farmer has to pay 50 per cent more.

There have been presented to the Senate and to the Congress heretofore the facts as they actually exist in relation to the high prices which our farmers have to pay for everything they use in producing their crops.

Mr. President, organization and coordination in every branch of business, in every department of our Government, are absolutely essential to our success. We must go forward as a united people, with a full realization of the responsibilities con-

fronting us. Our energies must be harmoniously organized and coordinated into a single unit of strength. That was the method which brought success to the fathers. By that method we can succeed and win now.

I repeat what I said a few days ago, that the testimony of representatives from various farm organizations who have appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is in accordance with the testimony of this man, the writer of the letter read at the desk, that in order to enable the farmers to produce wheat the price must be advanced.

Congress and the Food Administration have interfered with the farmers' market. The wrong course has been pursued, and the only thing we can do now is to do what we can to help the farmer out of the deplorable condition in which we have placed him.

To my mind it is more important to produce the food, let the cost be what it may, than to keep down the prices, thereby discouraging the production of food.

I have often said, and I repeat, that I consider food one of the important factors in the winning of this war, and when we analyze the situation, taking into consideration the large amount of labor necessary to produce grain, it must be apparent to all of us that we must allow the farmer an increased price.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we can win this war by mere lip service. I have never believed, nor do I believe now, sir, that we can win it by eloquence, by epithets or words of hatred. The Senators who have recently spoken so eloquently and so loudly with respect to their patriotism forget that many other Senators who have said but little upon these questions have sons in the Army and at the front as well as those who have spoken so eloquently upon this and other occasions. Thank God, you who make the most noise, you who seek to wrap yourselves in Old Glory, are not the only ones who are going to participate in this great struggle and in the effort to win the victory.

Mr. President, I agree with every word that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] said this morning. Let us eliminate from the discussions in the Senate political campaigns in the State of Wisconsin and elsewhere. Your own action condemns you; the words you have spoken condemn you; you have shown to the Senate and to the world that you are more interested in the campaign for a United States Senator than you are in the thousands and millions of brave boys who are willing to sacrifice their lives upon the altar of freedom for their country.

I admit when the declaration of war was pending in this body that there were those who were not ready to vote for it, but I stated then, if a majority of this and the other body said that it should be passed, I would do my full duty. So far as I am concerned, I have done so, and I will challenge any man anywhere to show to the contrary.

Mr. President, if I have read history right, I do not know of a single campaign, I do not know of any war, that was ever won simply by lip service and by heated discussion. Three-fourths of the time of the Senate recently has been taken up by certain Senators who have declared that other citizens are not as loyal as they are. So far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to vote for any measure, I am willing to vote for any appropriation, I am willing to follow the President as far as you will follow him in the performance of his duties in order to win this war.

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

Mr. GRONNA. I gladly yield.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator does not mean to leave the impression that any Senator upon this side of the Chamber has accused any Senator upon the other side of the Chamber of any act of disloyalty or any failure to give due and loyal service to the President, to the administration, and to our country in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator for that statement. I appreciate it, perhaps more than he has any idea.

Mr. KING. Speaking for myself, I should feel ashamed if any Senator on this side of the Chamber should attempt to detract in the slightest degree from the loyalty and the patriotism of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, or of any man who occupies a seat upon the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. GRONNA. I again thank the Senator. Mr. President, if I have made mistakes they are my own mistakes. I never have since I was thrown upon my own resources followed any man unless in my own mind and heart I knew that my action was right.

I would not allude to the matter to which I am about to allude except for the fact that certain Senators have spoken so elo-

quently about their patriotism. I do not challenge their patriotism; I believe they are patriotic; I have no right to refuse to believe they are, but I want to say to the Senate and to the country that so far as I am personally concerned my son went to the war when he was but 18 years old. He never had to ask my consent a second time, and he enlisted in the Regular Army as a private, he went to the bottom of the ladder. I have never written a letter nor asked for any favors for him, because I wanted him to take his chances with the rest of the boys who are going to the front. Mr. President, all that boy could do was to offer his services and his life.

It is a deplorable thing that a Senator's motives should be questioned; and when I hear statements made challenging the patriotism and the loyalty of certain candidates for office in Wisconsin, who made their fight upon a loyalty platform, let me say right now that so far as Mr. Thompson is concerned I know him personally, and I want to say for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi, and other Senators, that he is just as loyal as is the Senator from Mississippi or any Member of this body. Neither by word of mouth nor by anything that he has written has he intimidated anything but that he was in favor of the most vigorous prosecution of this war. What his attitude was before the war was declared, I do not know; but I want to say here and now that I know that Mr. Thompson is a loyal American citizen.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point for a moment?

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

Mr. GRONNA. I will yield for a question.

Mr. ASHURST. Well, I hardly want to ask a question. The Senator will bear witness that I have tried to keep out of this discussion. I do not blame the Senator. I deprecate these things that come from our side as much as I do those that come from the other side.

Mr. GRONNA. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy and friendship.

Mr. ASHURST. But I just want to say that the Senator is a valued member of the committee. He probably will be one of the conferees on this bill. I am not trying to lecture anybody. The Senator knows that I could not do that, and I would not do it; but I am extremely anxious to get this bill through this evening. It may be an unimportant bill; but being charged with the conduct of the bill, I do want to conclude its consideration. I have told a number of Senators around the Chamber that we would finish it this evening; and while I do not want to shorten the speech of the Senator—I could not if I tried to—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am through. I know that the Senator is anxious to get through with the bill, and I am anxious to get through with it, too.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. GRONNA. I was simply carried away, perhaps, with my own enthusiasm, because I have been sitting here in silence for many days listening to these eloquent speeches, beautiful as they are, couched in language which it would be impossible for me to use; but they can not always be substantiated by facts.

Mr. President, I am through.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, before this war began many United States citizens of German blood and of Austrian blood, having in mind those of their kin and former companions, that they loved abroad, naturally felt a sympathy for Germany and Austria, never dreaming of the devilish ambitions of the Kaiser to conquer and rob the world by brutal military force; but after the die was cast and the United States entered into this war, I think the overwhelming preponderance of those men and women, finding it necessary to make their choice, did make it with a sincere and patriotic heart, and with all their soul are favoring and supporting the Government of the United States.

I do not think it strengthens the United States to wound the feelings of those who, before the war developed the terrible issues we now clearly understand, felt sympathy for the German cause. They merely loved their old German friends and kindred, as was very natural, and did not know then the evil intent of the military autocracy. The majority of Americans did not at first comprehend the Kaiser's fiendish designs on the liberties of mankind. I deprecate any speech that would cause our patriotic citizens of German and Austrian blood to feel that they are the object of suspicion or the object of aversion or the object of positive hostility. On the contrary, their patriotism, in spite of their affection for the people of the old Fatherland, having been triumphant, they deserve all the more honor and respect because of their fidelity to the United States. Our German-Americans are in a position of great trial. Ninety-five out of a hundred are utterly faithful to America. A few are lukewarm. Probably not one in a hundred is so ignorant as to be hostile at

heart to America. Let us not insult or wound the 99 by intemperate talk.

This is a great struggle, in which all of our people ought to cooperate. I deprecate exceedingly that there should be any appearance of political debate on the floor.

Let us welcome to the ranks of patriotic Americans all who are with us in heart now.

Let us not drive away by unjust and ungenerous suspicions those who tried to keep us out of war, but who are now willing to give every evidence of devotion to our common cause.

In 1916 our noble President was praised to the skies because "he kept us out of war," and those who by unsound argument then tried to keep us out of war ought not to be treated as common enemies because their arguments were unsound. If they are right now, let us receive them, and let them march in honor with us against the common enemy of mankind.

I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have read by the Secretary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a question of order. Is there not an amendment pending?

Mr. OWEN. Oh, I beg pardon. I thought that had been disposed of. I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter now pending is the point of order raised by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. I did not make the point of order, Mr. President. I was not recognized for that purpose. The Senator declined to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the point of order made to the amendment of the Senator from Montana been withdrawn?

Mr. MYERS. There was none made.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator declined to yield for me to make the point of order, so it was not made.

Mr. MYERS. There is no point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, this amendment refers to the improvement of Indian lands in one of my neighboring States, and I would not at this time delay the Senate to discuss the amendment but for the fact that I have the impression that I have perhaps a more intimate personal knowledge of the facts in this case than other Senators present.

This project, Mr. President, was initiated and completed a number of years ago, and it is one of the most satisfactory that has ever been constructed. The work is well done and the supply of water is abundant. The lands that have been reclaimed and those still to be reclaimed are of the finest possible quality. Yet the lands have not all been brought under cultivation.

The question has been asked here why this development has been delayed, in view of the fact that the project has been completed for so many years. The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that a good many causes have contributed to this delay. First, I should say that it has been a tedious process here, as elsewhere in the country, to wean the Indians away from the habits not only of their lifetime but the habits of many generations which have preceded them; and yet I have occasion to know that they have been gradually led away from the old order and are each year taking more and more kindly to the cultivation of their lands, and particularly to the production of different kinds of live stock, with which these irrigated lands have an intimate relationship.

In this particular territory the Crow Tribe, the members of which are the owners of these lands, have made material progress during the past few years in the cultivation and development of their country, and undoubtedly more would have been done in improving these lands except for the fact that their extent is far in excess of that which the tribe actually requires, and this is one of the conditions that have combined to cause delay. Another is that the lands are a long way from market, and there has therefore been no opportunity of leasing them to white settlers, for the reason that the population of the surrounding country until recently has been very scant.

These conditions, Mr. President, have materially changed within the past year or two. A great deal of this land has recently been leased to white people for the cultivation and production of sugar beets to be used near my home town in Wyoming, and if this appropriation be granted, many thousands of acres of this land will be made productive during the present year.

I will say incidentally that this is the least refractory kind of land. It is as level as a floor, and in other ways is ready for the hand of the farmer, and will be easily reduced to a state of cultivation. In my judgment it would be a pity for this appropriation to fail, because of its immediate effectiveness in the

increase of agricultural crops. Most of this fund, as I understand, is to be employed in the building and construction of lateral ditches. I have occasion to know that the main canal—not only the diversion dam, but the main canal covering this body of land—is in a perfect state of repair and ready to use, with enormous quantities of water available which would without a doubt be used to good advantage from the very first day that these laterals and other incidental improvements are provided.

In addition to this, Mr. President, there is almost an assurance at this time that an electric railway will be constructed from the nearest railway town straight through this project, which would make it possible to transport such heavy crops as sugar beets. Again, there is a plan for building an immense power plant in the Big Horn River, from which this water is taken. All of this movement in the way of improvement perhaps hinges on this appropriation; and, though it may be late in appearing here, it is unquestionably one of great importance. As has been pointed out, as I understand, by the Senator from Montana, this appropriation is to be taken from the Indian tribal funds, is it not?

Mr. MYERS. It is.

Mr. KENDRICK. It is to be taken from that source and employed in the development of lands owned by the Indians. The title to very little of this land has ever passed from the Indian to the white man; and the benefits would not only be immediate but they would go directly to the Crow Indian Tribe.

Of all the appropriations contained in this bill, Mr. President, I dare say that not one is more worthy of favorable action than this that has been offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not know anything about the proposed project or its possibilities. I have had no opportunity to investigate it; and I know nothing of the department's estimate that this project would result in the production of 600,000 bushels of wheat. I assume, however, that this statement is based upon more or less investigation.

While the promise may be more or less golden, perhaps too generous, yet I think we ought to resolve the doubt in favor of production. If \$200,000 will bring into existence 600,000 bushels of wheat, it is, indeed, a splendid investment. The wheat itself will be worth \$1,200,000. The outlay will be only 33½ cents a bushel. Not only that, but the improvement will be permanent and will be valuable for the future.

While it might chance that our expectations will not be entirely justified, while it might happen that the estimate of the department would not be equalled by the actual production, yet it is certain that if we do not make the attempt there will be no production whatever; and it seems to me that in this crisis, with the overpowering necessity for foodstuffs, we ought to resolve the doubt in favor of this appropriation.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, line 17, after the amendment already agreed to at that point, it is proposed to insert the following:

For assisting in the continuation, the enlarging, and extending of the drainage project now in progress on the Indian reservation set aside by the State of Florida for the Seminole Indians under the provisions of chapter 7310, Laws of Florida, acts of 1917, and the maintenance thereof, the sum of \$100,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, in dealing with the Indians, and in the matter of meting out the beneficent aid of the Federal Government, I was impressed, as I read over this bill and considered the various and sundry appropriations to assist in reclamation projects in the West, with the fact that certainly within my own State we had a project that was as worthy of assistance as any of those that are being aided through this measure in the West.

We have within the Everglades of Florida an Indian reservation of approximately 100,000 acres which was not contributed or donated by the Federal Government, but which was given to the Indians by the State government from the State's domain. This territory, comprising as it does approximately 100,000 acres, is located within what is commonly known in our State, and so designated by statute, as the Everglades drainage district of Florida. Here we have a vast empire, composed of some 4,000,000 acres of land that is as fertile and productive as any within the borders of the United States; and it has often been said of it that it is as fertile as the valley of the Nile. It is

within this territory that the State of Florida, through its beneficence, has seen fit to set aside an Indian reservation of approximately 100,000 acres.

The drainage project there has been in progress for some years. When we think of its magnitude, its expansiveness; when we consider that it is by far the largest drainage enterprise within the United States, it may be well realized that, necessarily, it is of such extensive proportions that it can not be completed within a brief period of some two or three years. Active operations have been going on in this territory for the last 10 years. The work is carried on under the supervision of a board composed of five members of the State cabinet. The State and the owners of lands located within that territory have, up to the present time, expended some four or five million dollars upon reclamation by drainage. I am glad to say that splendid progress has been made. At the present time there has been reclaimed partially or almost completely at least five or six hundred thousand acres of land. Upon this reclaimed land there are many settlers at the present time, prosperous villages and towns have sprung up here and there, farming of various kinds is being carried on successfully and very profitably. It has been established beyond question by actual experience and actual demonstration that there are no better or more productive farming lands within America than are to be found within the Everglades drainage district of the State of Florida.

Mr. President, I speak more generally of that district, because it is within that district that, through the generosity of the State of Florida, the Indians are so fortunate as to have the large reservation to which I make reference. In order to develop this reservation to its greatest degree of efficiency and value, in order to make it most beneficial to the Indians who are living upon it, who are now the beneficiaries under the appropriation made by the State, it is necessary that the land be reclaimed by drainage. Partial drainage is in progress at the present time upon this territory, but it will be necessary for considerable further amounts to be expended to perfect and complete the reclamation in this particular territory, as well as within the entire drainage district of Florida, composed of about 4,000,000 acres of land.

Mr. President, I believe that when we bring before Congress a proposition involving assistance in reclaiming a territory that has not been granted to the Indians by the Federal Government, but has been donated to them by the State government, there certainly is some merit in the request that the Federal Government assist in reclaiming that land and making it more habitable, making it so that it can be cultivated, and cultivated profitably. One hundred thousand dollars is a small sum, considering the cost that will be required to reclaim this territory; although I may say, Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. I should simply like to ask, for information, as to how much money—if the Senator is prepared to give the information—will be required to reclaim this land?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, it will take, possibly, a half million dollars, in addition to the expenditures heretofore made.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, while I do not want to interrupt the Senator's excellent speech—and there is merit in his statements—can not the Senator see at this time that we have applied the rule to Montana and Arizona, and expect to apply it to Wyoming, with regard to new projects? That is to say, we have set our faces for the present against the creation of new projects or the entering into or the opening up of new lands at this particular time. Is there any special reason why we should at this time make an expenditure of \$100,000 for the purpose of entering upon a project that ultimately will cost us, say, a million dollars?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I had not stated that it would cost the Federal Government a half million dollars. I was just about to state that this assistance that may be contributed by the Federal Government would be only a very small proportion of the expenditures, and that the expenditures were now in progress under the direction of a board composed of State officials, and that this would be merely a matter of co-operation on the part of the Federal Government in assisting in the reclamation of the State Indian reservation in Florida. Now, I do not know that there is any particular reason why we should engage in new projects at this time, unless it would be a matter of advancing this meritorious project to the position it deserves, as well as trying to correct some dereliction heretofore.

I state, Mr. President, that there has been great dereliction on the part of the Congress of the United States in making ap-

propriations or else in providing assistance for the reclamation of the swamp and overflowed lands of this country. We have sat supinely by for a number of years now and have seen the bounty of this great country of ours bestowed upon the great West and their arid-land projects. We have seen millions and millions of dollars of the Federal money appropriated for the purpose of carrying on arid-land reclamation projects, upon the ground that it was reclaiming a vast territory of valuable land, taking it for granted that it was done from the standpoint of developing that territory and bringing into use valuable land. But at the same time, when the Government was expending from \$30 to \$60, and in some instances \$100, an acre for the purpose of reclaiming those arid lands, this Government, through its beneficence, might have been assisting other sections of the country in the reclamation of lands which would have been reclaimed by drainage at a cost not exceeding from six to ten dollars per acre; and every time that you were reclaiming one acre of that land, costing you from \$60 to \$100 per acre, in other sections of this country, you could have reclaimed land elsewhere in quadruple its amount, and could have brought to use a greater amount of fertile, productive lands of the country. The lands of the Florida Everglades can be reclaimed even so low as \$4 to \$10 per acre; and as this vast territory is an open, untimbered country, the cost for preparing the drained land for cultivation is not exceeding \$2 or \$3 an acre.

Mr. President, far be it from me to complain because the Congress has assisted in developing the western country. I have rejoiced in seeing their prosperity. I have been gratified to witness the wonderful development, the expansion and enlargement of their resources throughout that section of our country. But, Mr. President, I say that there is equal justice and merit in asking some assistance from the Federal Government in carrying on reclamation projects in other sections of our country.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. FALL. I am, I think, in accord with the general ideas that the Senator from Florida is now advocating; but the Senator must realize that there is a very great distinction between the reclamation of the arid lands and the proposition that he is now advocating. The arid lands in the West are being reclaimed at the cost of the settlers under those projects. The Government has assisted, from the funds set aside out of the sale of public lands, by advancing a certain amount of money; but the lands that are reclaimed in that way are sold, and the individuals purchasing those lands from the Government are paying the cost of the reclamation. The people of the United States are not giving to the West a dollar for use in the reclamation of arid lands.

I ask the Senator's attention to this point. I think he is right about the drainage of swamp lands. I think there should be some comprehensive system of legislation adopted, and it would be a magnificent investment, but there are two things involved in this proposition. A new system for an outright appropriation as a gift and the general system under which irrigated lands are being reclaimed in the West are entirely distinct and different. I will vote for any comprehensive system and an advance of any reasonable amount of money by the Government to carry out the system in the drainage of Florida lands or lands elsewhere.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I realize, of course, that there are some differences in regard to the amendment which I offer and the system which has been provided for the reclamation of the West, but I claim that this amendment has a great deal of merit in it when you consider that interwoven all through this bill are provisions assisting projects, assisting schools, and in various other ways where the Federal Government is making an appropriation, and the Federal Government will never have that money covered back into the Federal Treasury.

You should take in connection with this proposition the fact that a few years ago in dealing with the reclamation projects of the West Congress in its beneficence deemed it proper to remit the interest. You provided that system here and provided interest, and Congress remitted the interest or provided that there should be no interest account.

Coming back to the issue more directly, when you are dealing with the Indians of this country it is the policy of Congress that the Indians shall be treated as wards of the Federal Government. You can take this bill, and on its every page you find the lavish hand of the Federal Government extended to the Indian. We are dealing with him most generously. He is truly

receiving the bounty of our Treasury; and I say when the State of Florida has been generous enough, when the State of Florida is willing to cooperate with the Federal Government in treating the Indians as its wards and has set aside a reservation of 100,000 acres, certainly the Federal Government ought to be willing to assist in reclaiming it and making it habitable, making it suitable and cultivable for their occupancy, and I contend that from that standpoint this amendment possesses unquestionable merit.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator, as I did not clearly hear the amendment read, if it proposes the reclamation of Indian lands?

Mr. TRAMMELL. It proposes the reclamation of lands in the Indian reservations set aside by the Legislature of the State of Florida to be known as the Seminole Indian Reservation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is not a Federal Indian reservation then?

Mr. TRAMMELL. No; it is not a Federal Indian reservation, but it was set aside by the State, and I contend, Mr. President, if the State is willing from its bounty to furnish the land and appropriate it for an Indian reservation, and thereby relieve the Federal Government from granting the land for a reservation, certainly the Federal Government is doing better than it would if it had to furnish land for the reservation and then also contribute to the support and aid of the Indians in reclaiming that land. We are only asking in this instance for some assistance in the reclamation of the territory. The State, from its domain, has given the land.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to add one word to what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] said with reference to a suggestion made by the Senator from Florida that Congress had remitted the interest on the money appropriated for irrigation in the West. The Senator is a little mistaken in that statement. In the first instance no interest was charged on the money that was loaned for the reclamation project, but afterwards Congress did extend the time in which the money was to be paid back by the settlers, and in that extension interest charges were imposed upon the deferred payments. Every dollar of that money that goes to the reclamation of western lands for irrigation purposes outside of Indian reservations will be repaid to the Government of the United States, and on many of the Indian reservations repayment was provided for.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if the bill does not contain items for bridges alone that would far exceed the appropriation asked in this case for assistance in the reclamation of the lands on this reservation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not disputing that; it may be true. The chairman of the committee can answer as to it better than I can.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Roads and bridges and other public improvements have to be made on this reservation in our State. You have a little trifling sum of \$10,000 provided in this bill for assistance to the Seminole Indians in Florida, and you will find other items in the bill where the contributions are more than that for providing automobiles and other vehicles for Government agents who are looking after a few Indians on some reservation in the West.

I am contending, Mr. President, for justice on the part of the Indians in our State, and also for the same consideration for the people of Florida as Congress has extended to other sections of our country. In all fairness we are entitled to this treatment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, until about three years ago no appropriation whatever was made or none had been made for a number of years for the relief of distress among the Seminole Indians. Commencing with the bill passed three years ago, or two years ago, an appropriation of \$8,000 was made, and this year the item carries \$10,000. The State of Florida has done admirably well in setting aside this reservation; and I have no doubt if the Senator will, as I hope he will, argue as well as he has done to-day to the Secretary of the Interior the Secretary will direct the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to make a special investigation of this matter and include in his estimate of next year a certain amount that the experts of the department might deem necessary and proper.

But at this particular time it becomes my duty to make a point of order against the amendment proposed by my esteemed friend, because it has not been estimated for by the department. We have tried to keep the bill within the estimates and the amendment falls clearly under Rule XVI, which provides that "no amendment shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which is to increase an appropriation or to add a new item." I do not make the point of order out of hostility to this project, but I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT in the chair). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McNARY. I propose the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert in the Oregon item the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to withdraw from any of the tribal funds of the Klamath Tribe of Indians in Oregon now to the credit of said tribe in the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$3,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to use the same in payment to Levi Walker, Fred Hendricks, Harrison Brown, Joseph S. Ball, and Clayton Kirk for compensation at the rate of \$3 per day each for their services rendered to said tribe in presenting the affairs of said Klamath Tribe of Indians to the officials of the United States, and in addition to such per diem allowance a sum sufficient to pay the actual expenses of said Levi Walker, Fred Hendricks, Harrison Brown, Joseph S. Ball, and Clayton Kirk for travel and maintenance at the city of Washington, D. C., said per diem compensation to begin from the day of their leaving the Klamath Indian Reservation, Oreg., and to continue until the day of their return thereto: *Provided*, That such payments to said delegates shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I understand this amendment embodies a principle that is recognized in the bill. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the amendment. I believe he is willing to accept it.

Mr. ASHURST. I am familiar with the amendment. There were five Indians who came here from the Klamath Agency and appeared before the Senate committee and I am not certain but that they appeared before the House committee. The amendment simply proposes to take the sum of \$3,500 out of their own funds, as they wish done, to pay the expenses of and give a per diem to the five delegates. I am sure there is no objection to it as far as I know.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert in the Montana items the following:

That Indians of the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana entitled to allotments under existing laws may select lands classified as coal and receive patents therefor in accordance with the act of May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L. 558), with a reservation, however, to the United States of the coal deposits therein and of the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have no personal interest whatever in this amendment. I offer it at the request of both the Indian Bureau and the Fort Peck Indians. It is easy to see what it proposes to do. The law is such at present that the homesteaders have a right on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation to make a homestead entry of the surface over coal lands, reserving the coal to the United States. That right is extended to the homesteader. It simply gives the Indian the same right, the right to take his allotment on the surface of coal lands if he sees fit, reserving the coal to the United States. There is nothing making it compulsory on the part of the Indian. He need not do it unless he wants to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MYERS. In a second. There was a delegation of Fort Peck Indians down here a short time ago. They met with me in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and presented some of their desires. They desired to have this amendment offered, and at their request and at the request of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs I offer the amendment. I promised to do so at their request. I have no personal interest in it. I think it is in the interest of the Indians.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to ask the Senator a question, as I could not fully understand the amendment as it was read. Does it apply to lands on the Indian reservation or on the public domain?

Mr. MYERS. It applies to lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

Mr. CURTIS. They belong to the Indians already. The amendment proposes to give the coal to the United States, I understand.

Mr. MYERS. I understand it would allow the Indians to take an allotment anywhere on land that is not already homesteaded by entrymen. They can go anywhere on the Fort Peck Reservation, I understand, and take their allotments. If they take the allotment on coal land which is open to homestead entry, they can get the surface for an allotment and reserve the coal to the United States. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. CURTIS. The coal on that reservation belongs to those Indians. It is their coal. I make a point of order against the

amendment that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order will be sustained.

Mr. OWEN. I call up now the amendment which I offered. I will say in explanation of it that it passed the Senate on March 23 upon the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, after line 10, insert:

To pay additional interest upon items 1 and 4 of the judgment of the Court of Claims, of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokee Nation (40 Ct. Cls. Rept., p. 252), and upon the funds arising from said items 1 and 4, respectively, the same being 5 per cent interest-bearing Cherokee trust funds in the Treasury of the United States, as follows, to wit: On the amount of the fund which arose from item 1 of said judgment as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee school fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the amount of the fund which arose from item 4 of said judgment, as such amount was determined and paid to the Secretary of the Interior on July 2, 1906, to be by him credited to the principal of the Cherokee national fund, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to and including May 26, 1910; on the original principal sum of item 4 of said judgment, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 1, 1893, to July 1, 1903, and on the amount of the interest thus accruing interest at 4 per cent per annum from December 29, 1905, to May 14, 1906; and on the aggregate of the sums of the interest for the last two periods herein above mentioned, interest at 5 per cent per annum from July 2, 1906, to the date of the passage of this act; and the sum of \$27,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay the interest above allowed, is hereby appropriated and authorized to be paid to the Cherokee Nation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay the amount arising from item 4 of said judgment, with interest thereon as herein above provided for, to the agent appointed by the Cherokee Nation acting through its principal chief to receive the same, said payment to be made immediately upon the approval of this act.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not know much about navigation, but I do know if you load a boat too heavily it can not be propelled. This undoubtedly is a worthy piece of legislation; but we have tried to keep the bill free from legislation of this kind. The bill has passed the Senate, and I ask the Senator to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. The Senate has already passed the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I say the bill has already passed the Senate.

Mr. OWEN. It is very difficult to get a small bill at this time up in the House with the crush of business there.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, my mail is loaded down with letters appealing to me to put bills and claims on this appropriation bill. I have four bills that have passed the Senate relating to affairs in my State that I should like to reach into the calendar and stick on this bill, but I can not do it, or should not do it, and I hope the Senator will withdraw the amendment. I appeal to the Senator to withdraw it.

I make a point of order not because I think it is bad legislation—I think it is good—but I do not want to load the bill down too heavily.

Mr. OWEN. I am not entirely sure that a point of order will justly lie, because the bill has already passed the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. I am not going to try to deceive anybody. I do not believe the point of order will lie, because the bill was reported from a standing committee and therefore is not obnoxious to the rule, but I appeal to the Senator to withdraw it.

Mr. OWEN. The bill has passed the Senate, and it is to carry out an Indian treaty. I really think the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arizona state his point of order?

Mr. ASHURST. I can not. In my judgment the amendment is not subject to a point of order, because it has been reported favorably from a standing committee of the Senate, and that removes it from the position of being obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I do not want to have a long discussion about a point of order. It is nearly 5.30, and I wish to have the bill passed to-night.

Mr. GRONNA. I make the point of order that it is a claim on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that I have here an amendment which I had intended to press, giving the Osage Indian Tribe a right to have a hearing in the Court of Claims with respect to what is known as the civilization fund, the Osage Tribe asserting the right to the fund which has been appropriated and applied by the General Government to other purposes than Osage Indian affairs. I should like to know if the Senator will agree to let the amendment go into the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. It is a worthy piece of legislation; that right should be granted; but it is only by insisting on points of order that we can force Congress to take up individual cases and pass separate bills. I shall certainly make a point of order against the amendment if it is offered.

Mr. GORE. I will not afford the Senator that opportunity, having secured his commitment to the justice of the claim.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I offer the following amendment, to which I believe there will be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add a new paragraph after line 21, page 42, as follows:

For the completion of the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo Indian Reservation, \$4,226.14, in addition to the \$16,500 appropriated for this purpose by the act approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stats. L., p. 51), to be immediately available for payment to the El Paso Bridge & Iron Co., of El Paso, Tex., for extra work and material, the same being made necessary by acts of the Government: *Provided*, That said sum shall be reimbursed to the United States by the Navajo Indians and shall remain a charge and lien upon the lands, property, and funds belonging to said Navajo Indians until paid in full.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas if this amendment has been estimated for?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Interior recommending the appropriation, which is, as I understand, equivalent to an estimate. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1917.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Under date of January 14, 1914, the department approved a contract with the El Paso Bridge & Iron Co. for the sum of \$14,725 for the construction of the bridge herein referred to, payable from a special reimbursable appropriation of \$16,500 made by the act of June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L., 77).

The contract, plans, and specifications, prepared in the Indian Office, were based upon data furnished by a local engineer employed especially for the purpose, and this data proved incorrect as to the location of certain shale foundation for the north abutment, which was found after the contractor started work to be at an elevation of 80 feet instead of at 85 feet, as fixed by the engineer's data. The error necessitated the construction of a new cofferdam and the placing of the abutment on a foundation 5 feet deeper than the contractor estimated on. While the extra work was in progress a high flood occurred and washed away a considerable amount of the contractor's material and also the north approach to the bridge, thus permitting part of the river current to run between the abutment and the north bank of the river, which change in its course compelled a suspension of work in the bridge, pending the preparation of drawings for an abutment required to meet the new conditions. During this suspension further damages were done by additional floods, which caused further suspension of the work and delayed its progress into the winter season, with increased cost to the contractor, who, on July 7, 1916, presented a claim for extra work and materials, loss of superintendent's time, damage for loss of material and time, and deferred use of equipment, etc., in the sum of \$6,274.04.

After a careful consideration of the claim the Indian Office was convinced that the contractor was legally, justly, and properly entitled to a greater part of it and compromised with him for the sum of \$5,106.04 in settlement, authority for the payment of which, from any funds found applicable and available, was approved by this department on June 19, 1917.

The matter was then submitted to the auditor, who certified to the payment to the contractor the sum of \$880, the same being the unexpended balance of the appropriation and the only funds applicable and available, thus leaving a balance of \$4,226.14 due the contractor on the approved claim of \$5,106.04.

It is, therefore, believed that the action of this department in approving the claim should be sustained and the amendment intended to be proposed by Senator CULBERSON should be incorporated in the urgent deficiency bill.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. I make the point of order that this is not found in the Book of Estimates; that it has not been estimated for, and has not been reported by any standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state to the Senator that this amendment was introduced by my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON], and referred by him to the Committee on Appropriations. For that reason it did not come before the Committee on Indian Affairs in sufficient time to be reported. I have presented it for my colleague now. It is merely to extend the limit of appropriation made for a bridge. It is reimbursable out of an Indian fund. It was for the reason I have stated that it was not laid before the Committee on Indian Affairs. I trust the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw the point of order. The proposed appropriation amounts to about \$4,000.

Mr. GRONNA. I insist upon the point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment providing that a hearing shall be given to the heirs and representatives of R. V. Belt in connection with the distribution of the funds of the Pottawatomie Indians, which is provided for on page 78 of the bill. This fund will pretty nearly exhaust

the amount which has been set apart for the Pottawatomies, and unless this relief is granted it will be a permanent denial of justice.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

THE SECRETARY. On page 78, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That from the sum herein appropriated for said Pottawatomie Indians the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to pay to the legal representatives of R. V. Belt (Mrs. Joana Belt and William O. Belt) such sum as he, after a proper hearing, may fix as compensation justly and equitably due the said Belt and associates on a quantum meruit for their services in recovering for the said Pottawatomie Indians the annuities withheld from them, under a contract with representatives of said Indians approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs November 1, 1902.

MR. ASHURST. Mr. President, there is quite a controversy as to what amount of attorney fees should be paid. I take the view that some money should probably be paid to these attorneys for their services, but there is a wide and irreconcilable difference as to the amount that should be paid. I am, therefore, obliged to make the point of order on the amendment.

MR. OWEN. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this does not allow any particular sum, but only allows the Secretary of the Interior to determine what these attorneys were entitled to under the contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs years ago, before the attorneys rendered the service.

MR. ASHURST. I have a great deal of confidence in the Senator from Oklahoma, and what he says has much weight with me; but I feel that I must lay down a rigid rule in matters of that kind which come before the committee.

MR. OWEN. I will ask to have printed in the Record a letter as the justification upon which this request is based.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MARCH 10, 1918.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Mr. R. V. Belt, Mr. C. H. Merillat, and I, after 11 years' work, succeeded in establishing the claim of the Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan and Wisconsin to certain annuities, amounting to \$447,339, and Congress has already appropriated \$350,000 of this sum, which the Indians have received.

By reference of Senator NELSON this case was undertaken by Mr. Belt in 1902 under a contract approved by Commissioner of Indian Affairs Jones for 15 per cent, wholly contingent, but through an error of law on the part of Secretary Hitchcock in holding that these Indians were citizens and therefore the contract did not require his approval, it did not receive his signature and thus became a binding contract under section 2103 of the Revised Statutes. The attorneys prosecuted the claim at the request of the Indians and won, but their compensation can not be paid until Congress acts. Mr. Belt associated Mr. Merillat and me in the case in 1905.

When this case was undertaken it was considered a most desperate one, the Interior Department having taken the position that the Indians had forfeited their annuities. Two attorneys who had been employed by the Indians had abandoned it. Commissioner Jones, in approving the contract reducing the contingent fee from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, stated:

"This office has denied such claim on the ground that by refusing to move west under the treaty of 1833 they forfeited all rights under that and subsequent treaties with the Pottawatomie Nation. The contract is approved at the reduced rate with the express understanding and upon the condition that such action in nowise be regarded as a recognition of the claimant Indians as a tribe or the alleged claims in the premises."

Under these circumstances the claim was undertaken, and after 11 years' work on the part of three attorneys in filing briefs, preparing memorials, making arguments, and procuring necessary legislation, the claim was established and Congress recognized it in the act approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stat., 102), by appropriating \$150,000 on account, and thereafter by the act of May 18, 1916, \$100,000; act of March 2, 1917, \$100,000, and in the pending Indian appropriation bill, \$75,000, leaving a comparatively small amount yet to be paid. Thus the Indians through the services of the attorneys will have received \$425,000, while the attorneys through the failure of Secretary Hitchcock to act on the contract, have so far received nothing.

The House Indian Committee in the last Congress and the Senate Indian Committee at this session have made favorable reports on bill providing for the payment of the balance due these Indians and referring the matter of compensation to the attorneys to the Court of Claims for settlement. These bills have received the favorable recommendation of the Interior Department.

This claim had been persistently denied by the Indian Office for over 30 years before we were employed, as will be seen by the above-quoted statement of Commissioner Jones; and if it had not been for the services rendered by Mr. Belt, Mr. Merillat, and myself the Pottawatomies would never have received a cent. It is conceded both by the department and the Indians that it was through our work that the \$447,339 was recovered for the Indians.

On pages 171-172 of the committee hearings on the Indian appropriation bill, the Assistant Commissioner states: "By means of these appropriations the Indians have made substantial progress along industrial lines."

Thus it will be observed that these Indians, formerly poor and homeless, made so through the denial of their rights by the Indian Office, by the establishment of their just claim by us, have now come into their patrimony to the amount of \$425,000, and therewith are making "substantial progress along industrial lines," as stated by the Assistant Commissioner.

If the appropriation of \$75,000 in the pending Indian appropriation bill is passed without at the same time providing for the settlement of our compensation, then the anomalous situation will arise of Congress

having appropriated nearly all of the \$447,339 for the Indians, but nothing having been paid us. We feel confident that Congress will not knowingly do such an injustice. The Indians are willing and anxious that the matter of our compensation shall be speedily settled, as will be seen by the inclosed letters from John Shawano, chief, and from Rev. Dr. Morstad, the missionary who has lived and worked among these Indians for many years and who knows what services we have rendered the Pottawatomies. Both the Senate and House Indian Committees, after hearings, and the Secretary of the Interior have made favorable reports and recommendations on the bills referring the matter to the Court of Claims for determination. We are willing to render an account of our services to any tribunal Congress may see fit to name to hear and decide the question, even to the extent of going before the Department of the Interior, which had denied for 30 years the rights of these Indians to their annuities, and which, after 11 years of laborious and efficient services on the part of Mr. Belt, Mr. Merillat, and myself, finally conceded its error in not following the law of June 24, 1864 (13 Stat., 172), providing that the annuities shall be held in the Treasury for these Pottawatomies.

Mr. Belt died in 1910, and his widow will receive two-thirds and Mr. Merillat and I one-third of whatever amount the court may fix as proper compensation.

For a confirmation of what is herein stated, I would refer you to Senator NELSON.

I earnestly request on behalf of Mrs. Belt, my associate, and myself that the Senate adopt the accompanying amendment to the Indian appropriation bill, which has been approved by the department and the House and Senate Committees on Indian Affairs in their reports on Senate bill 2120, introduced by Senator NELSON, and which would give us our day in court before all the money due the Pottawatomies is appropriated.

Respectfully,

(Signed) CHARLES J. KAPPLER.

MR. OWEN. This matter was really set before the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I myself am to blame for not having it called up before the committee. I happen to know something about it, because R. V. Belt was Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs many years ago. He was a man of great uprightness and great probity, and he brought this action for the Pottawatomies, and recovered some \$447,000 for them. He never was compensated for that service. He is now dead; he died in poverty; and his widow is in the city here living on very narrow means.

This amendment only provides that before the final distribution of the funds which Mr. Belt recovered the Secretary of the Interior may ascertain whether anything was due to him, and, if so, what under the contract which had been approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. I think it is an extraordinary case of merit, and I hope the Senator will not insist on his point of order in this particular instance.

MR. ASHURST. Mr. President, I trust I am not doing an injustice to any man, but I must insist on the point of order.

MR. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

MR. ASHURST. I yield the floor.

MR. McCUMBER. Before the Senator from Arizona makes his point of order—although I really can not understand what that point of order would be, as I think it has been ruled over and over again that when a fund is paid not from the Treasury of the United States, but out of funds belonging to an Indian tribe, the same requirements for an estimate that would be necessary when the fund is paid out of the Treasury of the United States are not applicable—I want to say this on the merits of the case: I know something about this case, because it came up years ago when I was a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MR. ASHURST. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

MR. McCUMBER. I yield.

MR. ASHURST. Mr. President, I withdraw the point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is withdrawn.

MR. McCUMBER. Then, will the Senator from Arizona allow the amendment to be voted on now?

MR. ASHURST. Certainly; and I will say that I hope the Senator from North Dakota will appear—he has stated that he was a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs at that particular time—and I hope also that the Senator from Oklahoma will appear before the conferees in respect to the item, in order that we may have further light.

MR. McCUMBER. I shall be glad to do so and shall not now say another word.

MR. ASHURST. I withdraw the point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, at the end of line 4, on page 66. I did not have the amendment prepared when the committee amendment was adopted by the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and therefore ask for its adoption now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Oklahoma that perhaps it would be best for the Senate first to agree to concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GORE. But this is an amendment to an amendment which was made as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it will be remembered that there was one amendment reserved by me; that is to say, on page 81 the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENNICK] proposed an amendment to the committee amendment, which was adopted, proposing to insert certain language after the word "expended," on line 22, page 81. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, disagreed to the committee amendment, and I reserved a separate vote, which I now desire, on that amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Chair that the amendment which I offer is an amendment to an amendment which was adopted as in Committee of the Whole. I desire to offer this amendment to the committee amendment before the amendment is concurred in in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that the amendment he offers comes at the end of an amendment, and the Chair thinks he may offer it as an amendment in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Very well, though I should prefer to pursue a different course, because if my amendment to the amendment is not adopted I might then want to make a point of order against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Oklahoma reserve the committee amendment as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GORE. I do not think that is necessary. I do not think there will be any objection to my amendment; I feel certain that there will not be, but I do not want to waive my right to submit a point of order; and I would suggest that all the other amendments except this and the one suggested by the chairman of the committee be concurred in by the Senate, these two being left open for further amendment. I think the Chair undoubtedly will perceive the point I am making.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is quite of the opinion that the Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to a vote on his amendment in the Senate, even though the Senate might proceed to concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GORE. But the point is this, Mr. President: If the committee amendment is concurred in as reported from the Committee of the Whole before I offer my amendment, then I want the opportunity to make a point of order against the amendment which has heretofore been agreed to, in case my amendment is not agreed to. I think, however, my amendment will be accepted without objection, and, of course, if it should not be, I should not wish to waive my right to make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can not offer his amendment as in Committee of the Whole, for the bill is now out of the Committee of the Whole and in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And no vote has been reserved in connection with the amendment.

Mr. GORE. But, Mr. President, it is not necessary to make such a reservation. I can offer any amendment in the Senate that I could offer as in Committee of the Whole. There is absolutely no limitation, no requirement that the right should have been reserved to offer an amendment in the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. If I caught the amendment aright, it simply provides that a certain Mr. McMurray shall be authorized to sue in the Court of Claims, and shall be required to give bond for the costs in the case. Is that it?

Mr. GORE. Yes; to abide the judgment of the court, or the award of the Secretary, as the case may be.

Mr. ASHURST. Unless some other Senator has objection to the amendment, I shall not object to it.

Mr. GORE. There could not be any objection to it, but I can not be required to waive my right to make a point of order

to an amendment agreed to as in Committee of the Whole by allowing the amendment to be agreed to in the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be reported and considered now. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The SECRETARY. On page 66, after line 4, at the end of the committee amendment which has been agreed to, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That the Court of Claims shall require the said J. F. McMurray, upon filing suit in pursuance hereof, to give a sufficient bond, with two or more good and sufficient sureties, to abide the judgment of such court in said suit, and in case the Secretary of the Interior should arbitrate such claims and counterclaims, he shall require the said McMurray to give sufficient security to abide the award of such arbitration.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. Do I understand that the amendment as amended has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The situation is this: There was an amendment agreed to, the Chair understands, as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FALL. Then the amendment as amended is now agreed to as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has been treated as a new amendment in the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Then it is agreed to in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is agreed to in the Senate, but the original committee amendment has not yet been concurred in; that is the status.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, is the bill being considered as in Committee of the Whole or in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in the Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Have the amendments adopted as in Committee of the Whole been concurred in in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet; we are trying to get to that.

Mr. MYERS. Then I ask to reserve the right to have a separate vote on the committee amendment in relation to the Flat-head reclamation project in Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator reserve that right when the bill was under consideration as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MYERS. No; I had not heard any announcement until I asked if the bill had gone out of the Committee of the Whole and into the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has passed from consideration as in Committee of the Whole and is in the Senate. Now, the question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MYERS. Is there no way of getting a separate vote on the Montana item in case I choose to bring it up?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is no doubt about the fact that we have the right in the Senate to vote separately on each amendment. The only reason for reserving an amendment is that the Presiding Officer usually states the question on concurring in the amendments en bloc; and, unless an amendment is reserved, he puts the question on concurring in the amendment in that way. Where an amendment has been reserved he saves it from that action; but the right exists under the rule, whether an amendment is reserved or not, to consider it in the Senate at any time. The object of the reservation is merely to guard against quick confirmation of all amendments before separate action can be had. If action has not been taken upon concurring in all the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole in the Senate, it is the absolute right of every Senator to have a vote on each one separately, because the rule provides that matter shall be considered in the Senate *de novo*, which means just as independently as to each amendment as was the case when the bill was under consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not understand the rule as the Senator has just stated it. Whenever an amendment has been voted on when the bill was under consideration as in Committee of the Whole, then it can only be offered again and voted upon in the Senate when it has been reserved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is not the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Georgia says that is not the rule. That certainly has been the practice of this body for 16 years.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is the practice; but I have explained, Mr. President, the reason of the practice. The rule

expressly declares that the entire matter is before the Senate de novo, just as it was when the bill was being considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the purpose, then, of the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To give the double opportunity for investigation and care.

Mr. SMOOT. In this particular case there is no amendment to concur in in the Senate because of the fact that the amendment is not in the bill; it was defeated when the bill was under consideration as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MYERS. It is a committee amendment which was adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, when the bill is in the Senate an amendment can only be brought up when it has been reserved?

Mr. MYERS. It is a committee amendment; it was adopted; and I want the right to reserve it for a separate vote. I do not know that I will exercise that right; probably I will not—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MYERS. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. To end the matter, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a separate vote on the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator. I may choose to exercise that right or I may not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in view of that, I will ask for a separate vote on the Yakima item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I announce, then, that in the Senate I may conclude to offer an amendment which will reach the committee amendment in regard to the Flathead reclamation project, which was adopted as in Committee of the Whole. I may not want to do it, but I may conclude to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I will be glad to read the rule to the Presiding Officer. It is as follows:

All bills and joint resolutions which shall have received two readings shall first be considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, after which they shall be reported to the Senate; and any amendments made in Committee of the Whole shall again be considered by the Senate, after which further amendments may be proposed.

So each amendment made as in Committee of the Whole may be considered anew as a separate amendment in the Senate, after which any amendments which any Senator may wish to offer may, under this rule, be offered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there was no amendment made as in Committee of the Whole; the amendment was offered, but it was not agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator is wrong about that. I refer to the committee amendment which was adopted as in Committee of the Whole. I may want to object to it in the Senate; I have not decided yet whether I will or not. I will in a certain contingency, but not otherwise.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is granted it is not required then to decide the question of the rules, which usually causes so much agitation and discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico renew the request for unanimous consent?

Mr. FALL. I renew the request for unanimous consent—that the amendment referred to by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] may be voted upon separately, and also the amendment referred to by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], provided that the yeas and nays are not to be called for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole with the exception of the amendment reserved by the Senator from Arizona, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 81—

Mr. MYERS. And the other amendments which were reserved by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, on page 81, commencing with line 16, and extending down to line 22, it will be observed that there appears the following provision, which the committee recommended be stricken out:

For continuation of investigations, beginning of construction and incidental operations on a project for the irrigation of a portion of the conditionally ceded lands of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., \$100,000, reimbursable in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905, and to remain available until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arizona suspend for a moment?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, with the exception of those which have been reserved? The Chair hears none, and all amendments are concurred in with the exception of the three reserved.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, nothing would give me greater gratification right now than to vote for this appropriation, because here on my left is my esteemed friend the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] who has pressed this matter with great ability and force, and on his feet stands the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], for whom I have an affection. If personal consideration could influence me at all, it would be a delight right now for me to vote against the amendment reported by the committee, and for the appropriation. But, Mr. President, the Committee on Indian Affairs laid down a course of action which we considered would save the Treasury. It was deemed that it would be well to save a million dollars at this particular time. So, with a pruning knife that was impartial, we laid out this bill, and carved it to the bone. We took the appropriations for irrigation in Arizona and cut them in two. Then we went to the State of Montana, where there was an appropriation provided for of \$750,000, and we reduced that to \$250,000. Then we went to that splendid project in Washington, the Wapato, on the Yakima, where the Secretary of the Interior asked for \$750,000, and we carved that down to the tune of \$250,000.

Much as I should like to gratify the two esteemed Senators from Wyoming, how can I vote against this amendment, and vote for the appropriation, when I know that it authorizes the expenditure of \$5,000,000? Senators, in my judgment, if you vote for this appropriation of \$100,000 you are voting to authorize the construction of a \$5,000,000 project.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, save to say that that is not a fair or correct statement.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator will correct me, then.

Mr. WARREN. It can reach that amount, but it is only intended to reach about half that amount.

Mr. ASHURST. I am glad the Senator has corrected me. I misspoke the figures; and that is all I have to say, except this: Now, this is not a threat. I ought to be driven out if I made a threat; but I do say that if we are going to authorize a new project in Wyoming, a project that will cost \$2,500,000, we ought to turn right around and reverse the action of the Senate with respect to Washington, with respect to Montana, and with respect to Arizona, if we wish to be impartial, because we can not say that one project is better than another, or that one is entitled to more consideration than another.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I realize full well that the able chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, in the performance of his duty in charge of a great appropriation bill, must be alert at all times to keep out all matter that calls for appropriations that have not been considered fully in this committee, whatever his feelings may be.

The Senator has stated that the appropriations for projects in Montana and Washington and other States have been cut down. Now, the facts are these:

There came over from the House various sums providing for these various Indian irrigation projects. As I am informed, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, in their first consideration, decided that on account of the war and on account of the necessity for economy they would strike out the whole of all those appropriations. It seems that the committee later on—and I think they are to be commended for it—believed that we needed food, that we needed certain industries to go on to support not only the Union generally but this war in particular; went back, reconsidered, and allowed a part of every one of these appropriations in every one of the other States, and only cut out in whole the Wyoming project.

Mr. President, I have taken some pride in standing upon this floor and providing for the various States, old and new, as far as my voice would command, and in the committees as well as here; but I have never thought that we ought to make an orphan of any one State. To leave out Wyoming in this case, will be simply to say that she shall be discriminated against as compared with all the other States that are yielding up to Indian reservations and other reservations large areas of their territory. The Senator from New Mexico has shown in his map the quantity of land taken from his State by these reservations. Wyoming is a sufferer to the same extent, and even to a greater extent in many ways, as added to Indian and forest reservations

are immense oil, coal, phosphate, and other reservations and withdrawals while the little that is left pay the taxes. That we should in Wyoming alone have cut out this its one proposition of only \$100,000, which has already been cut in half by the House as to the estimate from the department is certainly most unjust. It is true that it was not estimated for the Indian bill especially. It was estimated, though, among these irrigation projects, and, by the way, these are not projects wherein we ask anything except the credit of the Government. There is no expenditure of money but what comes back; but this one is put in the Indian bill at half the amount estimated. Half of the expenditure to be reimbursed from the Indians and the other half from citizen settlers, as both Indian and settlers land are to be watered.

I could stand here and talk for hours about the excellence of this particular project, but I desire, in the first place, to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to the fact that he is mistaken about this being a new project. It is a project that has had money appropriated to start it.

One section of it has had some \$40,000 expended upon it, and there are other private canals and properties of which this will form a part. This is a project that will cost probably \$2,000,000 or \$2,100,000 to bring it down to the irrigation of 70,000 acres of as beautiful land as ever water was poured upon. By their putting in reservoirs and going on down the plain, taking in more land, it will reach nearly twice as much, and then the Senator might be right in saying that it would cost \$5,000,000; but that is not the intention now; and this appropriation does not contemplate the second section.

I have seen nearly every one of the irrigation projects in the United States. I have visited them personally; and I say with all the sincerity that I can say anything in this body that I do not know of a single one that is superior, and very few that are equal, to this proposition that we are now talking about.

Now, here we have a railroad very near to it. We have the Indians there that are seeking this work. They have been employed upon other projects. It is at once an avoidance of the scarcity of labor and high prices, because it will employ the Indians. One of the greatest things we are doing for the Indians is to educate them in labor. Nothing in the world helps so much as to give them work and teach them how to work. Now, we come down to the fact that this project conduces to the benefit of a State that is furnishing to-day for the Army more than almost any other State, certainly more than any other State of its population. It is furnishing more men for the Army according to its inhabitants than any other State in this Union. There are two or three others very near to it.

The State is furnishing horses for the armies of the United States and our allies as well as wool, mutton, beef, sugar beets, and so forth, to support not only those in the war but this Government and others generally; and while we should be careful in what we spend, we should give this project a million dollars. We ask \$100,000 to further it and get the head gates in, because industries must go along with this war.

Here is the proposition: The House passed it, and it came over here; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, has adopted the House view. I ask the Senate now to take the view of the Committee of the Whole rather than the view of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I ask if they want to make an orphan of the State of Wyoming and turn their backs on that State and on that class of people which I have described and say that Wyoming is the only one in this bill that shall receive the knife clear to the hilt, and have nothing left, where every other State has received at least part of what it has asked for?

I am glad the others have gotten what they have. I would be glad if they had gotten more. I believe in it all; but, at the same time, this is a cut that is a peculiar hardship, and I may say that I believe the Senator himself must realize that we ought not to be cut out at this time in this way.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask a question that may solve this problem. I really think that in the action of the Senate committee we did go further in this case than in others. I think that if this amendment had been reduced to \$50,000 it would have been just and fair in view of the action taken in the other cases. I will ask the chairman if he will not agree to make the item \$50,000, if that will satisfy the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, if the matter goes over to conference, they can handle that in conference.

Mr. CURTIS. I will ask the chairman if he will not, so far as he can, consent to that?

Mr. WARREN. I prefer to submit the question of my distinguished friend from Kansas to my colleague [Mr. KENDRICK], who sits near the chairman, that he in turn may take it up with the chairman. I do not want Wyoming to be blackballed at this time, almost at the end of my service here, as if it were guilty of some misdemeanor.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I fully concur in all that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] has said about this appropriation; and I shall delay the Senate but a moment further in saying that this is the only item of development on our Indian lands that has been asked for on behalf of my State. There is not a Western Senator on the floor who does not understand that it is a detriment to a State to be burdened with Indian reservations; and it is a question as to how much the Government, when it sets aside these reservations, should permit itself to delay the development of the territory involved.

My colleague has pointed out that Wyoming is the only State that has not received at least some encouragement in this appropriation bill. I submit that it is not fair that we should not be allowed to have our territory improved while other States are given the privilege of continuing development.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KENDRICK. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to know if the Senator will not accept the proposition submitted a minute ago, to let this item be put in at \$50,000, and virtually make it the same as the others. There was no estimate before us at the time we considered the bill, and the item was cut out entirely. I think that, had the estimate been there, the committee would have given the project \$50,000.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, I have just a word further to say about this matter. If that would prove agreeable to the Senator who has the bill in charge, I would be willing to accept a compromise of \$50,000, with the statement that, with all of his good qualities, the Senator from Arizona lacks the quality of understanding when he is beaten. This amendment was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, and, in my judgment, he should be generous and allow it to stay there.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I see that the clock has reached the hour of 6. As I said before, if I were voting on personal grounds, I would cast my vote for \$100,000 gladly. I want the senior Senator from Wyoming to understand distinctly that, so far as my attitude is concerned, it has not been one of any hostility to the sturdy State of Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, Mr. President, I can not allow the Senator to go further, because there has not been the slightest suspicion on my part that this was the action of the chairman himself. It was the result of a misunderstanding.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senate properly referred this morning to the long service of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. Why, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] came to this body in the latter part of the year 1890. That is a long time ago. We are living almost in a new world since the distinguished Senator from Wyoming first came here. He said something about his term of service in the Senate. The last years, I know personally, are glorious. He has been a stalwart supporter of this Nation and a stalwart supporter of its war policies. No Senator could have a greater affection for him than I have, or could wish to do him an honor quicker than I would wish to do so.

Therefore, Mr. President, to bring the matter to a conclusion so far as I am concerned, other members of the committee having expressed their approbation, I am willing, and I move, that the item be agreed to at \$50,000 instead of \$100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion made, as the Chair understands, by the Senator from Arizona to amend—

Mr. ASHURST. To restore the item, but in the amount of \$50,000 instead of \$100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to reduce the sum from \$100,000 to \$50,000. The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on concurring in the amendment, on page 81, as amended.

The amendment was nonconcurring in.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I asked to be recognized before that vote was taken. I stood on my feet for about five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hopes the Senator from South Dakota will not tax the Chair with deliberately declining to recognize him.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I simply wanted to ask a question. Perhaps I can ask it now. I want to know about what per cent of the benefits of this appropriation which has now been agreed to will be for the real benefit of the Indians. That is all I desire to ask the Senator.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, the amendment as now drawn provides for the reclamation of Indian lands primarily and for reimbursing the Indian fund for any lands that may be incidentally reclaimed that are now owned by white settlers. This would make of it primarily an Indian appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, that does not exactly answer the question that I wanted answered, but I am satisfied with it. I had no objection to the appropriation if it was a meritorious one.

While I am on my feet I want to go on record as being opposed to this bill. I have never voted for an Indian appropriation bill since I have been here. I live in a State that has five or six Indian reservations, and my reason for not doing so has been that I believe the system that the Government has carried out toward the Indians has had the effect of destroying the usefulness of those people by taking from them the law of necessity for their own maintenance and substituting a law that compels them to be a nation of beggars.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee for his earnest effort to bring from the committee, of which I am a member, this bill in its most economical and best form; and I can say that this is a better bill than I have seen since I have been here, but I shall not vote for it because the Indians will not get 10 per cent of its appropriation.

Just a word with regard to the amendment just agreed to. It has been acted upon now, and anything that may be said will not help it or hurt it. A gentleman came to my office two or three days ago and said that I should support this bill by all means; that it was 90 per cent for the benefit of the white people. I do not care to divulge the name of the party. I do not know whether he told the truth or not; but if he did tell the truth, he only told what everyone who is intelligent and who knows anything about Indian appropriation bills must know.

If Congress really wanted to help the Indians, if they wanted to benefit them, they would go down to the Indian Office and they would procure the records of the lands that the Indians own and preserve them. Then they would tear up all the old, musty records of that office that have accumulated in the last 50 years and make a bonfire of them. Then they would either lock up that office or they would open it up, after a thorough fumigation, as a sort of a relic of modern methods of handling ancient things. That is exactly the best thing that could happen for the Indians.

I do not intend to take any of the time of the Senate, and I apologize for what little time I have taken, because the hour is late and I know the chairman of the committee desires to crowd the bill through to-day; but I wish to go on record as voting against the bill if there is a roll call and I am not able to be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] desire a separate vote upon the amendment he reserved?

Mr. MYERS. It appears to me it has to be voted on separately now, because it was not adopted with the others, and I ask for a separate vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question, then, is on concurring in the amendment of the committee on page 35, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senate as in Committee of the Whole agreed to the amendment of the committee to strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, appropriating \$750,000 for the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, and to insert in lieu the words:

For continuing construction, maintenance, and operation of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, \$250,000 (reimbursable), which shall be immediately available and remain available until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reserved by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 75, line 22, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, agreed to the amendment of the committee striking out "\$500,000" and inserting "\$250,000," so as to read:

For continuing construction and enlargement of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, to make possible the utilization of the water supply provided by the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 604), for 40 acres of each Indian allotment under the Wapato irrigation project

on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and such other water supply as may be available or obtainable for the irrigation of a total of 120,000 acres of allotted Indian lands on said reservation, \$250,000 to be immediately available, and to remain available until expended, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government. I submit this motion with a view of making the bill the unfinished business, and I give notice to the Senate that if it is made the unfinished business I will agree to lay it aside for the consideration of the military bill that comes up to-morrow, and probably this bill will not be taken up before Monday. I simply want to make it the unfinished business, and then I will agree to lay it aside for the other bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to suggest that it may be the Senator will find it agreeable to allow the bill on the calendar for commandeering ships to be taken up.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the Senator and I are on the same committee and we will agree about that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3771, the so-called Overman bill, so as to make it the unfinished business.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will then agree to lay it aside for the consideration of other bills that are pressing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With the intention of making it the unfinished business?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he has consulted with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have, and I will agree to lay this bill aside for the consideration of the other bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My only interest in this matter is that the bill providing for the registration of men for the draft upon reaching 21 shall be disposed of as soon as possible.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will lay this bill aside for that purpose. I do not expect to get the bill up before Monday.

Mr. WARREN. And it would not come up as the unfinished business before 2 o'clock.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not until 2 o'clock, and then if the Senator wants to press his bill I will agree to lay it aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

TAPPING OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE WIRES.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby requested to furnish the Senate with a full report on the method and efficiency of the Telautograph and Delaney systems of preventing tapping of telegraph and telephone wires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to hear the resolution read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 218), and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if these methods are already in operation?

Mr. OWEN. I do not know whether they are or not. I have a letter from the manager of the Telautograph Co. stating that his method will prevent the tapping of wires. I have seen it in operation in some of the hotels. I do not know very much about it, but the War Department made an answer a few days ago, which is now Senate Document 207, stating that it did not know anything about any systems. It seems that these might be available, and I think the Senate ought to have the information with regard to them.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator if it would not be wise to put in the words "if not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. OWEN. Yes; I have no objection to inserting the words "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified. The resolution as modified was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 29, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 28, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou Infinite and Eternal Spirit, humbly we bow before Thee and acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee.

"We are weak but Thou art mighty,
Hold us with Thy powerful hand";

and guide us through the duties and responsibilities of this day, that its issues may be in accordance with Thy will and good pleasure; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill pending before the House yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks leave to extend his remarks on the bill pending yesterday, and which will be pending again in a few minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ELECTION.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of the following Members to the committees named.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the nominations. The Clerk read the following committee nominations:

Mr. WILLIAM E. CLEARY of New York to be a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN of New York to be a member of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY of New York to be a member of the Committee on Accounts, the Committee on Claims, and the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JEROME F. DONOVAN of New York to be a member of the Committee on Education, Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? If not, the question is on the election of these gentlemen to the committees named.

The question being taken, the motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. POLK, for to-day and to-morrow, on account of important business.

PAYMENT OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to use these few minutes to call the attention of the House to a bill which I introduced on March 6—House bill 10526—the purpose of which is to amend sections 200 to 214 of the revenue law to provide for a splitting up of the payment of the excess war-profit tax, which matures on June 15, into four installments, payable June, August, October, and December 15.

Since the introduction of this bill I have been besieged with letters from all parts of the country in favor of the passage of this bill, and with many requests from Members of the House who are being similarly treated, and there is a tremendous demand from the taxpayers for some action in regard to the dividing of these excess war-profit tax payments, which come due on next June 15. I understand that the bill is resting quietly in the Ways and Means Committee, and from a letter which was issued on March 12 by the chairman of that committee

[Mr. KITCHIN] I understand that he is opposed to any dividing or postponement of these payments. I also understand that the Secretary of the Treasury is similarly disposed. The purpose that I have in speaking of this matter at this time is to get some official statement or good reason from these gentlemen as to why they are not responsive to the general demand of the people who are to pay these taxes, and I am making this demand in their behalf, that some consideration of this worthy and just measure of relief must be given these patriotic taxpayers who are willing to give up almost everything they possess to help the Government in this crucial hour. It is rare indeed that you find or hear any complaint from these people who are paying these taxes.

The Government is paying out about \$40,000,000 daily or about \$1,000,000,000 monthly, and that is about the limit of our capacity to pay. I am hoping that if this statement is correct, that provision will only be made to collect the money in from taxes and sale of bonds as the demand for payment exists, and thus keep our equal balance, and disturb as little as possible our financial system.

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

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood from a communication printed in the Record the other day, written by the Internal Revenue Commissioner, that he was in favor of the division of the payments, provided the payments were made in advance. Would that be of any advantage to the business public, to have the payments made in advance?

Mr. McFADDEN. It would not give them entire relief. On the contrary, the division and extension of these payments is right in keeping with the plan adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury in calling for the money from the sale of liberty bonds. These payments are always made in installments for the purpose of relieving the strain on our financial system. I am simply demanding the same relief in the payment of these \$3,400,000,000 estimate of taxes due June 15 in one payment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. WINGO. I understand the gentleman to say that dividing it up into installments to be paid in advance will not be a relief. Is not the argument in favor of installment payments that by making the payments in installments there will not be a large disturbance by reason of the transfers of bank balances?

Mr. McFADDEN. That is the idea, exactly. Of course, the purchase of these Treasury certificates in anticipation of these tax payments help some, but the real help is my bill.

Mr. WINGO. Why would it not grant relief if they took advantage of the provision which the Secretary has already made—to make these partial payments in advance and distribute them over four or five or six months, as they have had an opportunity to do?

Mr. McFADDEN. They have had that opportunity; but the people who pay these taxes find themselves still further embarrassed, because the law now provides for the payment before the taxes are due. My bill provides for dividing these payments up into four equal installments, payable in June, August, October, and December.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman's argument, then, resolve itself into this, that they want a longer time and not installment payments?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. A longer time and installments, too.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes. I want these taxpayers to know why no action is being taken on this bill, and to place the responsibility where it belongs. I believe that a majority of this Congress are in favor of this relief, but no action can be had so long as the bill is not favorably reported from the committee.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not the position of the Secretary of the Treasury that if these payments are not forthcoming in June he will not know how to finance the war, because there are such heavy drains on the Treasury?

Mr. McFADDEN. I have not the figures in detail, but I understand the Secretary of the Treasury has sold \$1,250,000,000 of Treasury certificates for the purpose of aiding in the payment of this tax due June 15. I understand the total amount of these taxes is about \$3,400,000,000. I also understand that the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the \$1,250,000,000 of Treasury certificates, has sold \$2,400,000,000 additional certificates of the Treasury and has just offered for sale another \$500,000,000. The business interests of the country have their money invested in raw materials and accounts, and so forth, and they are not in a liquid condition, and it will require that

these people must go into the open market and borrow money to the amount of probably \$1,500,000,000 or \$2,000,000,000, the rediscounting of this amount of which will have to be done with the Federal reserve banks.

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

Mr. McFADDEN. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that the amount paid into the Treasury and the amount received from certificates are both greatly in excess of the estimates that were made for the receipts from both these sources of revenue up to the present time?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. And is there not now a larger unexpended balance in the Treasury than there has ever been before?

Mr. McFADDEN. I understand that is the case. I want to quote from a couple of letters I have received, one from the National Retail Dry Goods Association, as follows:

The bankers in one Middle West city estimate that the total payments from that district will aggregate at least one-half of the total deposits of the banks of their city. As you are undoubtedly aware, a growing business requires that a considerable part of the earnings be retained to meet increased capital requirements. Delay in freight shipments and the tremendous advance in the price of commodities has also greatly increased the requirements upon capital investment.

And Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association, of Chattanooga, Tenn., as follows:

The present law calling for payments of this great sum of money on June 15 will seriously embarrass the resources of the banks, will cripple the efforts of the Liberty loan campaigners, and will seriously handicap the manufacturer of war material in obtaining sufficient financial assistance to enlarge and develop his business to the extent necessary to manufacture goods for war purposes. Moreover, the Government can not possibly redistribute this money promptly. In short, \$5,000,000,000 can not be withdrawn from the ordinary channels of trade without seriously affecting the very important interests necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

Also T. S. Southgate & Co., of Norfolk, Va.:

NORFOLK, VA., March 25, 1918.

Representative McFADDEN, M. C.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We feel that you are doing the commercialism of the country a great service in advocating the innovation of payment of these tremendous war taxes in installments. We cite it as an actual fact that not less than two-thirds of the mediocre small concerns, especially in the South and West, were able to make more profit than usual during the last year, be called upon to give up 50 to 60 per cent of what they made, amounting to from twenty to forty thousand dollars per firm, it will be little short of crippling the entire small business of the country.

It is an exhilarating fact to note the splendid feeling among men everywhere that they are willing to give up almost everything they possess to help the Government in this crucial hour. Indeed, it is rare that you find an honest merchant who complains even at the call that is thus made upon him.

That is not the point at all; the point is one of physical ability to comply, and our own judgment is that the shock is too great; it would take two or three years for men to fit themselves to bear such a burden as this all at one time in cash.

The time is growing short, and we sincerely hope that you will succeed in your efforts; and if you will tell us what we can do to aid to that end, we will certainly try to get busy and accomplish it if possible.

Very truly, yours,

T. S. SOUTHGATE & Co.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the reference of the bill H. R. 10956, to make "The Star-Spangled Banner" the national anthem of the United States, changed from the Committee on the Library to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to have reference of the bill H. R. 10956 changed from the Committee on the Library to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman given notice of this?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that I called the attention of the Speaker to it. The bill has been so referred before.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the gentleman authorized to do this by the committee?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to be authorized to do that in order to make the request.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall object for the present, until I can see what it is.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

Anderson	Flood	Kitchin	Rowland
Anthony	Flynn	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Blackmon	Fuller, Ill.	Lenroot	Schall
Borland	Gandy	Lunn	Scott, Pa.
Britten	Gard	McCulloch	Scully
Caldwell	Glass	McKeown	Sherley
Carew	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Sherwood
Carter, Mass.	Good	Mann	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodall	Martin	Slomp
Classon	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Coady	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Smith, C. B.
Connelly, Kans.	Griffin	Miller, Wash.	Smith, T. F.
Cooper, Ohio	Hamill	Morin	Snyder
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Steele
Copley	Harrison, Miss.	Mudd	Sterling, Pa.
Costello	Hayes	Neely	Sullivan
Crigo	Helntz	Oliver, Ala.	Swift
Curry, Cal.	Hensley	O'Shaunessy	Talbott
Darrow	Hersey	Overmyer	Templeton
Davidson	Hicks	Parker, N. Y.	Thomas
Denton	Hollingsworth	Peters	Tinkham
Dies	Hood	Polk	Van Dyke
Donovan	Huddleston	Porter	Venable
Doelling	Ireland	Powers	Ward
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pratt	White, Me.
Eagan	Jones, Va.	Robbins	Wilson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Kahn	Roberts	Wilson, Tex.
Estopinal	Kehoe	Robinson	Winslow
Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rosenberg	Wood, Ind.
Fess	Kettner	Rouse	Woods, Iowa

The SPEAKER. On this call 308 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7795, with Mr. POT in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEVER. As I understand it, the substitute offered for the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] has been passed upon—it has been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LEVER. The next vote, then, is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas as amended by the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas includes the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, and in those circumstances the Chair supposed that the gentleman from Kansas was not going to insist upon further action on his amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The fact that the substitute may include all of the original amendment would not remove the necessity for the adoption of the amendment as amended, even if the substitute were adopted, would it? In other words, are we not compelled to vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to offer an additional amendment to this section. Would it be in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees no reason why it is not in order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair rules that my substitute has already been adopted as an amendment to the section, of course I shall not insist upon further action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already stated that he has so ruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 18, after the word "wheat," strike out the comma and the following words: "oats and barley."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my amendment, which I send to the desk, as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 3, line 18, after the word "of" before the word "wheat," insert the word "corn."

Mr. LEVER. To that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I understand this is offered as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BLAND. Yes. Gentlemen of the committee, I expressed my views on this question briefly yesterday. It is very important that we in Indiana have seed corn. I said yesterday that I did not care anything especially about the loan feature in this law, although it might be important in isolated instances, but we want seed corn so that we can get it and have it under the direction of the Government. If seed corn is imported into Indiana from the South it matures too late; if it is imported from the North it matures too early. The Government will know what kind of seed corn we need.

I said yesterday, and I repeat, that 75 per cent of the great corn crop in the corn belt of the Middle West was frost bitten. I went through the fields last October and saw the best corn of that State frost bitten in the roasting ear, which absolutely destroys its seed value. The people ought not to be permitted to plant that character of corn, because they will not get the proper crop. We ought to be interested in seeing that they do not plant inferior seed corn. I know they are offering from \$8 to \$12 a bushel for seed corn. Some Member suggests that it is \$15. They do not know where to get it. I am informed that there is corn in other States that can be furnished by the Government, and if the Government will buy it and test it and bring it to us, we will plant it and raise a bumper crop. Without this amendment I do not think we can. If you are going to furnish seed wheat and sell it to the people of the country, I want you to include corn, because it is one of the vital necessities.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Has the gentleman's constituents money to buy the seed with?

Mr. BLAND. I think the most of them have; we are not poverty stricken in Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman has no interest in this bill?

Mr. BLAND. I have an interest in this bill. The proposition is that the Government shall buy and sell seed, and I want it to apply to the Middle West. It is rarely we get anything from this Congress to apply to the Middle West.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. You have already got it.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in Illinois and parts of Indiana for the past five years they have only had one good crop. Many a farmer has not the money to pay the high price that they are asking for seed corn now.

Mr. BLAND. I have no doubt that is true. There is another thing to take into consideration, and that is it does not take much corn to plant 20 acres; it is not a big financial proposition. One bushel of seed corn will plant from 6 to 8 acres, but with wheat it is different. We want it under the direction of the Government.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have received scores of letters from western Kentucky to the effect that it is almost impossible there to get seed corn.

Mr. BLAND. I know that is true, and it is true in my State, and it is a very important matter. I do not think the financial

question ought to be any objection, because it does not amount to a great deal for seed corn as compared to seed wheat.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say that there is a tremendous scarcity of cotton seed in my section, of good cotton seed.

Mr. BLAND. The Secretary of Agriculture is from the gentleman's State, is he not?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; from Missouri.

Mr. BLAND. He is looking after you pretty carefully, is he not?

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered to line 18 proposes to strike out certain language in the bill beginning at the comma after "wheat" and including the words "oats and barley." The gentleman from Indiana offers as a substitute an amendment to insert after the word "wheat" the word "corn." I make no pretense to anything like a very great knowledge of parliamentary law, but it does seem to me that the proposition to insert can hardly be held to be germane to a proposition to strike out. It strikes me that the two propositions are absolutely inconsistent with each other and so thoroughly unrelated to each other that they can not be brought together under the guise of germaneness.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman is quite correct, but if the gentleman from Indiana would offer his amendment as an amendment to perfect the text it would take precedence over the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina, which is merely a motion to strike out.

Mr. LEVER. In response to what the gentleman from Tennessee has said I am arguing the status to the Chair as it exists, namely, that I have offered an amendment to strike out, and the gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment by way of substitute, and I am pressing that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to perfect the text.

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

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by adding corn to wheat, barley, and oats.

Mr. LEVER. I make a point of order against that. I make it on the theory that while the gentleman is offering this in the guise of an amendment to perfect the text, he is undertaking to do by indirection that which he can not do by way of substitution. The amendment that I propose looks to the striking out of language. Now, the gentleman's amendment must be in the nature of agreeing to the striking out of the language and adding something by way of substitution, and I do not believe that that kind of a situation can be held to be in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the contentions of the gentleman from South Carolina are not tenable so far as they go to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, which tends to perfect the text.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not in the third degree?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is not in the third degree. It adds one more grain to those already contained in the text. After the text has been amended as proposed by the gentleman from Indiana, the House can vote out the entire paragraph as amended by the gentleman from Indiana, if it desires to do so, but there is no question that it is in order as an amendment to the text as it now stands. It is not offered as a substitute but as an amendment to the text and is preferential to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to strike out the text.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Does not the gentleman come back to the situation he started with on the proposition ruled upon by the Chairman a moment ago that it is really, while offered as a proposition to perfect the text, in its very nature a substitution for the amendment I offered?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not at all. It is preferential in its nature and must be acted upon by the House before the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina is acted upon. It perfects the text of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I discuss the point of order briefly?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana had been offered as an original amendment to the text of the bill it would be undoubtedly in order, because the bill

itself mentions three different kinds of grain, and therefore it is in order to add a fourth. But if the text of the bill had only mentioned one grain it perhaps would not have been in order to have added the second; but in view of the fact that the bill specifically mentions three grains, it is in order to add the fourth. Now, if the gentleman from South Carolina had not offered his amendment, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana would have been in order, undoubtedly. My contention is the mere fact the gentleman from Indiana has offered just a motion to strike out does not make the gentleman from Indiana's motion out of order, because the words are still in the bill—"wheat, barley, and oats." They have not been stricken out, and the motion of the gentleman from Indiana must be voted on first, which is a motion to add a fourth grain. The mere fact that the gentleman from South Carolina made his motion first does not make the motion of the gentleman from Indiana out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not sustained.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana on the ground that it adds a new subject matter to the pending section, and is therefore out of order. In that connection I wish to cite some precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very glad to hear the gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman from Virginia reserves the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the section of the bill to which this amendment relates proposes to furnish the farmers with certain indicated seeds. The bill names three varieties of seed that will be furnished. The amendment adds corn, another and different food seed, from those mentioned in the bill. This same question of the right to add new matter, that it is additional subjects, was raised last year in connection with the food-control bill, and the amendments proposed were held out of order, from that ruling. The Chair will find the ruling in the RECORD of June, 1917, page 4497. A point of order was raised to the proposed amendment, and in ruling on same the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union referred to the fact there were only three specific subject matters in that bill, food, fuel and feed, and the additional subject matter contained in the amendment was not germane, and therefore was out of order. The same arguments that have been advanced to-day in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana were presented in support of the proposition to add another subject matter to the food-control bill. In this connection I will call attention to the ruling of the Chair on the occasion referred to.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. At that time was not the amendment to add clothing and things of that sort which were not food?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will read a citation from the ruling of the Chairman, citing Speaker Carlisle:

The rule does not prohibit a committee reporting a bill, from embracing in it as many different subjects as it may choose; but after the bill has been reported to the House no different subject can be introduced into it by amendment, whether as a substitute or otherwise.

The manual says: (Rule XVI, sec. 7.)

No motion, or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

It is contended that if the pending bill proposed to furnish wheat only, the amendment to add corn would be out of order, but that when the bill proposes to furnish wheat, and two other specified grains, then the amendment adding corn is in order. Upon what pretended principle is this distinction based? If the bill referred to furnishing wheat only, then wheat would be the subject under consideration. If it is considered that the addition of corn, would be out of order, then it must be on the ground that the addition of corn, would be the addition of another subject. But if two other grains are mentioned, in addition to wheat, it is insisted that corn may be added by way of amendment. Is the addition of corn to three specifically denominated grains, any the less a new subject matter, than when corn is proposed to be added to a section referring to wheat only? The rule says that after a bill is reported, a different subject can not be introduced by amendment. If corn is a different subject when it is proposed to be added to wheat only, and is therefore out of order, how is that objection removed when three grains are mentioned? If corn is not germane as a subject matter, to wheat standing alone, how does it become germane to wheat when two other grains are mentioned? Corn is no more germane to the other grains than it is to wheat.

The ruling of Speaker Carlisle says that after a bill has been reported no different subject can be introduced by amendment. It does not say that when a bill contains one subject an amendment will be out of order, but that if a bill contains that same subject, and two other named subjects, the same amendment will be in order. Upon what principle will it be in order? Upon the ground of germaneness? Is corn as an amendment, any more germane to wheat, when wheat is mentioned as a seed, with two other seeds, than when it stands alone? And if it is germane in the one case, and in order, why not in the other case?

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. BLAND. If it had named the character of food it is plain that you could not add another kind. Where it says food in general, the ruling is settled. Where it says seed and mentions the several kinds, that is a different proposition.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The principle, it seems to me, would be precisely contrarywise. The more general the terms you use, the greater the number of particular amendments that would be in order. But when you denominate the particular seed to be furnished, and then undertake to offer an amendment affording another variety, you are introducing a new subject matter. I am familiar with the precedent generally cited in this connection, namely, that to a bill admitting several Territories, another Territory may be added by way of amendment. But that is not the addition of a new subject matter. The subject matter there is Territories, the matter proposed to be added is a Territory. The fact that it is a Territory with another name is immaterial. Hence there is no change of subject matter. It is true that another precedent holds that a bill providing for the admission of one Territory, an amendment to add another Territory is not in order.

The fact is that the precedents are not in harmony. If the subject under consideration is the proposition to furnish the three denominated seeds, then that is a single subject, and under the precedent last cited, namely the bill to admit a territory, the amendment to add corn, would not be in order. If the proposition to furnish three seeds is really threefold, then the committee has exercised the right referred to in Speaker Carlisle's ruling, namely to report a bill with several different subjects, and each one of them is under consideration, and should be considered precisely as if the committee had reported their bill with three independent sections relating to seed, each section providing for a single variety. In that event certainly corn could not be added by way of amendment to any one of the three sections. But it is insisted that if these different seeds are referred to in a single section, the amendment adding corn will be in order. When they are grouped in this fashion, they are still three subject matters, and when corn is proposed to be added to them, it is just as much a different subject matter, as it would be if offered as an amendment to these items reported in separate sections. If out of order in the one case, on principle it ought to be out of order in the other. If held to be germane, if offered to a section containing wheat, and two other food grains, it ought to be germane if offered to wheat standing alone. The mere fact that three articles are mentioned can not be presented as the ground on which the amendment adding corn, is considered to be in order. If the ruling is put that it is in order because it is germane to some one of the items, wheat for instance, what is the answer to the suggestion that if the section provided for wheat only, corn as a food grain offered by way of amendment, would be as germane to wheat, as it would be when offered to a section containing wheat and two other grains? It is submitted that if the amendment for corn, if offered to a section containing wheat only, would be out of order under the rule on the ground that a new subject matter was sought to be introduced by the amendment, it is equally out of order, on this ground when it is offered to a section containing three specified grains, including wheat.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SNELL. The question before the House is whether the amendment adding the word "corn" is germane to the provision of the bill providing for the purchase of wheat, barley, and oats. The title of this bill is "for the purchase of seed grain." The bill itself enumerates wheat, barley, and oats, as seed grains. There is also no doubt but that corn comes under the heading of "seed grain." So the question is, simply, Is it in order to add one more seed grain to the seed grains already mentioned? As I understand the rules of the House, when we are considering a measure, if we have one substantive proposition you can not add additional ones, but if you are considering two or three,

or more, substantive propositions it is perfectly in order to add another proposition of the same kind or character.

In the Digest, on page 481, in regard to this rule, it says, on the subject of admitting Territories into the Union as States—

If you were trying to admit Idaho, for instance, alone, you could not add Montana and Washington—

And so forth—

But if you turn it around the other way and make the bill general in its character, to admit Montana and Idaho and Washington, then you might add to it, as an amendment, Wyoming, for instance, and it would be a perfectly germane amendment.

Therefore I claim that, according to the rules and according to these precedents, as laid down by Speaker CLARK in his ruling of December 5, 1912, Sixty-second Congress, it is entirely in order to add "corn" as another seed grain in this instance, that the Chair is entirely right in not sustaining the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to call his attention to the fact that in the amended title, as proposed on page 6, there is even stronger support of his contention, because there the language "for the production of grain" is used. That language clearly is sufficiently comprehensive to include all of these specific seed propositions.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee if the Chair has his mind made up. I am strongly of the opinion that the amendment is in order, and if the Chair's mind is not made up I would like to argue it. If the Chair's mind is made up, however, I do not like to trespass on the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say frankly to the gentleman from Georgia that the Chair considers that the amendment is in order.

Mr. CRISP. Then the gentleman has no desire whatever to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of the bill is to provide seed, to make loans to farmers in the spring-wheat area for the purchase of seed—wheat, oats, and barley. Now, the Chair believes we would be going to a very great extreme to hold that one additional food product of similar character—to wit, corn—could not be added to those already enumerated.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment that I sent up be reported.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 18, strike out the words "wheat, oats, and barley" and insert in lieu thereof the words "agricultural seed."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. WINGO. I would like to know on what grounds?

Mr. LEVER. I will reserve it, if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. WINGO. I have no desire to be heard on it.

Mr. LEVER. I ask that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment on the ground that you can not amend germanely a specific proposition with a general proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the Chair rules—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I should not raise my voice, but I am the proponent of the amendment offered in good faith and under the rules plainly entitled to less summary action. The Chair says that the purpose of this bill is to provide for seed for a certain purpose. My amendment is to strike out the specific enumeration of wheat, oats, and barley and substitute "agricultural grain seeds," because the main purpose is not to furnish wheat, oats, and barley, but the main purpose is to relieve the grain and food shortage in the United States by furnishing agricultural seed for that purpose to farmers growing such food.

Why should it not be in order as much as the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND]? If you can add one grain, can you not strike out all those specific grains and include all grains? The greater includes the less, the whole includes the part, is the rule. If the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is in order, which is the lesser, then the greater, which I offer in my amendment, should certainly be in order, because it includes the lesser.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair indulge me?

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not a fact that the greater production of corn and rice in this country will really mean the furnishing of more wheat bread for the people across?

Mr. WINGO. That is true. That is all I care to submit to the Chair on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds it difficult to follow the lines of argument that are proceeding in different parts of the Hall.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has just ruled that it is in order to add to the character of seed enumerated in the text of this bill. If the Chair follows that logically, he must necessarily hold that it will be in order, instead of designating the character of seed specifically, to designate them as an entirety, and that it is in order to obtain by direction that which you can obtain by indirection by specific designation.

Gentlemen on the floor of this House have stated that this bill is for the purpose of authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to procure certain characters of seed. There is one certain provision as to that, but there is another provision, and I direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to this phase, that this bill authorizes a direct loan not of seeds but a direct loan of not more than \$450 in any one case to farmers. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the language that authorizes that appropriation:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers—

Not of wheat, not of barley, not of oats, but—

to make advances or loans to farmers * * * where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley.

Mr. Chairman, under that provision the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make, not advances of wheat, not advances of oats or barley, but to make loans and advances directly to the farmers in all cases where he shall find—I am reading now from line 17 on page 3—

where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes.

I wish to direct the attention of the Chair to the fact that that idea is carried out in lines 4 to 8, on page 4, where it says—

The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450. All such advances or loans—

Not of wheat, not of seed—

All such advances or loans shall, as far as practicable, be made through the agency of State and National banks.

Now, what does this bill provide on its face? It has two major premises, one authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans or advances of money in those districts where the Secretary of Agriculture finds there is need. I now read from lines 17 and 18, page 3—

where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes.

The next authority which is granted under this provision of the bill—

or, when necessary—

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized—

to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. In just a minute. Now, this bill involves two purposes, one the advancement or loan of money to farmers where the Secretary of Agriculture ascertains that there is special need among farmers in districts where it is necessary to procure seed, and next to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers. Therefore we come back to the original proposition whether under the first authorization, where the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to advance or loan money where he ascertains that there is need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes, it is in order to make a generic, germane amendment instead of taking up the time of the House by offering specific amendments piecemeal.

The Chairman, in order to be logical in his decision in holding that the addition of corn is in order, would have to hold necessarily that a generic amendment, such as is offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], namely, "agricultural seed," is in order. If the gentleman from Arkansas should offer single amendments embodying every character of agricultural seed, the Chair would have to hold that those amendments were in order under his ruling just made that the addition of "corn" is in order. If you can offer single amendments piecemeal, certainly you can offer a general amendment covering all, and there is no rule or precedent of the House that will controvert or deny that position. Now I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. The title of the bill calls for an appropriation for the purchase of seed grain. When the language is used in the body of the bill it says "such grains." The general term

"agricultural seed" might mean clover, or alfalfa, or lettuce, or carrots. They are not seed grain, but they come under the term "agricultural seed." Would an amendment to this bill providing for the purchase of carrot seed or clover or alfalfa seed come within the term "seed grain" when the product itself is not a grain?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is basing his argument on the title of the bill, when everyone knows that we never determine the germaneness of amendments by the title of the bill, but that the text of the bill is what governs, and that the title of the bill is amended to conform to the text when the bill has been completed; and in this very case there is an amendment proposed to the title of the bill.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The language is used in the body of the bill. It says "such grain."

Mr. STAFFORD. I will answer the gentleman specifically, that any kindred grains, as mentioned by the gentleman, would, in my opinion, be in order.

Mr. REAVIS. But carrots and lettuce and alfalfa are not grain.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know under what rule these gentlemen are continuing this discussion after the Chair has ruled?

Mr. WALSH. I should like to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he is familiar with the provision of Rule XVI, which reads as follows:

A specific subject may not be amended by a provision general in nature, even when of the class of the specific subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is referring to a situation where there was but one subject named—that is, for the construction of one building or the admission of one State—but this is different. This case is entirely outside of that ruling, because this is general in its character, by including more than one, and therefore any general amendment of a generic character may be offered.

Mr. WALSH. If it named half a dozen seeds, it would still be specific, and you could not amend by an amendment general in its character.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the general amendment is of the same character as that designated specifically, it would be in order, for the same end would be accomplished by offering specific amendments as by offering at one time a general amendment covering the same class.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this section provides, as has been stated, that the Secretary of Agriculture may make advances for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley. A few moments ago I presented to the Chair the proposition that these articles, were the three subject matters of the bill, and that in my judgment, in conformity with the precedents which were cited, it would not be in order to add another subject matter. In the discussion of the point of order one of the gentlemen participating in the debate called attention to the title of the bill, in which he said this was a proposition for the purchase of seed grain, and argued therefrom that that being so, the addition of another seed grain would be in order. The Chair acceded to that view. I have no complaint to make of the ruling of the Chair, but I wish to call attention to the fact that as a matter of logical sequence from that ruling of the Chair, it would be perfectly competent for a succession of gentlemen on this floor, or for any one gentleman if he obtained recognition for that purpose, to move by successive amendments to add to the specifically mentioned seed, every other seed grain in the calendar of seeds. All of these successive amendments would be in order.

This being so, an amendment providing in one general phrase, for furnishing all of these foods, without mentioning them seriatim, would be in order. One great principle of parliamentary law is to do business, and it is certainly in the interest of business, to save a multiplicity of amendments, by one direct motion, achieving at one blow the end that would otherwise be reached by a multiplicity of strokes.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. I am not an expert in parliamentary law, but I take it that the purpose of the bill is to furnish bread to the allies and the civilian population. Now, is it not a fact that we ought to leave it to the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the production of all kinds of bread, because there are certain kinds of bread that we like in this country which the allies do not like over there, and if you can increase the production of bread that we like and they do not, does it not tend to increase

the amount of wheat bread that we can send to the allies across the water?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I think so.

Mr. LAZARO. Then, why not take in all kinds of bread?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That relates to the merits of the amendment. My argument is with reference to the parliamentary situation. I am interested in this ruling for the reason that it will create a precedent for future rulings by other presiding officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the gentleman is correct as far as it applies to corn in the form of seed corn. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas is broad enough to include all agricultural seed.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have already called the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas to this feature of his amendment and he will ask leave to modify it in this respect.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, if it does not say "agricultural grain," that was my intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment says "agricultural seed."

Mr. WINGO. I will put it "agricultural seed grain."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified in that way.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. To that I make a point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As a result of the modification of the amendment in the new form it is a proposition to provide in a general inclusive phrase for every form of agricultural food grain. If it is admitted that by successive amendments at great length it is in order to put into the bill all of the food grains and this appears to be conceded, then I submit that it is not contrary to any parliamentary precedent whatever to include all of these items in one inclusive phrase. With respect to what may be done when some specific subject matter is up I wish to call attention to one precedent—I do not know that it has any particular relevancy in this connection but it will show how far the House has gone—namely the case where there was a proposition to amend a section of an act, and it was held that an amendment was in order to repeal the act itself. This goes much further than anything proposed to be done to-day. V Hinds, section 5824. It would certainly therefore seem to be germane and in order to provide by one amendment to furnish all possible food grains.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand from the gentleman's theory and argument that a bill that provides for building public buildings in three different cities might be amended so that the Secretary of the Treasury could build anywhere.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If a bill is under consideration for admitting Territories into the Union, an amendment adding other Territories is in order. To a bill providing for public buildings in two or more different cities, an amendment providing for buildings in other cities, will be in order. I am aware that there are rulings that a specific subject may not be amended by a general provision, but the statement of that ruling is misleading, and the principle controlling these rulings do not apply to this situation. Looking to those precedents it will be noted that they are of this general character, namely, a proposition to give particular relief to some individual, and which is sought to be expanded into legislation of a general character to give the same relief to all persons similarly situated. The rulings forbidding this are plainly right. Really, they fall within the principle that when a bill carrying one subject is before the House, it is not in order to admit, by way of amendment, a subject different from the one under consideration. A proposition to give an individual relief upon a predicated state of facts is one subject. An amendment to provide by general law for the relief of all persons similarly situated is another and different subject.

But this principle does not apply to the case in hand. I maintain that if it is in order to proceed by successive amendment to insert all of the agricultural food grains, it is competent under the rules, with a view to reducing discussion and expediting business, to provide by one specific amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to purchase and supply every variety of agricultural food grains to farmers needing them for seed, in consequence of the conditions affecting those farmers.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair ruled on this point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not, but the Chair is ready to rule. The Chair may have been in error in holding that the

addition of the word "corn" was in order, but the Chair thinks not. In any event, the Chair is not willing to go to the extent of holding that an amendment using the words "agricultural food grain" is in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. With all due respect to the Chair, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is more than willing for the gentleman to appeal. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents contains all of the decisions on this question.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the floor; this is not the time for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents, section 5843, the Chair will find where it has been ruled time and again that you can not convert a specific law for one or more articles into a general law. That has been held from time immemorial, and there is no question in the world about it. All the precedents have been that way, and no one can cite a different precedent. It justifies the ruling of the Chair. [Cries of "The regular order"!]. If the gentleman will permit, I am pursuing the regular order. I have a right to debate this appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes had it.

So the decision of the Chair was held to be the judgment of the committee.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, in order to get at the object I have in my amendment will it be necessary for me to offer a specific amendment for each agricultural grain? That is the logical conclusion of the Chair's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer such amendments as he sees fit, and the Chair will pass upon them as they are offered.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I did not make the parliamentary inquiry in an argumentative spirit. I am anxious to save time and that is the reason I offered my amendment. The conclusion of the Chair is that I shall have to do that under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say very frankly what the opinion of the present occupant of the chair is. The Chair takes judicial notice of the fact that wheat, oats, and barley are food products—

Mr. WINGO. I am trying to get at the idea of the Chair. Would it be in order for me to offer this amendment by substituting the words "agricultural food grain seed"?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say very frankly to the gentleman that that so completely changes the scope of the bill, so enlarges it, that the Chair thinks it would not be in order.

Mr. WINGO. Is not that an argument that goes to the merits of the amendment, and not to its germaneness?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit the regular order is the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take up unnecessary time and seldom take the floor. I stated that I am going to vote for the bill. Some of the gentlemen who are calling for the regular order are seldom seen on the floor. I want to get at the matter in the most direct and expeditious manner. If the Chair believes it can be done only by separate amendment for each particular seed, then we reach the same end as my amendment only in a long and tedious way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair tried to answer the gentleman in the spirit of frankness.

Mr. WINGO. The Chair believes that an amendment including agricultural food grains would not be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that while the Chair does not wish to anticipate that, yet, at this time the Chair would not feel disposed to hold such an amendment in order.

Mr. WINGO. I shall offer it so that the Chair can rule upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending.

Mr. WINGO. I offer it as a substitute in lieu of the one that was just now ruled out.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the Chair has just ruled on the proposition that the gentleman is now submitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEVER. I understand that the gentleman from Arkansas withdrew his original amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, no; I never did. That was ruled out.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That was ruled out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 18, strike out the words "wheat, oats, and barley" and insert in lieu thereof the words "agricultural food-grain seed."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Indiana has offered an amendment to include corn, which is in the nature of an amendment to perfect the text. Is it not in order to first vote upon that amendment before we vote upon the substitute of the gentleman from Arkansas? The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is to add corn, and this is a substitute for wheat, barley, oats, and corn, if corn be added.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the point of order of the gentleman from Oklahoma is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to further perfect the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will send it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] is pending. He spoke five minutes in favor of it. I would like to be recognized in opposition to it; or will the Chair put the motion without opportunity for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to have five minutes upon it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will not be adopted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute that I desire to offer to perfect the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Michigan in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Texas will have opportunity to offer his amendment later.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment and all that the one who offered it and those who support it have said is contrary to the purpose and spirit of this bill. This bill contemplates the purchase of seed for farmers to be supplied to them on credit, but only to those who need it and are themselves unable in any way to obtain it. The Committee on Agriculture reported the bill after thorough investigation, believing that there is a limited section of the country particularly in need of this seed, that people of that section will not be able to get the seed unless the Government supplies it in this way. Now come gentlemen from some of the great wealthy, prosperous farming States of the country and plead for their people, telling us that their farmers are entitled to the benefits to be conferred by this bill; that their farmers have not been able and will not be able to get seed if their sections of the country are not included with the spring-wheat section and given the privileges to be offered by this bill to farmers of that drought-stricken, crop-failure section of the Northwest.

Gentlemen from the great corn belt, from the very heart of that magnificent farming country, plead for their people, and ask for amendments that, if adopted, will change the entire spirit and purpose of the bill; making a measure that will include the entire country, a measure that will place the splendid, prosperous farming sections in the same class as the spring-wheat section, which, temporarily at least, is poverty-stricken and unable to care for itself.

Enactment of this bill into law does not commit the Congress to the policy of supplying seed to farmers on credit or of loaning money on personal security. At this particular time our Government is intensely interested in the production of food, particularly wheat; interested in the welfare of our people and

also the people who are so bravely fighting our battles. We need food, we must have it, and we must go even to the extent of adopting a policy of paternalism if by so doing we may be able to reach the result so much to be desired, that of increasing our food supply.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. WHEELER. Evidently the gentleman has not read the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have read the bill and I helped to prepare it, and I know why it was prepared, to meet a particular situation. It is not a general proposition or for the relief of the seed difficulty which more or less acutely affects the entire country. It is to meet an emergency in one small area in which the farmers are unfortunately, temporarily I believe, too poor to take care of themselves.

Mr. WHEELER. To borrow money.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And these gentlemen, urging this amendment, always loyal to and alert in behalf of their own people, are unwisely seeking so to change this bill as to make it apply to the entire country alike.

It must be admitted—everybody knows it—farmers all over the country were very unfortunate last year in having their crops, particularly corn, damaged, some of them destroyed by frost. This was true even in the States of the corn belt, the most fertile country in the world, where the farmers usually are, and I believe now are, the most prosperous of any on the face of the earth. But farmers of that favored section of the country are only temporarily embarrassed—many of them only slightly inconvenienced—and surely the Congress ought not to be asked to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury for their relief. Every one of them has either money or credit, and their well known independence and pride would not permit them to accept help from any outside source if it were offered. And even if we were able by a stretch of imagination to believe the farmers of that wonderfully fertile and otherwise favored country had been so unfortunate with their recent crops as to be embarrassed, without money, and in need of help, I am altogether unwilling to believe that their neighbors and friends, the business men, the great and prosperous industrial interests of those great States, would hesitate for a moment to supply to the limit that need. The States, the counties, the municipalities, large and small, would promptly and cheerfully furnish money, scoring even a suggestion of outside help.

That is the spirit in which the State of Michigan has acted, and it acted promptly. Knowing that early frosts last fall had wrought great damage to crops and inflicted heavy loss upon the farmers of the State, the legislature anticipated the difficulty that would confront the farmers this spring and made ample preparation and provision to assist them. The legislature and the State authorities did not think of seeking outside help, and I am sure I am right in saying that such help would not have been accepted.

Early after war was declared the Legislature of Michigan, being in session, passed an act providing for a war preparedness board, and made an appropriation of \$5,000,000 and placed that enormous sum of money at the disposal of that board to be used as it might be needed. The board is assisting our farmers to get seed of various kinds, also implements and machinery, and I am sure it will supply every need as it becomes known.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The people of Michigan are showing a disposition to take care of themselves and to help the country to the limit of their ability. They do not come to the Federal Treasury to which appeals should come from those only who, under extraordinary circumstances, are not able to take care of themselves. Yesterday I said when this bill first came before the Committee on Agriculture it was turned down cold, because the committee did not believe it was right for the Government to go into the business of loaning money on personal security or that it should go generally into the business of supplying seed on credit.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But after further lengthy hearings and after, as I say, thorough investigation, the committee was satisfied that there is a section of this country where this help is absolutely needed. It is the section of the country where grains, largely wheat, that the country as a whole is interested in now are raised. But while it is largely a local problem to help these people who need help, it is a problem in which all the people are interested. It rises to the dignity of a national problem, and I believe under all the circumstances the Committee on Agriculture was right in bringing the situation to the attention of the House, and right also in so limiting

and restricting the measure as to furnish help only to the particular sections of the country where, on account of bad climatic conditions, crop failures in the recent past—

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan (continuing). The people are in such a condition that they can not themselves supply the seed. It very properly does not include the corn belt.

Some of the gentlemen who are urging the amendment to make the bill apply to the entire country alike offer as a reason—a very slim excuse—that there has been no session of the legislatures of their States since the declaration of war by this country. That is no reason at all. Because their States have not seen their duty or have not performed it does not justify an appeal to Congress, nor is it good reason for begging at the door of the Federal Treasury. Their own people have money in abundance, and State authorities can easily make it available for every local need. It is not even a good excuse that legislatures have not been in regular session. If an emergency exists and the people are suffering, why did not you get busy and hold special sessions? Why did you not do as North Dakota and South Dakota have done? They called special sessions of their legislatures—the need is urgent and the duty is appreciated up there. They have done everything they can for their own people, and we are taking up the work where they have stopped, because they are unable to go further.

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by myself and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana and all amendments by way of substitute to those or amendments to the substitutes may close—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana now in order? I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. There are already three pending. If the gentleman will withhold his amendment, the Chair will see that he has ample opportunity.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to have my substitute that I offered read by the Clerk for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has the floor for the moment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair answer my parliamentary inquiry whether or not the substitute is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is not in order at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Not at this time?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] and all substitutes and amendments to substitutes thereto be closed in 40 minutes, the Chair to control the time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask if the gentleman's request would preclude the offering of other amendments to this section?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not an amendment to his amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. To whose amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. I offer one amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Send up the amendment and the Chair will have it read for information.

Mr. BLANTON. And I ask for five minutes on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be read for the information of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the words "wheat, oats, and barley," add "corn, maize, sorghum, and feterita."

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to put my request.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for five minutes on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is about to put the unanimous-consent request. The gentleman from Texas will remember that the Chair asked that his amendment be read for the information of the committee. Discussion of it is not in order

at this time, but the Chair will see at the proper time, if the Chair shall hold the gentleman's amendment in order, that the gentleman is recognized for discussion. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on amendments pertaining to the commodities enumerated in this bill, all substitutes, and all amendments to amendments be concluded in 40 minutes, the time to be controlled by the Chair. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the Chair to reserve me five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. I sought to get the Chair's attention before any other gentleman addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair will say to the gentleman from Missouri the Chair has been doing the best he can.

Mr. RUCKER. I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman saw the gentleman from South Carolina on his feet for quite a while endeavoring to get recognition and the Chair put down his name first.

Mr. RUCKER. If the Chair will pardon me, I had the unanimous consent of the House, except the Chair, to make this speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this legislation as reported by the committee. I am opposed to loading it up with these different amendments. I am afraid that many of them are supported without any idea of perfecting the bill, but in the hope on the part of some of the Members who are supporting them that by loading up the bill with a lot of amendments it may be defeated. [Applause.]

There is such a shortage of food products the world over that Congress ought to do everything it can within reason to encourage and make it as easy as possible for the farmers to increase production in this country. This bill is undoubtedly a step in the right direction, and it ought to pass.

My colleague from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] referred a few minutes ago to what Michigan has done along this same line since the war started. I rose more particularly to state a little more fully than my colleague did what the State of Michigan has been doing for the farmers of the State. Michigan has been a pioneer in this legislation, the same as it has been in other progressive legislation. Much has been said since this debate started about the conditions in other States, but no one has told of any State doing the work which Michigan has done. It has done for the farmers of our State the very thing this bill proposes to do for the farmers of the country at large.

A year ago when the war resolution was passed the legislature of the State was in session. In less than two weeks after the declaration of war by Congress the Michigan Legislature had enacted legislation, and given it immediate effect, creating a State war preparedness board, composed of State officers, with the governor of the State as chairman, and putting \$5,000,000 at the disposal of that board for the purpose of better enabling the people of our State to do their part in the prosecution of this war.

Besides looking after the more strictly military affairs of the State, this board has made use of the funds placed at its disposal to do practically all, and in some respects more, for the farmers of the State than this bill proposes to do for the farmers of the country. I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Michigan War Preparedness Board, Maj. Roy C. Vandercook, telling of the work Michigan has done, which I desire to read. The letter is dated March 25, 1918, and is addressed to me. The body of it is as follows:

Michigan has purchased approximately 75,000 bushels of tested seed corn for distribution to the farmers of Michigan at cost and about 20,000 bushels of spring seed wheat to sell at the same basis.

We are now distributing throughout the State 1,000 Ford tractors at the manufacturer's price of \$750 plus freight charges and cost of delivery.

Through the Live Stock Sanitary Commission we are purchasing sheep by the carload for distribution at cost in small lots to the farmers of the State.

Carrying out this program, the State has, of course, been bearing the overhead charges of office work, printing, postage, and a considerable amount of traveling expense.

The governor is at present working on a plan to sell the surplus stock of potatoes to a dehydrating concern, and the plan seems to be practical, but no contract has been entered into on this matter as yet.

I might add that in connection with the tractor proposition we have arranged for the sale of a gang plow through the regular dealers at a price lower than these plows are quoted for retail purposes.

The State has in its employ an agricultural expert, who is endeavoring to boost production in every way possible and keep watch as to conditions generally throughout the State, in order that the board may be of service in every way possible.

This, in brief, is the situation in Michigan to date.

The letter is signed "War Preparedness Board, by Roy C. Vandercook, secretary."

Mr. DENISON. May I interrupt the gentleman there?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Since the State of Michigan is doing that for the farmers of Michigan, would the gentleman say, as his colleague said a while ago about the farmers of Indiana, that those farmers are in the position of beggars and mendicants?

Mr. MAPES. I agree with my colleague that the States of Illinois and Indiana are prosperous enough and able enough to take care of their own farmers, the same as the State of Michigan has done.

Mr. DENISON. How about the farmers of Michigan?

Mr. MAPES. I have read this letter to show that the people of Michigan are alive to their obligations in this war. They realize the need of increased production, and the State is doing what it can to assist the farmers along that line. What Michigan has done it is fair to assume that the Secretary of Agriculture can do with the funds provided in this bill for any locality which is in need of assistance. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if we limit this bill to wheat, oats, and barley, as proposed by the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER], we will fail in producing any great results, because the time for planting these three crops has almost passed even in the few States designed to be benefited by this bill. How much time will there be for planting wheat, oats, and barley after this bill can be passed and the machinery of it put into operation? April is already upon us, with all the machinery yet to be organized. Therefore, if the purpose of the bill is to increase the food grain supply of this Nation, then I propose by the amendment which I have offered to do that very thing by embracing corn, milo maize, feterita, and sorghum. All four of these grains are used for food. I notice that some gentlemen seem mystified when I mention milo maize, feterita, and sorghum. There are mills in my country to-day making flour out of milo maize—flour that makes good bread and that will be a valuable substitute for the wheat products of this country. You know what sorghum is. It is one of the food substitutes upon which we are now depending largely.

If the bill is confined merely to the proposition of wheat, oats, and barley, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yesterday afternoon made it plain to my mind that it will be of little benefit to the country, and for myself I intend to vote against this bill if it is confined to those three grains. I do not believe there is time yet remaining in which to plant wheat, oats, and barley that will produce anything during the crop year of 1918.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. I can say that in Indiana we can plant corn, and it will mature if planted up till the 15th of June.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado we can plant feterita, milo maize, and sorghum during the next four months and make a good crop.

In the State of Texas there are 144 counties, some of them big counties, that last year, because of an unprecedented drought, made practically no crops whatever. The drought situation has been extreme in that section of the country. It has been a terrible blow to the people, and the farmers have been moving out by the hundreds. There are farms that are as bare as this floor, and have been bare for more than 12 months, and that condition exists in a part of my district and practically in 144 counties of the State of Texas. And I want you to understand that under ordinary conditions some of this land is the finest and most productive in the world and will retrieve itself as sure as the sun shines, but aid just now will increase the acreage planted and the production of food supplies this year. Texas is nobly doing her part, for our legislature has provided for \$2,000,000 relief already.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MEEKER. That is good stuff to send out into our districts, where they are selling Texas farms.

Mr. BLANTON. Texas farms can take care of themselves. Texas farms are exceedingly valuable property in the country generally to-day, and they can not be hurt by the statement of my friend from Missouri, and I commend the people of his Missouri district upon their good judgment, if they are fortunate enough to be investing in Texas farms. All they need is rain, and the rain comes, usually. We have had a drought situation for a year or two, but the seasons will come back, and the farmers will come back, even farmers from Missouri. If this bill seeks to accomplish anything at all it must accomplish something in the way of producing crops that the farmers can plant and raise during the crop year of 1918. If it does not reach the crop situation of 1918 it is futile. I want to say

again that I hope these other four grains which I have mentioned—corn, Milo maize, sorghum, and feterita—may be embraced in the bill.

Mr. DENISON. What were those two products that the gentleman mentioned which he said are raised in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Milo maize and feterita.

Mr. DENISON. What is feterita?

Mr. BLANTON. It is very similar to Milo maize. It is both a splendid food and forage crop. I want to say that 90 per cent of the cattle of west Texas have been moved out of that State now and placed upon pasturage in other States. When they come back this fall they are going to depend largely upon Milo maize and feterita and sorghum, and if those feeds are not furnished they are going to have to feed some food substitutes to them to keep them alive. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan made two statements which were very conflicting. One statement was that this bill would take money out of the Treasury, and the inference was that it would never be returned. I asked him if he had read the bill, and he said he had, that he was familiar with it as a member of the committee. He finally made another statement that the money was simply loaned and to be returned later on. Of course, the last statement was correct. Now, if this money is simply to be loaned, which is the purpose of this bill, and to be returned later, there is no reason why all sections of the country that need seeds should not be benefited, the same as the particular section that raises spring wheat. For the past five years the section of the country from which I come has had four crop failures in some parts of it. A great many of the producers on the land there are tenants, and all the money that they have made from the one good crop has been required to pay off their indebtedness. I think they should be permitted to be benefited by this act, the same as the farmers in North Dakota and Montana and Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I have only two minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have some time, and I will yield to the gentleman half a minute. The urgent deficiency appropriation bill carries \$4,000,000 for the very purpose the gentleman is asking for. The Secretary of Agriculture can buy the seed and sell it. I understand you gentlemen out there have the money. You want the seed, and that is taken care of in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. WHEELER. The farmer can do that in the section of the country from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; they have not the money.

Mr. WHEELER. I stated that there are farmers and tenants in my district that can not afford to expend any money on seeds because they have not got the money. For four years they had absolute failure of crops. In other sections they have had good crops and the farmers are prosperous. The fact remains that there are a number of farmers and tenants who have had to take the proceeds of one crop to pay for the loss of the other four. Seed corn is selling from \$8 to \$10 a bushel, timothy from \$14 to \$16 a bushel, clover seed \$24, \$25, and up to \$27 a bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOOHER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolutions and bill of the following titles:

On March 27, 1918:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

On March 28, 1918:

H. R. 9867. An act 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

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that the time has been parceled out.

Mr. MONDELL. But I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent debate for the consideration of all amendments was to close in 40 minutes. The committee gave unanimous consent to that request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MONDELL. But I desire to offer an amendment and have it pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that there are two amendments pending at this time, and that at the conclusion of the 40 minutes' debate the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. MONDELL. But there will be no opportunity to debate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is powerless to extend the time under the circumstances. The committee agreed to 40 minutes discussion, the time to be equally divided by the Chair between gentlemen on the respective sides of the aisle.

Mr. MONDELL. Then there is no opportunity to offer and discuss an amendment under the present conditions?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer his amendment, but the Chair is bound by the unanimous consent.

Mr. MONDELL. Then I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment and have it read at the Clerk's desk for information. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "oats," insert the word "rye."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does all debate close on this section and all amendments thereto in 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is about one-half exhausted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under the agreement made, which, I regret to say, I did not hear, having been engaged elsewhere, no further amendments can be offered to the section?

The CHAIRMAN. At the expiration of 40 minutes no further discussion is in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Nor can any other amendments be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I hope the Chair will not hold to that.

Mr. HAUGEN. Amendments may be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair intended to say was that there could be no discussion on further amendments.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Amendments will be in order for the balance of the evening.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Debate having been limited to 40 minutes, those who have offered amendments are given the opportunity to speak during that period?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only state to the gentleman the unanimous-consent agreement, which was on the request of the gentleman from South Carolina, that all debate on the pending amendments and all other amendments pertaining to the commodities enumerated in line 18, page 3, should conclude in 40 minutes, the Chair to divide the time between the respective sides of the aisle.

Mr. MONDELL. Some of us were engaged in committee hearings and were not here when the agreement was reached, but desire to be heard on amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can readily see that the Chair is powerless to extend the time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was here yesterday and served notice that he intended to offer an amendment when the proper time came. If an arrangement can be made, I suggest that the gentleman ought to be permitted to offer an amendment and be heard upon it. I appreciate that the time for debate has been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee can extend the time by unanimous consent if it sees fit to do so, but at this time the Chair is bound to carry out the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes, and that the gentleman from Wyoming may be heard upon his amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. I suppose that that comes at the conclusion of the time already agreed upon.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the 40 minutes' time agreed upon for debate be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for eight minutes in order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may have five minutes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in view of the fact that other matters of great importance are to follow this, we ought not to extend the time in this way. I do not object to five minutes being given to the gentleman from Wyoming, but if half a dozen more are to ask for time I shall have to object to the time being extended beyond the five minutes asked for by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming having asked for time yesterday, and having served notice that he would offer the amendment to-day, I think he should be given the time now.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two minutes to discuss my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks to proceed for two minutes to discuss his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, let me put in a request for two minutes myself. I told him I wanted some time in this connection, and I find that I am not going to get it, but I want only two minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not spoken on this bill, and I want to speak on an amendment that affects my section of the country. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, personally I do not want to close out anyone. I have not spoken on this bill either, and I would like to speak, but I am willing to forego that in order to hurry that matter along.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, to settle the matter, I object.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WELLING. I would like to ask if the unanimous-consent agreement did not merely go to the amendments now pending and not to the final amendments to the entire section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asked unanimous consent that debate on all amendments pertaining to commodities enumerated in line 18 and all amendments thereto and all substitutes therefor should be closed within 40 minutes.

Mr. WELLING. And that other amendments to the section were in order and could be debated.

The CHAIRMAN. His request went only to the commodities enumerated in line 18.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair is absolutely right about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; because there is a disposition to ram this bill through, despite the fact that there are some other men in this House besides the friends of the farmer.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The point of order is made on a request that covers four minutes of time. I hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] will withdraw his objection and let the gentleman from Wyoming have his two minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman from Wyoming having two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have made the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I can get time, when I can be here. I am engaged in other matters.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I was out temporarily to get a little lunch. I am willing to aid the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Wyoming, both of whom are engaged on conference committees.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some time.

Mr. LEVER. Let me put the proposition. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended five minutes for the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, five minutes will not do me any good.

Mr. LEVER. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Very well, 10 minutes. How much time would the gentleman from Wyoming want?

Mr. MONDELL. Two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming, two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], and two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will enumerate the names as he has them. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 2 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] 2 minutes, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] 2 minutes, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC] 2 minutes—

Mr. LEVER. And the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] two minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Was there not an agreement a little while ago fixing the time for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That stands, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. This is additional time. How much does that make, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It makes 25 minutes.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Then I would ask the Chair to add three minutes for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER]. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 35 minutes, to include the names of the gentlemen the Chair has, and that at the expiration of that time debate upon this section and all amendments thereto shall close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the original time of 40 minutes be extended 35 minutes, that the gentlemen enumerated by the Chair be recognized for the time stated, and that at the expiration of the 35 minutes all debate on the section and all amendments thereto be closed. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Reserving the right to object, here we have had 35 minutes added to the debate, brought about by a Member of the House coming here and threatening to make the point of no quorum unless he has 10 minutes of time. There are Members who sit here day in and day out and who do not occupy the time of the House, while some of these other gentlemen do, and I am going to object unless the roll be called and get the Members over here and keep them here until we are through.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will not do that. We will make time the other way.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this important question was limited to two hours yesterday and it was impossible to give the time that was asked for, and I trust the gentleman from Texas will withdraw his objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is called for. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will withdraw it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum is withdrawn and also—

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I would like to ask the chairman if he can not get unanimous consent as to when he is going to have a vote on this bill?

Mr. LEVER. I prefer to exhaust debate under the unanimous consent arrangement which we made a while ago—40 minutes' debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. How many more sections are there to be considered under the five-minute rule?

Mr. LEVER. About five sections. We are on the first section, but I would say to the gentleman from Texas this is the important section of this bill and Members desire to discuss it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the chairman of the committee I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, asks unanimous consent that the original agreement of 40 minutes be extended 35 minutes and that the names of the gentleman as read out—

Mr. LEVER. I withdraw that request temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] for three minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting bill and important, more important for the legislation it suggests as a possibility for the future than what really it contains. It is a proposal to take money out of the Common Treasury and distribute it to the selective favorites in a certain area. It is a proposal to give money taken from the taxpayers in general to those producers who live in the spring-wheat area. Now, Mr. Chairman, if it is a good thing to tax the people who do not live in the spring-wheat area for the benefit of those fortunate sons of the soil who do live there, why would it not be wise to tax them for the benefit of the people who live in other sections of the country? There are other places that produce food besides the spring-wheat area. Louisiana produces sugar, which is of indisputable value as a food product; so does Texas. They ought to be recognized. Then it occurs to me while naming important food products that the peanuts of old Virginia and Texas and Georgia are a contribution to the food supply of this country. Peanuts—I would not advise them to be eaten raw, because there might be painful consequences, but roasted—are very good food, and I am told when crushed they yield an oil that is an excellent substitute for the Mediterranean olive oil. Mr. Chairman, the potato of California and Utah and Colorado ought by all means to be taken care of.

Mr. Chairman, this is put forward as a war measure, of course, for everything now put on us is denominated a war measure, but it has not been stated on whose authority, at least if it has I have not heard of it. But it is a class of legislation which will remind every gentleman in this House of a certain and by no means advanced age—because I am sure the Speaker is one who delighted in the book—it will remind everyone in this House who read Samuel Warren's great story of Ten Thousand a Year, in which that eminent parliamentarian Tittlebat Titmouse appears, of his famous bill offered on the first day of his parliamentary service, which no doubt you recall was to "give everybody everything." [Laughter.] There never was a more important and popular bill proposed in any legislative body, and if we desire to escape the annoyances of the distribution of the benefactions of this measure, if it contains any, we should adopt the parliamentary system of Tittlebat Titmouse and substitute for the bill his original suggestion, to give everybody everything. It simplifies the almsgiving of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the House yesterday witnessed a very remarkable scene. When we convened in the morning the first question that confronted us was whether we should dispense with Calendar Wednesday. The vote upon that question, I think, may be taken fairly as a guide of the temper of the House at that time. The vote was 299 to 47. The vote was a little over 6 to 1. Then what next transpired? The father of this House, with all of his fervor and eloquence, not of 82 years of age, but of 40 years, arose and spoke for 15 minutes, and at the end of that time we took a vote, and he won with those who were present and heard his argument. However, gentleman, he erected and demolished a man of straw. He pointed us to the pioneer, to his hardy virtues and the fact that his independence was as unyielding as the high trees of the forest which he felled, and he said that he would never have taken, as farmers were now soliciting, something from the Treasury as a gift. Now, gentlemen, that is not the important question at all; that is not the question that confronts this House. We know that we are saying to the farmers—and I am not criticizing anyone—but we are saying that we have fallen down upon our ship program, and we are only 28 per cent along in the creation of our tonnage, and that is the estimate of the gentleman who is in charge of the shipbuilding. We are saying to them we have not any machine guns or any cannon; that we are borrowing them from France. We are saying to them that the American Government has built only a handful of aeroplanes, when we were making the proud boast that we would turn out more aeroplanes than all Europe combined.

And we are saying to the farmers, "There is one class of production that has made good; there is one class of production which has been supplied; it is the food from the farm, and it is necessary not alone to supply our lines, but we have now upon the front 'over there' several hundred thousand men, and if we are to protect them we must feed them."

And how are we to feed them unless we increase our food supply? Why, the farmer is not coming to Congress; we are going to the farmer. We are saying to him out there where they have had failures of crops—and I limit it to this war time; I limit it to this area where they need this relief—we are saying to him, "You have had failures of crops, and we come to you and we want to supply you with the seed which you can not buy. We do not ask you to come to us and solicit this as a gift, but we furnish it to you, and we ask you to help increase this food supply that we sorely need."

Let us turn our eyes for a moment across the Atlantic and see what Great Britain has done in this crisis. Why, they have come over to the city of Detroit, and the Government of Great Britain has bought 6,000 tractors at \$750 apiece, \$4,500,000 of money. Who bought them? Did the farmers buy them? Oh, no. Who was it that was in charge of the correspondence? The premier, Lloyd-George, and his correspondence is to-day on file out there in Detroit. Why did he do it? He did it to increase the food supply of Great Britain, and he has thereby increased the food supply enormously.

What else has he done? They have undertaken to supply the farm labor, and thousands upon thousands of women are doing every kind of farm work except simply the holding of the plow and the pitching of the grain, and to-day as the result of the efforts of the Government of Great Britain the farmers of that country are producing more than they ever produced before in that country's history.

That is a sample of what a country can do and what a country is doing in a time of stress such as this. The tractor is an iron horse which never tires. [Applause.]

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the demand for this legislation is predicated upon the ground that Federal aid is necessary in order to increase the production of certain important food crops. If that contention is correct and it is necessary, why, then, in my judgment, the scope of the bill should be enlarged and broadened so as not to be confined to only a few of the important items of food. Wheat, barley, and oats—especially wheat—are important items, so far as the production of food crops are concerned; but, as you all well know, corn is equally important, and it has as great a place in the list of food crops as any other crop, and why it should be cut out and not taken into consideration in this legislation I can not understand.

It is practically too late to accomplish anything by making appropriations for seed wheat. We all know that.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. My time is limited and I ask the gentleman to excuse me.

We can, however, aid materially in the production and enlargement of the corn crop. In my section of the country, owing to early frost last year, practically all the corn was so severely damaged that it is worthless for seed. I do not say our people are in distress, as they were when the Congress came graciously to our support on account of the 1916 flood, but I do think that help there could wisely be given, so far as the purchase of seed corn is concerned; and if it is the intention of this bill to increase the production of food crops and promote the general welfare, then I know that corn can be included, and profitably so.

If corn is included, and the section of the country in which I live and which I have the honor to represent becomes the beneficiary of this legislation, there will be no risk taken, and I will say that they can give good security, and none of the money will be lost, and the food crops of the country will be materially increased.

Mr. GORDON. You need not give any security. This bill does not require any.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We sometimes can do more than we are asked to do.

If this bill is to become a law, corn should be included and the Secretary of Agriculture given full authority to apply the appropriation in such manner as to bring the greatest good to the entire country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the corn amendment. [Laughter.] I am opposed to this bill on principle unless it includes seed corn [laughter], because it would be a sectional and an unfair bill if it omitted that great staple.

Mr. MADDEN. Why don't you put in corn juice? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, well; you can get plenty of that in Chicago without additional legislation, and besides such an amendment would not do anybody in Kentucky any good, as we are going to quit dealing in the stuff down there pretty soon. Mr. Chairman, when I remember all that King Corn has done for the world, the hunger it has satiated, the thirsts it has quenched, and the drooping spirits of the weary that it has revived, I can not refrain from raising my voice in protest against the discrimination embodied in this bill as it now stands. [Laughter.] I think the bill as introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] was a much better bill than this, not only because it was broader in its application but—

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the bill could stand after what he has said about it? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think it will stand if you leave corn out of it. [Laughter.] As I was proceeding to say when interrupted by the gentleman from Chicago, the original bill was better than this committee bill, not only because it was broader in its scope but likewise because it carried an appropriation large enough to be of real and substantial benefit to the farmers of the country. [Applause.] I am a bit surprised at my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] who was dubbed in the debate yesterday by a partial friend of his as "The Little Giant from the South," in which I heartily concur, for bringing in such a sectional, discriminatory measure as this; and I believe if the spirits of the departed were permitted to come back and speak to us, that Thomas Jefferson's saintly voice would ring out in this chamber with the exclamation, "Oh, Asbury, Asbury, my dear boy, what on earth are you trying to do? Have you forgotten the admonition I left for the guidance of Democracy—'Equal rights for all and exclusive privileges to none.'" [Laughter and applause.] So, Mr. Chairman, in these nonpartisan days, I feel warranted in giving as an additional ground for opposing this bill without the corn amendment, my desire to preserve the traditions of the old Democracy. This "Little Giant from the South" made yesterday a rather curious argument which convinced me that he was trying to find some excuse for bolstering up his sectional bill, and that he is not really heart and soul for the measure which he is managing. His argument was that seed corn should not be included in the bill, and that preference should be given to wheat, because our allies are not accustomed to eating corn bread. May I not be pardoned, gentlemen of the Congress, for saying, "with malice toward none and charity for all," that inasmuch as we are eating corn bread all the time here our allies ought at least to be willing to go us fifty-fifty and eat corn bread half the time, particularly since we are sending it to them. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. If we have to eat corn bread, ought we not to be permitted to get our seed supply to plant the necessary corn?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly; and that is the main reason why I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman take the position that corn bread is not the best bread on earth?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly not. The gentleman knows that I have quite the contrary view, and that I was born and brought up on a farm and raised on corn bread, and that Kentuckians and Missourians never forget their "raisin'." But I was trying to combat the argument of the gentleman from South Carolina that we ought to discriminate against corn and in favor of wheat because the English and French, as he alleged, are not accustomed to eating corn bread. Why, Mr. Chairman, back in the days of the Civil War the boys from the North and the boys from Dixie frequently were unable to get anything as good as corn bread. "Hard-tack" was a luxury to them, and they were satisfied with it, and a good old Missouri or Kentucky cornodger would have been as tempting to them as a nugget of gold is to the avaricious in these days of commercialism.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman permit another question? Mr. LANGLEY. I am afraid that I shall lose more time than I can spare and finish what I want to say if I yield further, but I can not resist the appeal of my beloved friend from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman has had very wide and varied experiences in life. Has he at any time or any place on earth found any food better than a cornodger?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I never have. I think it produces the healthiest and best men on earth, and that is another reason why I am in favor of including seed corn in this bill. We need in these times of stress all of the strong and healthy men that we can produce, and to adopt the Bland amendment would, I think, mean more seed corn where it is needed and at a cheaper price, I trust, and that would mean in turn more corn and hence more cornodgers. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. You always got cornodgers without the Government furnishing seed to you, did you not?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; but that was in the old days when a different administration was in power. But this year we are short of seed corn, as has already been pointed out by myself and others. I do not intend by this to inject politics into this debate, because if there ever was a time when this should not be done it is now, when our boys are giving up their lives in the cause of liberty and when still more of the boys of the allies are giving up their lives, which, in the end, may mean a saving of untold numbers of American lives that might otherwise have to be sacrificed. No, Mr. Chairman, this is not a time to talk politics and we Republicans are not doing it, and I believe that when the impartial historian writes the history of our participation in this great war he will record an example of tolerance, patience, and patriotism on the part of the Republican Party, which is unprecedented in the political history of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for three and one-half minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] was making such an excellent speech a few minutes ago that I have concluded to yield to him all of my time, and I am very glad to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire first to resume what I was saying on the subject of tractors. To-day the great obstacle to the having of tractors is the fact that they cost so much money. The Caterpillar, which is the best tractor that can be bought, costs \$1,800. The Ford tractor costs \$750. I have been in communication with Mr. Ford, and I find that if his tractors were made on a large scale he could turn them out at the figure of \$350 apiece, and perhaps \$300 apiece. I refer to that simply as an illustration of what those people think who have been in the stress and fury of war for a longer period than we have; those who to-day are feeling the pinch of hunger; those who to-day are rationed; those who to-day can obtain but a quarter of a pound of butter per person per week for all purposes, cooking and the table alike; those who if they leave their homes and go to a hotel and have a dinner are obliged to have their ration cards detached to show that they have had so much food to eat. What have they said about this? Have they said, "Why, this will increase populism, this will lead to raids upon the Treasury"? Have they said that this will lead to everyone wanting everything, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas says? Why, no; on the contrary, it has led to a concerted effort on the part of the Government to improve the condition of its farmers, to enable them to produce more. For their own benefit? No; in order to add to the food supply of the Nation. And so, if the Chair will allow me to conclude as I began, this is not the farmer coming to the Treasury, hungry to raid it, anxious to get something for nothing, anxious to obtain the seed without paying for it. This is a case of the Nation saying, "We have on the other side some two or three hundred thousand boys, and you can not export corn meal, you can not grind it when you get it there, you can not bake it there, for they do not know how to use it, and it will spoil on the way. We need white bread; we need an abundance of it." So the Government goes to those men and says, "Now, perhaps you have not the money to buy any seed. If you have not, here is the seed. Perhaps you would not use as much seed as you will if we will furnish it to you. Perhaps you would not plant as many acres as you will plant if you knew that you can get the seed from us and get it on the terms on which we are ready and willing to furnish it." So the Government says, "Increase your production, so that we may continue to succeed in the one thing in which we have succeeded so far, which is the sending of supplies abroad for the allies and for ourselves." For this purpose the Government with united voice urges these men to increase food production, to take this seed, to plant an increased acreage, so that in 1919, when we have, as we will have, a million and a half or 2,000,000 men at the front, they will be abundantly fed, and so that we shall not have to be rationed as the Englishmen and the Scotchmen and the Irishmen and the Frenchmen have to be to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the committee give me its attention while we see what is the exact situation.

Early this morning I offered an amendment to strike from this bill the provision for the purchase of oats and barley. I did that upon the theory that the one vital thing that was being sought in this bill is the increase in the production of wheat, because wheat bread is the war bread not only of this Nation but of all nations engaged in this great world conflict. I recognize, of course, that the increase in the supply of barley and oats is an important matter, but not so vitally important as is the increase in the supply of wheat.

Many gentlemen have come to me in a rather facetious way to inquire how it happens that the Committee on Agriculture reported a bill of this kind. I have been surprised at that inquiry, and yet not so greatly surprised either, because probably the membership of this House are not so intimately acquainted with the very serious situation as it affects the bread supply of this country and her allies as are the members of the Committee on Agriculture. It has been our duty to keep close track of that. I am voting for this bill on the theory that if we are going to hold our military lines in Europe intact it is absolutely necessary that we likewise hold intact and continuous the bread line from this country to our soldiers in Europe.

You say that this is a gamble. I admit that it is a gamble; but we are gambling seven and a half million dollars here, taken from all the people of the country, possibly to save the civilization of the world for all time to come, and I am willing to gamble the stake. [Applause.]

You say how can this little amount of wheat help the situation? We have got to send many million bushels of wheat across the ocean. We have got to keep the cities of Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore and industrial centers of this country from the reduced loaf or the increased price of the loaf. We have got to prevent the bread line in this country if it is possible to do it. I stand here to predict that we are not many months away from the bread card. Is this vital? I want Members in this committee who have been laughing about this bill to take it to their hearts. Suppose that the vital thing in the bread line was an additional 10,000,000 bushels of wheat and we did not have it, and the line is broken and your boys in France are without wheat bread—the boys of the allies struggling for your homes and firesides are without it—there is not a Member here who, feeling by his vote that he was responsible for that situation would not get down on his knees and pray God for forgiveness for his unwisdom. [Applause.] That is why I am supporting this bill.

The great leaders of this party come to me and jeeringly and laughingly say that in your hearts you are not for it. I deny it. I am for it, because I realize the tremendous importance of bread in this conflict. I realize that civilization itself is at stake in the great issue across the water. [Applause.] Therefore I am centering all of my energies to-day on the proposition of wheat. I have come here upon my own motion, after consultation with members of my committee, to strike out barley and oats, and when I have done that I am met by these facetious gentlemen, who are looking largely, I fear, to their own districts, with a proposition to load this bill down with seed corn and feterita and milo maize and confetti, and the devil knows what, in order to beat this bill. [Laughter and applause.] I want members of the committee to know where they are at in this business. I want them to vote my proposition up and to vote down the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana and every other proposition like it that would load the bill down and work to its ultimate defeat. Do not be deceived. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is the parliamentary situation, and what are the amendments that have been offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEVER: On page 3, line 18, after the word "wheat," strike out the comma and the following words: "oats and barley."

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 18, after the word "of" and before the word "wheat," insert the word "corn."

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not my amendment that I offered to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana come in?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not in order at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. My amendment was an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman's amendment is not in order. After the other amendments are disposed of the Chair will have the gentleman's amendment again read.

Mr. BLANTON. But my amendment is the only amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. It is not an amendment in the second degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will remember that his amendment was read for information only.

Mr. BLANTON. I offered it and spoke to it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair expressly stated to the gentleman at that time that in the opinion of the Chair it was not in order, but on request of the gentleman from Texas it would be read purely for information of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. At what stage of the proceedings, Mr. Chairman, will it be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not answer that question at this time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, to add the word "corn." That is the first amendment offered, and then the gentleman from South Carolina offered a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman from South Carolina offered his amendment first.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And now the gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment to strike out certain language?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I offer a substitute to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers a substitute.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As I understand, the gentleman from South Carolina moves to strike out the words "oats and barley."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Now, I offer a substitute to strike out the words "wheat, oats, and barley" and the word "for," and then, after the word "seed," strike out "purposes," so that the bill will read "for the purchase of seed or when necessary to procure such seed," and so forth.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order against that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute to the Lever amendment: Page 3, line 18, strike out the words "wheat, oats, and barley for," and after the word "seed" strike out the word "purposes," so that the line will read "for the purchase of seed."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me one moment. I reserve a point of order while I make a parliamentary inquiry. As I understood it, the situation is this: I offered an amendment to strike out certain language in the bill. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLANTON] offered an amendment to that to insert the word "corn" after a certain word in the bill. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] now offers his proposition as a substitute for my proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a vote.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLANTON] offers an amendment to perfect the text, to add the word "corn." I now wish to direct special inquiry as to why that amendment is not amendable by the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to further perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 18, after the words "wheat, oats, and barley," add "corn, maize, sorghum, and feterita."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer that to perfect the text.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were—ayes 23, noes 76.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLAND) there were—ayes 70, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Page 4, line 11, after the word "Immediately," insert the following:

"Provided, That after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful during the continuance of the existing war for any person, firm, or corporation in the United States to use any corn, wheat, barley, oats, rice, or any other grain or foodstuff in the manufacture by distillation, brewing, or otherwise of any intoxicating, spirituous, or malt liquors, and any person, firm, or corporation violating this provision shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not less than six months nor more than three years, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I think would come in ahead of that.

Mr. HOWARD. So have I.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Then I desire to discuss the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think probably we can arrange this matter all right. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto may close in 20 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Reserving the right to object, I want to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. I have a substitute for the entire section that I want to offer at the proper time, and out of this conglomerate mass I am endeavoring to find when that time is. The gentleman from South Carolina has asked that all debate on this section close in 20 minutes. I want to offer an amendment to strike out and insert, and I want to know whether the 20 minutes would cover debate on that.

Mr. LEVER. It would.

Mr. HOWARD. Then, Mr. Chairman, while I do not like to object, but unless—

Mr. LEVER. Before the gentleman commits a crime against his friend, let us see if we can not get this settled.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's proposition is subject to a point of order, and I am trying to get him five minutes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Did not the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] make the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. He did.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Then is it not the duty of the Chair to rule upon the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but if the gentleman from Florida insists upon it, the Chair will hear him on the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, certainly I want to be heard on the point of order. I submit to the Chair that the amendment I have offered is in order on this bill. This is a bill dealing with grain or grain seed. We are proposing by this legislation to loan farmers money with which to buy seed to plant and raise food products.

Now, it seems to me, it is certainly competent to amend the bill in any way which provides for conserving these food products, or which provides for their disposition. Mr. Chairman, I shall never appeal to the gentleman from Georgia to deliver me a lecture on lucidity. The gentleman is so extraordinarily lucid—

Mr. HOWARD. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman's amendment, and I am trying to help my good friend.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For which I am duly grateful, Mr. Chairman. I was stating, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill providing for the loan of Government funds to certain people, in order that they may buy seed from which to raise certain food products. I insist that it is perfectly competent for this committee to limit the use of those products. There is no question about that.

The very highest purpose of this legislation is the conservation of food products. Why the necessity of going to this extraordinary procedure—and it is extraordinary—it is beyond any of the ideas of government that we have ever had, and only justifiable on account of the extraordinary conditions prevailing, and that it is so important as to justify us in taking this departure—we certainly have the right to see that the money is expended in the right direction and that the food products raised from it are put in the proper channels for use. My amendment goes to the effect of seeing that none of these grains, none of these products, shall be hereafter used in the manufacture of intoxicating spirituous or malt liquors. There is a demand from all over the country for this legislation during the war. Here we are being cut down to a pound and a half of flour a week for each individual, and yet millions of dollars of foodstuffs are being rotted in the distilleries and breweries of this country with which to manufacture intoxicating liquors which are not needed. Gentlemen talk about their proclivities for prohibition. Everyone upon this floor, unless he comes from one of the great cities, will go back home and howl upon the stump about how he stood for prohibition of the liquor traffic. Here is the test. Here we have got the chance, Mr. Chairman, to put this House upon record in favor of this beneficent legislation, and yet a point of order is made. I hope gentlemen will withdraw it and let this House vote upon it. It is not subject to the point of order for the reasons I have outlined; but even if it is, if gentlemen mean what they say when they talk to their constituents, these points of order will not be made and the American Congress will have the right and be given the privilege of going upon record on this great question.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. I agree entirely with what the gentleman from Florida says about the waste of food products in grain, but the President has authority to stop that now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think he has.

Mr. REAVIS. And he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but I am not the President. [Laughter.] This House has its own duty to perform, and I say it is cowardly to "pass the buck" to the President. [Applause.] We have here an opportunity to do it, and we ought to have the manhood to do it, and not have men coming from prohibition States get up here and say "the President has got the power."

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We can not escape our responsibility by any sort of camouflage. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DYER. Did not the gentleman himself and most all of us vote to give that authority to the President?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What is that?

Mr. DYER. Did not the gentleman vote to give that authority to the President at the request of the President?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know about the request, but I think likely I voted for it, for I voted for everything in this House and everywhere else that will effect the purpose of prohibition.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. Did not this House forbid the use of grain for such purposes at the request of the President, that being stricken out in the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not recall that the President ever made any request. I do not think the President has ever requested this House to do anything except within his legitimate sphere—

Mr. DYER. Did not he write a letter to the Anti-Saloon League asking them to withdraw opposition—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. The President wrote a letter to certain members of the Anti-Saloon League asking them to withdraw their objection to the authority being placed in the bill instead of making it prohibitory.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Has the gentleman got that letter? Has he ever read it?

Mr. DYER. Yes; I have seen it.

Mr. REAVIS. Published in the Bulletin June 30, last year.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman's amendment also, as I understand it, since we put corn in this bill, would prevent these fellows from taking the grain that is included in this bill, after getting it from the Government, and making liquor out of it, as a lot would do.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It would prevent them from making liquor out of any sort of grain after this act is passed.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order. We desire to make some time this afternoon. The gentleman was discussing it very ably, I will say, until he was diverted. I want to say that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion [laughter]—it is awfully ludicrous that a man on this floor ever should conclude, I will admit. There are a great many of you that never conclude. As my young friend from Texas said the other day, there are a few Members in this House who never get through, and I apprehend that it is calculated to stir the risibilities of many gentlemen of that class upon this floor to hear a Member say he is about to voluntarily conclude. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not yield. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman: The sole purpose of this legislation, the underlying fundamental object of it, is to conserve the foodstuffs of the land for the benefit of the Army and the Navy and the people at large. We are taking this extraordinary step in order to accomplish that purpose. Here is a place where the greatest conservation possible can be reached, and therefore it is entirely in order to offer any amendment which looks to the conservation or preservation of the foodstuffs of the country and their being sent into the proper channels, namely, to feed the Army and the Navy and to feed the people of the country. I insist, therefore, that it is entirely in order. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, no man can foretell how long this war will last. We may have differed, as we had the right to differ, regarding the duty of America as to entering the war; we may have differed, as we had the right to differ, touching the manner in which we were to raise our armies; but those questions having been settled in a legal way by the votes of a majority of the representatives of the people, it then became the solemn duty of every loyal American citizen to consecrate his all to the defense of his country's flag and all for which it stands. We are in this world-wide struggle between the legions of autocracy and the forces of democracy, and our boys are standing shoulder to shoulder on the fields of France with those who are fighting and dying to "make the world safe for democracy." At this very hour the very flower of Pershing's glorious Army is following "Old Glory" into the jaws of death. We have appropriated and are spending billions of dollars, and we shall appropriate and spend many more billions before the awful slaughter shall come to an end. We have given hundreds of thousands of the best and the bravest of America's young manhood, and before the dawn of peace millions of them will have faced the bullets of the Hun in this struggle for the survival of self-government among men. These young men have responded to the call of country as the sons of this Republic have ever responded when the integrity of our institutions has been assailed or threatened, and when the smoke of battle shall have cleared from the bloodstained fields of Armageddon the starry emblem of this Union will float in triumph over America's victorious and unconquerable soldiery.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are facing in mortal combat the most powerful, cunning, and unscrupulous military people in all the world, and our Army is a long distance from its base of supplies. Of necessity we must husband and conserve our resources. If we are to win this war, and we will win it, we must conserve with great diligence our food supply. Neither whisky nor beer is a necessity—neither one is food. Both are perfectly useless in times like these, if, indeed, either has ever served a useful purpose in the history of the world. And yet, Mr. Chairman, we are allowing the distillers of whisky and the brewers of beer in the United States to annually consume millions of dollars worth of grain in the distillation of whisky and the brewing of beer, which could be converted into food for our Army and the armies of our allies. If we now had the grain which went into whisky and beer during the past 12 months Congress would not now be called on to appropriate several millions of dollars with which to furnish our farmers with seed grain.

The good people of this country have decreed that intoxicating liquors must go. The handwriting is on the wall, and this is an opportunity for this House to respond to this great

popular demand. Why delay the inevitable? Why camouflage? In the interest of food conservation, in the interest of economy, in behalf of the morals of the land, in behalf of the good women of the country, in behalf of the "boys in the trenches," and for the honor and glory of the flag, I appeal to my colleagues to join me now in settling this question forever.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 3401. An act to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy; and

S. 3404. An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any naval or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months or who has been convicted of any offense punishable by confinement in the penitentiary by the civil authorities and prohibiting such officer's reappointment.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3400) to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. LODGE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, fortunately it is not necessary for me to explain my record on prohibition to my constituents. It is not necessary for me to camouflage on that issue. I am in favor of prohibition and have voted consistently for it in this House and elsewhere.

But there is a time for all things, Mr. Chairman, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is so clearly out of order that I can not help feeling, knowing him as I do, and esteeming his intellectual attainments as I do, that he knows his amendment has not a leg on which to stand. If the gentleman's amendment were a limitation on this bill it might possibly be in order, but when he undertakes to say that no grain shall be used for the purpose of manufacturing liquor he goes entirely outside the scope of this bill.

The object of this bill is very clear. It is to afford relief to the farmers in certain wheat-growing areas in order that the food supply of this Nation may be increased. I share the views of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the chairman of the committee, that the bill is entirely too important to be treated in a light fashion, and I made the point of order because I felt that the time for joking about this bill had passed, and that we should treat it in a serious manner. Therefore I make the point of order—as a Prohibitionist, if you please—because I do not want to see either the cause of prohibition or the cause of increased food production made a football for petty politics on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is not my amendment as a substitute for the present section in order? I have an amendment to perfect it.

Mr. HOWARD. In the meantime mine will be pending?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, can I send an amendment up to the desk to be read?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the Chair ruled on the point of order made by the gentleman from Colorado?

The CHAIRMAN. He has.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What was the ruling of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia has been recognized to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma announced that he had a preferential amendment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It is only preferential in respect to the submission of it to this body. No man holding an amendment to a section to be stricken out can take another Member off the floor. His amendment must be submitted before the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia, but the gentle-

man from Georgia has the floor, and has the right to speak in behalf of his motion to strike out.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to submit an amendment under the same conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. I want the gentlemen on the floor to hear this amendment. This is a serious amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Strike out all of the section, commencing at line 14, on page 3, down to and including line 11, on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated out of the moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$7,500,000, with which sum the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase field seeds and sell the same to farmers at actual cost for cash in such areas where he shall find such assistance in the procurement of said field seeds necessary."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment. It is not germane to this section.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I will go to the mat with the gentleman on this.

Mr. LEVER. Very well. The gentleman can proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair desires to hear from me, the distinguished and lovable chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], has made a point of order against my amendment on the ground that it was not germane.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see. The section for which that is proposed as a substitute is familiar to the Chair. The Chair is familiar with its contents. What does it propose? It proposes to get a specified class of seed, to wit, wheat, oats, and barley. It specifies that those seeds shall be confined to what is known as a particular area. He proposes in that section to establish a first lien in favor of the Government, I presume, upon the growing crop of the beneficiary of this seed fund. And the bill appropriates \$7,500,000.

Now, what does the substitute propose? It proposes to appropriate the same sum of money, but does away with the classification of the seeds into wheat, oats, and barley, and says "field seeds," taking in the propositions of the gentleman from Indiana and other gentlemen here who have offered amendments, some of which have been adopted and some of which have been rejected. It leaves out the classification of the seeds. The only other thing is that I eliminate the necessity for the lien, because of the fact that I propose that these farmers shall procure these seeds at actual cost for cash from the Government of the United States. If that is not germane, nothing could be germane, and I want some good veterinary surgeon to take me off and bore me for the hollow horn. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not a veterinary surgeon, but I am going to bore the gentleman for the hollow horn, all right. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, this substitute is so clearly not germane to this section that I hardly think it is necessary to argue the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLINTIC: Page 3, line 18, after the word "purposes," insert "and such other seeds as are necessary to produce wheat substitutes, the same to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida: Page 4, line 11, after the word "immediately," insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no farmer shall receive the benefits of this act unless he shall enter into a written agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture that he will not sell or furnish any of the grain raised from the seed acquired hereunder to any distillery or brewery to be used in the manufacture of any intoxicating, spirituous, or malt liquors."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Just for one word. I simply want to say that this is a clear limitation upon the expenditure of the money, and it is clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I send my amendment to the desk.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order that that comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has an amendment, which he has offered, and the Chair will be compelled to hold that the appeal comes too late. Of course the Chair has no objection to having his decision submitted to the judgment of the committee if the appeal comes at the right time. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEAGALL: Page 3, line 25, after the word "eighteen," strike out all down to and including the word "therefor," on page 4, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"No seed shall be furnished or supplied under the provisions of this act unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall first secure payment of the price of same by good and sufficient first lien on all seed so furnished or supplied and on all crops to be produced therefrom."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment temporarily. I should like to examine the amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] will agree, upon an examination of this amendment, that his point of order is not good. I am seeking in good faith to do what it is manifest the committee intended to do in the preparation of this bill. The language of the act as it now reads with reference to the subject of securing a lien is as follows:

A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor.

You will observe that under this language the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to consider a lien on the crop sufficient, but there is nothing in the language of the bill which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to take a lien on the crop to be grown from the seed furnished. My amendment specifically requires the Secretary of Agriculture to take such a lien on the crop to be grown from all seed furnished, and in addition to that, requires him to take a lien on the seed furnished for making the crop.

We are doing an unusual thing here. If this bill passes we are going a long way in the effort to relieve the peculiar conditions that have been outlined as creating a necessity for this measure. Certainly we ought not to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to take this money and loan it here and there and yonder and everywhere without any sort of security. Under the bill, as originally drawn, that is what he is authorized to do. The amendment simply requires that he take a lien on the crop and on the seed. Then if anybody undertakes to buy seed or obtain them and then dispose of them to somebody else for cash, not using them for the purpose intended, he can not get by with his transaction; and when the harvest is ready the Secretary of Agriculture will have a valid first lien on the crop to be grown. Certainly nobody ought to object to that. [Applause.] It simply requires common honesty on the part of those who are to receive this special favor from the Government, and no man worthy of such assistance would object.

I offer this amendment in all seriousness. I do not know that I am going to vote for this bill. I think I may do so. I hope to see it amended in one other particular that we will get to further on. I refer to the power given to the Secretary of Agriculture to mobilize labor.

In the section of the country where I live it would be fraught with danger to begin at this season of the year to talk to our labor about excursions on the railroads to some other parts of the country. If you even mention such a thing, you will have many a vacant farm down in that section of the country where I live. Those of you who have ever seen a negro excursion will appreciate how this matter of free transportation will appeal to the farm laborers in my section, and the Secretary of Agriculture will not have to go and offer it. If we authorize it by law, every one of them will hear of it. If it is suggested to them, I venture to say that about the only thing that will hold the negroes in our section of the country will be to mature an early crop of watermelons. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I was engaged when the gentleman was making his statement as to his amendment. Will the gentleman explain how his proposition differs from that in the bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. The language of the bill is:

A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor.

There is nothing in the bill which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to take such security. My amendment cures that by specifically requiring that he take a lien on all crops to be grown and on the seed also; otherwise those to whom seed are furnished could dispose of them before planting and defraud the Government. [Applause.] I will say to the gentleman earnestly that the amendment ought to be put in this bill. There ought also to be a further amendment to the criminal provision to make it conform to the idea embodied in this amendment. Provision should be made to punish any man who fraudulently disposes of his crop to defeat the claim of the Government or who obtains seed with fraudulent intent and who fraudulently disposes of it in disregard of the claim of the Government and the purpose of this act.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. I agree to the absolute wisdom of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], and if this bill passes and the wisdom of this House decides that the Government of the United States ought to take a lien on the farmer's growing crop, to the exclusion of all other liens, to satisfy this great Government in this hullabaloo to increase the production of grain, I want to call your attention to one thing that you will do—and you need not think you are going to throw the horns and hoofs and retain the carcass for political buncombe to the farmer again, because you are not fooling him at all. What do you do? You do the farmers that are so destitute that they need this aid the most harm that you could do them; because the minute the farmer puts a first lien on his crop there is no man within the sound of my voice who does not know that he destroys absolutely his credit with everybody else in the community, so far as that growing crop is concerned. [Applause.] What do you do?

Here comes the poor destitute farmer out in Montana to the great Government of the United States and says, "I want 8 bushels of wheat." Uncle Sam says, "Yes; our boys over yonder," as my distinguished friend from South Carolina so patriotically spoke of a while ago, "need wheat; we want to keep the bread line up"; and the farmer says, "I want to help you, Uncle Sam, keep the bread line up." This great Government says, "You can get 8 bushels of wheat, worth \$18.60, but come here, Mr. Farmer, and sign away your birthright, let your wife and children suffer for groceries and supplies, let the guano man refuse to sell you a spoonful of guano, let the implement man leave you destitute of farm implements to cultivate your crop, but sign this paper. You have destroyed your credit." Ah, gentlemen, you are trifling with patriotic men who are bending every energy at this hour to increase the production of food and meet the exigencies of this great Nation, and, sir, if you give them real businesslike help they will all be found in the first-line trenches of production.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman be good enough to wait a minute? Here you are attempting a political trick for the aggrandizement of three or four political derelicts in this House. I know it, and you know it, and the gentleman from South Carolina knows it. He has camouflaged, barraged, and talked patriotism here all the evening, and all day yesterday, and tried to ram down the throats of this House a bill that no gentleman in this House can go home to the farmers in his district and look them in the face and tell them that he has not been a cringing hypocrite. [Laughter and applause.]

One word further, and I will have to talk fast. Let us see what you are doing. If you are going to do anything, do not make flesh of one and fowl of another. We have appropriated six and one-half million dollars since this war began under such terms and conditions that the Secretary of Agriculture can purchase seeds for the Government at the actual cost and sell them to the farmers at the actual cost. He has done that. He has on hand at this minute unexpended, twenty-nine hundred thousand dollars of that fund, and he has had no opportunity to use it because the farmers of this country that are worth a pinch of snuff can get all the seed they need in this manner or in the open market.

Mr. GORDON. How much credit of a man would be destroyed by a lien of \$18.60?

Mr. HOWARD. As much credit as a rabbit would have title to a permanent home. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, and as far as I am concerned and as far as

the committee with which I have consulted is concerned, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 3, line 15, after the word "the," strike out the word "crop" and insert in lieu thereof the word "crops"; and after the word "eighteen" insert the words "nineteen hundred and nineteen"; and in line 25, after the word "eighteen," insert the words "and nineteen hundred and nineteen."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a few minutes on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma desires to be heard for five minutes on the point of order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that we should go on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clearly in order, and I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the Chair is ready to rule, unless the gentleman insists on being heard on the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to be heard, because I think it is in order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be unfair to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is one of my very good friends, and I hope the members of the committee will indulge me while I ask unanimous consent that he proceed for three minutes upon this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. That will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the members of the committee understand what this amendment is. I hoped that the committee would accept the amendment. On yesterday the House amended the bill by striking out the words "spring wheat area," and made it applicable to all wheat sections of the country. By this the House indicated that it wanted to make this bill applicable to winter wheat areas as well as to spring wheat areas. But there is another provision which restricts aid extended to crops of 1918. Is the winter wheat crop sown during the fall of 1918 a crop of 1918? If not, then, under the bill as it now stands, no aid could be extended for wheat sowing this fall. My amendment is designed to make it clear that aid may be extended to those who sow wheat this fall, which I assume would be the crop of 1919. My amendment simply adds the words "1919"; that is, it provides the money appropriated may be used by the Secretary for crops of 1918 and crops of 1919. You gentlemen who have voted as to the point of order, I submit that this amendment of mine is in order. It simply makes the fund available for the use of the 1919 crop as well as the 1918 crop, and we have already amended the bill so as to make it apply to the wheat area generally and not simply to the spring wheat area.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORGAN) there were—ayes 11, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HUTCHINSON: Page 4, line 8, after the word "banks," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate of interest not to exceed 6 per cent per annum."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that, that it is not germane.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why it is not germane. If the Chair has any doubt about it being germane, I would like to be heard.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as I understand it, is for the benefit of the farmer, absolutely. The bill is made general to apply all over the United States. Some of our States are charging 4 per cent, some 6, and some 8 or 10 per cent, and this makes it uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 3, line 18, after the word "wheat," insert the words "kafir corn, milo, maize, and feterita."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that we have already voted upon that amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, no; that was not voted upon in the parliamentary situation. It was ruled out of order.

Mr. LEVER. Then I make the point of order against it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that under a unanimous-consent agreement debate was closed on all amendments pertaining to commodities mentioned in line 18 at the end of 40 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair is entirely right about that.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman reserve the point of order for two minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for two minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is entirely in order, because it adds other items to the particular class set out. If there be any merit to the contention that this bill is intended to increase our food supply, these articles should be added to further increase that supply. The three articles I put in are useful not only for feed but also for food. For many years these three articles have been used for the purpose of feed, and during the last two or three years they have begun to grind them into a food, each of the three different articles having been used as substitutes or partial substitutes for flour.

Several mills in our section of the country use two of these different articles in the manufacture of different brands of flour, and for that reason they are beneficial under the caption of the bill as originally drawn, and they are also in perfect alignment with the general purposes of the bill. Now, there are some sections in the Southwest where wheat has been an entire failure. We have mostly fall wheat there. We must have spring crops. The only chance to have crops raised on that particular ground is to have the spring crops, and those three articles are spring crops exclusively, and they will be used upon the same ground that was last year planted in wheat. That is in addition to the regular ground that was reserved for this character of crops.

I intend to support this bill strictly as a war measure. In normal times such situations would be handled through State action. And I am proud to state that Texas has appropriated \$2,000,000 to assist in taking care of the local situation.

But we are not living in normal times, and every nation is finding it necessary to take many unusual steps to promote production. England has bought hundreds of tractors and turned them over to the farmers. The President has urged that this legislation be adopted in the hope that it will increase the food supply. All are agreed that food is essential to the winning of the war. When our brave soldiers by the thousand are fighting our battles in foreign fields, we must see that they are supplied regardless of what sacrifice it may involve.

I take this opportunity to say that, probably through an error of the stenographer or printer, paragraph 6 in my speech on the food bill was erroneously inserted, and which attributes to me remarks which I did not make. On discovery of the mistake I secured consent to eliminate the paragraph, but I make this statement so that the permanent Record may show the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I ask the privilege of revising and extending my remarks.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to talk on the bill; I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask our friend to let us dispose of this proposition, and then I have no objection. I call for a vote. I withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 4 to 6, strike out, on page 4, in lines 4, 5, and 6, the following sentence: "The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall be in such amounts as may be determined to be sufficient and proper in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, and I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request, with the permission of the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in 30 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to have 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 2 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When does that come in?

Mr. LEVER. When the gentleman from California has finished with his five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to have 10 minutes of that time, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] 5 minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 2 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] 5 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina 5 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] shall have three minutes in which to present an amendment—I have that much time—and that the time be extended that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RAGSDALE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina rise?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does the time ever arrive in this House when anything can be done by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Then what is it, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman any request to make?

Mr. RAGSDALE. I rose to address the Chair to ask of this body unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] might have one minute in which to answer an interrogatory that I wanted to propound to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] may have one minute more in which to answer an interrogatory that the gentleman from South Carolina wishes to propound. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The purpose of this bill seems to be, as I understand it, to advance money where it will be the greatest risk to the Government. Does not the gentleman think it would lessen that risk to lend it to the farmers, who have something and who can produce something?

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman is absolutely and eminently correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I come from a city where the people are employed, and where they are using farm products in quantities not so large as they have used them heretofore, because of the limitation upon supplies and the demands of the allies. The people whom I have the honor to represent are paying the highest prices they ever paid for food supplies, and while they sympathize with the farmer, as I do, in all his fair contentions, some of them complain about the tremendous increase in the cost of living and about concessions being constantly made to farmers which they do not themselves enjoy.

I do not mention this in a sectional spirit at all, nor as attempting to draw a line between the city and the country, but merely to bring to the attention of our farmer friends in the House the fact that there are other people in the United States who are "doing their bit" and bearing their share of the

burdens of this war besides the farmers. While they are stinting themselves their boys are at the front, and they are maintaining the families that those boys have left behind. They are employed, it is true, but they must earn a wage, and earn it every day, in order to pay for such farm produce as is absolutely necessary for their sustenance.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman objects, I take it, to the purchase of seed for farmers or aiding them in that way?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not objecting to it if the farmer will pay for his seed. I am objecting to the proposition that we shall treat as paupers the farmers of this land, and bid for those who have nothing to come forward and take from those who have something. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Another question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let the gentleman hasten. It takes my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does the gentleman object to pauperizing the great industries of the country that are being financed to the tune of about \$5,500,000,000? [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all. The great industries are as beneficial to the farmer whom they protect to-day as they are to the man who lives within their own environment, and they must give security for their loans.

The city worker is fighting in the same or greater proportion than the man on the farm—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They fight 16 hours a day.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BAER. They are fighting in greater proportion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not yield. I want to say this: The man in the city is doing his part, and more than his part, in bearing the burdens of this war. He is not seeking exemption on the ground that he is producing on the farm. He is going forward, because he has no claim, as the farmer has, that he can remain on the farm to help the war by producing food for our allies and ourselves.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not now. I rose to make some comment on this bill, not to discuss sectional lines into which gentlemen are endeavoring to draw me. I am surprised that gentlemen on both sides of this House attribute this bill solely to patriotic purposes, or regard it as essential to the war. I regard this bill as largely political [applause], as coming from a few States which in this instance do not correctly represent the sentiments of the American people as a whole. I charge that this measure and the spirit behind it springs from the Nonpartisan League, an organization which has come to have one Representative in this House and expects—

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And which, I submit to my fellow Members here, is increasing its influence so rapidly as to terrorize certain hitherto free Representatives of the people in their own home districts, causing them to indulge these socialistic practices or get out of Congress.

Now I yield to my friend from North Dakota.

Mr. BAER. I am not going to get out of Congress. I have as much right here as the gentleman has.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not question that. The gentleman is the first Representative of the Nonpartisan League in Congress, and I think he has helped to put it over some other Members of Congress who have been here longer than he has been.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I compliment the gentleman from North Dakota, the sole Representative of the Nonpartisan League in this House, on the fact that the great and powerful Committee on Agriculture has adopted his argument and his speeches and has reported his views in its report.

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield now.

Mr. BAER. I want to tell you one thing.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman consent to my inserting in the Record certain facts about the Nonpartisan League?

Mr. BAER. You can insert anything you please.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert certain data about the Nonpartisan League. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert in his remarks certain facts about the Nonpartisan League. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, at this point, and because the House should have the information promptly, I insert a transcript of the testimony of the president of this new organization, which carries its propaganda into certain congressional districts, as reported by the Fargo Forum, February 16. It is a story of political high finance in rural communities well worth reading:

[From the Fargo Forum, Feb. 16, 1918.]

COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY BY TOWNLEY BEFORE BANKRUPTCY REFEREE—MANY FEATURES OF THE LEAGUE'S FINANCES GIVEN UNDER OATH BY TOWNLEY—REMARKABLE STORY OF HOW THE VARIOUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISES, IN WHICH HE OWNS BUT \$100 WORTH OF STOCK, ARE CONTROLLED BY HIM, RELATED BY PRESIDENT—ADmits DICTATORSHIP OF THE CHAIN-STORE SYSTEM, AFTER PLEADING IGNORANCE OF ITS FORM OF ORGANIZATION—SYSTEM OF HANDLING FUNDS MOST INTERESTING.

The Forum to-day presents the story of the National Nonpartisan League's affairs, as recited by President A. C. Townley at the hearing in Bismarck on January 29, before a referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. Townley is seeking absolution from his debts, which he places at over \$79,000, and against which he lists assets of less than \$500, all of which are claimed exempt. The bankruptcy proceedings grow out of Mr. Townley's flax-farming operations in McKenzie County, N. Dak. The proceedings, including the testimony given by Edwin Wood, who is listed as a half owner of the Nonpartisan publications, reveal with remarkable thoroughness the unique organization that Mr. Townley has constructed, as relates to its finances.

The testimony by Mr. Townley furnishes the most important document yet presented covering the affairs of the National Nonpartisan League, in which so many thousands of North Dakota people have a direct financial interest. A study of Mr. Townley's testimony, and the manner in which it was found necessary to question him on a number of important points, particularly the chain-store question, before he admitted holding financial dictatorship, will reveal many interesting features. The examination was conducted before Referee O'Hare by Attorney Francis J. Murphy, of Minot, N. Dak.

Direct examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. Mr. Townley, may I ask where you live, where your residence is?—A. My residence is in North Dakota; I am living in St. Paul.

Q. You claim, as I understand, your legal residence in North Dakota?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What part of North Dakota?—A. Fargo.

Q. But you are actually residing in the city of St. Paul, Minn?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you a married man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your wife's first name?—A. Margaret.

Q. May I ask if Mrs. Townley is at present in St. Paul?—A. She is not just now.

Q. Away temporarily?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. She expects to return?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want to direct your attention to some of the claims you have scheduled here, the claim of the International Harvester Co., Beach, N. Dak., in the sum of \$1,345, and another claim of the same concern, \$9,392, scheduled as secured claims. I will ask you whether you have ever paid those, or not?—A. I don't think I have.

Q. You know, don't you?—A. I think I haven't paid them, I am quite sure.

Q. Well, have you made any arrangements to take care of those claims?—A. Not outside of the present arrangement.

Q. By that, you mean these bankruptcy proceedings?—A. Yes.

Q. You have made no special arrangement with that creditor to take care of the claims?—A. No, sir.

Q. No agreement to take care of them or pay them in the future?—A. No, sir.

Q. And no payment has been made them prior to the commencement of these bankruptcy proceedings on these claims?—A. Not since 1912.

Q. Do you know whether within the four months preceding the bankruptcy any property was turned over to them on these chattel mortgages, or otherwise?—A. No property was turned over to them by me.

Q. Was any turned over in your behalf by any other person?—A. Not that I know of; there may have been some adjustment between creditors that I don't know anything about.

Q. Now, with reference to the creditors, Lowell brothers, the same situation obtains? Did you make any payments to them?—A. I haven't made any payments to anybody since 1912.

Q. None whatever to any of these creditors?—A. No.

Q. That covers all of them, so we won't have to go into them in detail?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Nor have you made any agreement to take care of them in the future, after the disposal of these bankruptcy proceedings?—A. No.

Q. Now, since 1914 your business has been that of president and manager of an organization known as the Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir; since the spring of 1915.

Q. Prior to that time you were engaged in business in farming operations?—A. Well, up to the fall of 1912. I didn't farm any after that year.

Q. What was your business between 1912 and 1915, when the organization of the Nonpartisan League was effected?—A. I worked for a land company a while.

Q. Where was that?—A. Illinois.

Q. That concern owe you any money?—A. Not that I know of. That is a land company that the Schusters belong to.

Q. And Adlers?—A. No; I don't think it is Adler & Schuster. He is associated indirectly with them, but I didn't work for Adler; I worked for Schuster.

Q. You had some farming operations in Colorado?—A. That was prior to 1912.

Q. Since 1915, when the Nonpartisan League was organized, you had been engaged in managing and in and about the affairs of that organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were the original originator of it, were you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you a member of it?—A. Not in the sense that I pay the membership fee I am not.

Q. You are not in that same sense that the ordinary members pays a membership fee?—A. That is correct.

Q. But you, as I understand it, are president of the organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The organization exists through several States?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Montana?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Idaho and Wisconsin?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And each one of these States has its distinct State organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the executive committee of the national organization is composed of yourself; your attorney, Mr. Lemke; and Mr. F. B. Wood?—A. That is correct.

Q. And these gentlemen are also members of the committee controlling each State organization?—A. No.

Q. Are there any committees controlling the State organizations?—A. Necessarily.

Q. Each State organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Each State organization have any representation on the national committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEMKE. I am willing to allow the utmost freedom, as far as the personal affairs of Mr. Townley are concerned, but I shall object to going into the affairs of the National Nonpartisan League, and I think Mr. Murphy will agree with me on that.

Mr. O'HARE. I look upon the question as simply preliminary.

Q. Well, let's get at it this way: You know Mr. Thomas Keyes?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Keyes is an employee of the National Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes.

Q. You employed him, did you not?—A. As a member of the committee, I did.

Q. As a matter of fact, you did the work of employing him yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, Mr. Keyes lives in St. Paul, does he not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is in addition to being treasurer of the National Nonpartisan League—or is it cashier, which?—A. Cashier.

Q. Is likewise treasurer of the League Exchange, isn't he?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is likewise treasurer or cashier of the Consumers' United Stores Co., isn't he?—A. I don't know as to that.

Q. Well, he is secretary-treasurer of the League Exchange, is he not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is treasurer of the United States Guaranty Co., is he not?—A. Perhaps; maybe; I am not sure of that.

Q. Well, if you would refresh your recollection on that point, I wish you would do so.—A. Well, I don't know.

Q. I have information that he is, but I would like to have it verified by you as a witness at this time; and he is also treasurer or cashier of the Consumers' United Stores Co., is he not?—A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know whether he is connected at all with that organization, or not?—A. I don't know; I think he may be.

Q. Don't you know, as a matter of fact, Mr. Townley, that he is an officer, or has practically the same connection with that concern, this Consumers' United States Co., that he has with the Nonpartisan League as treasurer or cashier or bookkeeper—the man who handles the details of the finances and books of that concern?—A. I wouldn't make that as a positive statement.

Q. Well, you are familiar with the affairs of that concern, are you not?—A. In a way.

Q. In what way?—A. In a superficial way, I know who the manager is.

Q. Who is he?—A. Mr. Brinton.

Q. Where is the office of that concern?—A. In the National Exchange Building, in St. Paul.

Q. Likewise the office of the United States Guaranty Co. is in the same building?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know Mr. J. J. Hastings?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Hastings is connected with the Scandinavian-American Bank at Fargo?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is also secretary of the United States Guaranty Co., is he not?—A. I think he may be; I think he manages the affairs of the Guaranty Co. in Fargo.

Q. Don't you know, as a matter of fact, that Mr. Keyes, as I have indicated, is cashier of the National Nonpartisan League, treasurer of the League Exchange, and cashier of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. Yes.

Q. And likewise cashier or treasurer of the Consumers' United Stores Co.?—A. I believe that he is.

Q. So that this employee of yours appears, then, to be connected in the capacity indicated in every one of these various organizations that I mention. That is a fact, isn't it?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, these organizations grew out of the Nonpartisan League, did they not? You understand I mean the League Exchange, the United States Guaranty Co., the Consumers' United Stores Co., the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., etc.?—A. Just what do you mean by "grew out of"?

Q. I mean they were organized by leaders of the Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. F. B. Wood, who is one of the members of the executive committee of the National Nonpartisan League is likewise president of the League Exchange?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you, Mr. Townley, are a director of the League Exchange?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the last hearing you overlooked that fact?—A. I had forgotten that I had any stock in it.

Q. That concern is capitalized at \$1,000,000?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was that incorporated?—A. North Dakota.

Q. What was the capitalization of the Consumers' United Stores Co.?—A. \$10,000.

Q. And that was organized and incorporated in North Dakota?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what was the capitalization of the United States Guaranty Co.?—A. A million dollars.

Q. Where was that incorporated?—A. Minnesota.

Q. Have you any stock in the Consumers' United Stores Co.?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any stock in the United States Guaranty Co.?—A. No, sir.

Q. Anybody carrying any for you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any understanding, directly or indirectly, with any person or persons that you are in the future to receive any stock or other interest in these concerns?—A. No, sir.

Q. None whatever?—A. No, sir.

Q. And that is true with respect to all these organizations?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And including the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. or Nonpartisan Leader?—A. The Nonpartisan Publishing Co.

Q. Before we go any further I want to clear up a point. Your testimony at the last hearing, as I recall it, with respect to the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., was that this concern was a copartnership?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Consisting of Mr. E. F. Wood and Mr. A. J. Fox?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that that concern owned the Nonpartisan Leader?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the Courier-News?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you not know as a matter of fact that the Courier-News is a corporation and that the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. does not own or hold any stock in that corporation?—A. The Nonpartisan Publishing Co. advanced the money to buy the stock.

Q. I am not asking you that.—A. I don't know that the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. does not own the stock.

Q. Don't you know that the sworn statements of the Courier-News on file in the capitol, in April, 1917, and in October, 1917, are to the effect that that concern is a corporation and shows the names of the holders of stock, over 1 per cent of the stock, and that the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. is not shown as either a stockholder or bondholder? Don't you know that to be a fact?—A. No; I don't know it to be a fact, though it may be a fact.

Q. So, when you testified the last time that the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. owned and controlled those two papers and that you were paid a hundred dollars a month for directing the policy of those papers, you were mistaken, weren't you?—A. If you are correct, I was.

Q. Who pays that \$100 a month?—A. I get it from the publishing company.

Q. From the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So you claim, as I understand you, that you don't know what the facts are with reference to that Courier-News?—A. Well, I don't know the details in the matter; I know in effect the publishing company owns the Courier-News.

Q. In effect they do?—A. Yes.

Q. And the fact is that despite the sworn statement made by that officer that back of it all lies a real ownership vested in these two men—Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox?—A. Yes.

Q. So that the sworn statement does not represent the true situation as it actually exists. Is that the fact?—A. Yes.

Q. You know as a matter of fact that Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox own that paper through their partnership?—A. I know as a matter of fact that the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. advanced the money to buy that paper, and that they do own the Courier-News stock. Any temporary arrangements I don't know about.

Q. Let us consider the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. for a moment, or let us start back further. The offices of the National Nonpartisan League are kept at St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is where your office is and where the office of Mr. Keyes, the cashier, is?—A. Yes.

Q. He is the cashier, isn't he?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He has an office right there adjoining you, in the same building?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the business affairs, the financial affairs, of the league, are conducted through that office down there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, in the Giffell Block?—A. Yes, sir; you are correct.

Q. And the books of the National Nonpartisan League are kept there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And, in fact, all of the books with reference to the affairs of the Nonpartisan League, national or otherwise, are kept there at St. Paul, and the financial operations are directed from there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And all the checks that are drawn are signed by yourself as president and Mr. Keyes as treasurer?—A. Treasurer or cashier.

Q. You sign them as president and he as cashier?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Wood and Mr. Lemke don't sign any checks?—A. Not for the expenditures of the league.

Q. Well, do they sign any league checks at all for any purpose?—A. No.

Q. The disbursements of the funds of the league, the actual disbursement of them, goes through your hands by checks?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the account of the league has always been and is now in the National Exchange Bank at St. Paul?—A. The account of the league?—A. Or the league's bank account?—A. The biggest part of it is there. It has not always been there.

Q. The biggest part is there now and has been for some months?—A. It is either there or there might have been part in some other bank; that is, in the hands of Mr. Keyes.

Q. The employee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Keyes would not check out any considerable amount of money out of the funds of the National Nonpartisan League without instructions from you, would he?—A. No.

Q. Now, as I understood your testimony the other time, the fee of a member of the league for the two-year period is \$16?—A. That is correct; that is common knowledge.

Q. That is, every man who joins the Nonpartisan League pays dues of \$16, and that covers a period of two years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That \$16 is paid in, of course, to the treasurer of the league, the National Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And is covered into the account of that league in whatever bank you may carry your funds?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is checked out in the manner you have just indicated, wherever it is supposed to go from the fund?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, of that \$16, as I understand you and I understand that is likewise a matter of common knowledge, \$5 goes to the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. Subscription to the Nonpartisan Leader, \$5 for the two years.

Q. And each member, when he enters into the league, subscribes for that paper, and agrees that \$5 should be turned over and receive the paper for two years. That only covers the Nonpartisan Leader?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It doesn't cover the Courier-News?—A. No.

Q. Now, could you tell us how much money the National Nonpartisan League has collected in that manner, approximately?

Mr. LEMKE. Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial to the subject matter under discussion.

Mr. MURPHY. I will show you how it is very material and very relevant.

Mr. LEMKE. It is not a question of how much money the league has; it is a question of how much money Mr. Townley.

Mr. O'HARE. He may answer, if he can.

Q. Let us have your answer as nearly as you can give it.—A. The Nonpartisan League has something around 150,000 members.

Q. It has about 150,000 members?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That means that there has been approximately \$750,000 turned over to this copartnership, consisting of Mr. Ed Wood and Mr. A. J. Fox?—A. No; it doesn't.

Q. Well, let's see; it means that five times a hundred and fifty thousand members, in dollars and cents—that is, \$5 for every one of the 150,000—has been turned over to the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. No; it doesn't mean that.

Q. Well, isn't the agreement that every one of these members subscribed for the Nonpartisan Leader, and that the subscription price is \$5 for the two-year period?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you collect \$16 it includes that \$5?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you have 150,000 members?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, would that not make \$750,000?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, why doesn't it mean that they received \$750,000?—A. Because they haven't received it.

Q. You haven't given it to them yet?—A. No.

Q. That, then, is given to them at your direction?—A. That money is turned over to the publishing company as the publishing company needs it for its business.

Q. By whom?—A. By the Nonpartisan League.

Q. And that is by you in the manner you have given here?—A. By me and by the treasurer or cashier, at the direction of the committee.

Q. That is, as I understand it, at intervals, whenever in the judgment of yourself and the members of the committee, consisting of Mr. Lemke and Mr. Wood and yourself, the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. should have a certain proportion of that money, you turn it over to them. Is that the fact?—A. That is the substance; yes, sir. I would state whenever the publishing company, in its business, has to meet its bills money enough is turned over to meet the bills.

Q. Well, does the publishing company then come to this committee and make a report as to the bills it has and request the money with which to pay them?—A. No; it doesn't make a report of the bills it has.

Q. Does it make any kind of a statement or showing to this committee for the purpose of obtaining money?—A. There is a very close association between the publishing company and the Nonpartisan League. The publishing company was organized to further the purposes of the Nonpartisan League.

Q. Who organized that company?—A. Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox.

Q. Mr. Wood is the son of F. B. Wood, of the Nonpartisan League executive committee and president of the League Exchange?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also an officer in these various other organizations?—A. Of the Guaranty Co., I think.

Q. And also officer of the United Stores Co?—A. I don't know as to that.

Q. And Mr. Fox, is he related to you in any way by marriage or otherwise?—A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Fox is a man of approximately 40 years of age?—A. I think he is about that old.

Q. Mr. Wood, who is present here, is considerably under that?—A. Yes, sir; he is a much younger man.

Q. Now, I will have to ask where Mr. Fox comes from, if you know?—A. He is a Minnesota man.

Q. What part of Minnesota?—A. Minneapolis.

Q. Mr. Fox is not a practical newspaper man?—A. No, sir. He is a practical organizer.

Q. And Mr. Wood is not a practical newspaper man?—A. Mr. Wood is a farmer.

Q. And a game warden?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But has had and so far as you know did not have at that time any publishing experience?—A. He has had about as much as I have had, which is none at all.

Q. And that was true of Fox?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, these two men, then, got together and formed a copartnership which they called the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., and some one agreed if they would publish this paper they were to have \$5 from every member?—A. The subscription price was to be \$5, and as much as was needed was to be turned over to run the paper.

Q. The subscription price was \$5, but they were only to get as much as was necessary of that \$5 to run the paper?—A. Well, let me state it to you. At the time the Nonpartisan Leader was started it wasn't very easy to get publishing concerns to publish the official organ of an organization that they didn't know anything about. The organization was very young, and we wanted an official organ to represent the organization and further its purposes. We made various efforts to use some standing publication as an official organ, and could not make any arrangements with them that was satisfactory who would serve the organization as we wanted it served. And so at the suggestion of legal advice Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox were asked to organize a copartnership for the purpose of publishing this paper.

Q. Who asked them?—A. I did.

Q. You had not known Mr. Wood or Mr. Fox very long up to that time?—A. Well, I had known Mr. Wood here for about a year and a half or two years, and been closely associated with him for about a year, and had known Mr. Fox for about a year.

Q. Did this organization commence about the same time as the Nonpartisan League commenced?—A. Now, this publishing company was not organized until the fall of 1915; the paper was not published during the summer.

Q. Then your arrangement with them is that this copartnership was to receive as much of the \$5 as was necessary to run the paper?—A. There has not been any definite arrangement or understanding with them to that effect.

Q. That is the understanding, if any?—A. The understanding is that they are to publish the paper.

Q. What was the understanding with reference to the financial end of it if they did publish the paper? That is what we are interested in. What money are they to receive from the league for publishing the paper?—A. If they would demand it, they could receive the whole \$5.

Q. But they haven't demanded it?—A. No. And, further, if there was any misfortune, if the paper should be sued for libel, and it would be necessary to raise the subscription to \$3 a year, that might be done to save the paper.

Q. Three dollars a year, to make it \$6?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If they libeled somebody, and they proved it, and they had to pay a big judgment, you would raise the subscription fee from \$5 to \$6?—A. If we thought it would be to our advantage to maintain that paper, you would come to the rescue?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And, out of the league funds, you would even go so far as to turn over \$3 a year?—A. Not out of the funds collected. Any time the subscription price would be raised the price would be taken out of the membership fees to be collected in the future; and it also might be reduced.

Q. So the relationship between this copartnership of Wood & Fox or Fox & Wood with the National Nonpartisan League is very intimate, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it is so intimate that it is pretty difficult to distinguish between the executive committee of the Nonpartisan League and this copartnership?—A. Yes, sir; quite so.

Q. Now, did you personally ever have any understanding with either Mr. Wood or Mr. Fox, or both of them, that you were to profit in the affairs of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. I have not.

Q. None of that kind?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you never have profited in any way?—A. No, sir.

Q. Never received a dollar aside from the \$100 a month that you stated they pay you for advising with them and dictating the editorial policy?—A. Correct.

Q. Not a dollar?—A. For my personal purposes.

Q. What do you mean by your personal purpose?—A. Purchasing of property for myself, or buying automobiles for myself, or furnishing myself with a vacation, or a big feed, or buying a farm, or something of that kind, or paying off my debts, or using it for my personal being.

Q. Did you ever receive from them aside from this \$100 a month any other sums for any purpose, from the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. I have used some of the money of the publishing company for political purposes.

Q. Quite a sum of it?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Where are the books of this concern kept? Do you know?—A. Of the publishing company?

Q. Yes.—A. St. Paul.

Q. Mr. Morris is the editor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is his full name?—A. Oliver C. Morris.

Q. Who is business manager?—A. Herbert Gaston.

Q. Mr. Gaston is likewise editor of the Courier-News?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The fact of the matter is, that neither Mr. Fox nor Mr. Wood has anything to do with running that paper?—A. Not directly; no.

Q. And they never have had?—A. Not directly.

Q. What do you mean by directly?—A. Well, they don't set any type.

Q. And don't write any editorials?—A. No.

Q. And don't collect any news?—A. No; they don't report for the paper.

Q. And don't solicit any advertising?—A. No.

Q. And don't sign any checks?—A. The work is all done by employees.

Q. These two gentlemen don't concern themselves with it at all?—A. No; not so long as it serves the purposes of the organization. It has to serve the organization.

Q. But the fact is they don't engage in the operation of that newspaper at all, or of the publishing company? Either Mr. Fox or Mr. Wood in any way? Let me put it this way—the checks drawn on account of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. are not signed by either Mr. Fox or Mr. Wood; they are signed by Mr. Keyes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same gentleman who signs the checks for the National Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You couldn't tell us approximately how much money has been turned over to this partnership, consisting of Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox?—A. No; I couldn't tell you.

Q. Do you know whether they are paid any salaries or anything of that sort for the services you have just described, that they perform with reference to this publishing company; or don't you know about it?—A. I think they draw a salary from the league as organizers. I don't think they draw a salary from the publishing company.

Q. Do you know whether either one of these gentlemen has drawn any money from the publishing company?—A. I wouldn't say whether they had or not.

Q. As a matter of fact, the finances of the publishing company are just as much under your domination and control as the finances of the National Nonpartisan League?—A. No.

Q. What difference is there?—A. Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox are in a position any time to dispense with my services, or the service of anybody in the employ of the publishing company, and Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox are not in a position to interfere with my work in connection with the National Nonpartisan League.

Q. That is the distinction?—A. Yes, sir. As long as my services in a very general way directing the work of the publishing company and the services of the men directly in charge of the publishing company, as long as their services are satisfactory to Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox, I presume they will continue the arrangement. When it is not they are in a position to make any other arrangements they see fit.

Q. They have the power to do that?—A. Yes.

Q. But they haven't exercised it?—A. No; we were very careful to see this publishing company was organized by men who believed in the work of this organization and wanted to forward it, wanted to do it, and would be fair and square and true to it. That, I presume, is the reason why Mr. Fox and Mr. Wood have never double-crossed us.

Q. By that you mean these men had a very great deal of confidence in your judgment?—A. I wouldn't want to say that. I will leave that to them.

Q. In any event, the fact remains that you, as the head of the National Nonpartisan League, control the financial affairs of this Nonpartisan Publishing Co., subject to the exercise of the power that rests in those men to stop you if they want to?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, the books of this concern, this Nonpartisan Publishing Co.—A. I might say in connection here, just as Mr. Thomas Keyes and myself handle the finances of the Nonpartisan League, subject to the power of the executive committee of the National Nonpartisan League, Mr. Lemke, Mr. Wood, and myself, that could be changed any time it wasn't handled properly.

Q. To suit them?—A. Yes.

Q. But they have never chosen to express their dissatisfaction, if they have any? So you and Mr. Keyes go right on drawing checks without consulting these men every time you draw one?—A. Well, I would like to explain that.

Q. Do you consult them?—A. No; certain men draw a stated salary, and when we draw a check to pay it we don't consult them. If we put a new man to work, or any big or unusual expenditure of funds we have, they were quite often consulted.

Q. Does this committee put it down in writing, or is it merely oral approval?—A. We have daily conferences, almost.

Q. Any record made of it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Nothing to show if the trustees here should want to go into the books of the concern and ascertain, as a matter of fact, a certain expenditure was authorized by Mr. Lemke, Mr. Wood, and yourself as the committee, we couldn't find any record of them?—A. Not formally authorized.

Q. Now, Mr. Lemke lives in Fargo?—A. Yes, sir; he lives in St. Paul, but his residence is in Fargo.

Q. The same as you are now; he has not been in St. Paul until recently?—A. Not until we moved our office down there, and then about all the time.

Q. That is how long?—A. Less than a year.

Q. And Mr. Wood is in charge of some other line of business?—A. He has a farm out at Deering.

Q. Well, he doesn't spend much time on that farm?—A. He superintends the work out on the farm.

Q. Mr. Wood spends most of his time in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't he engaged in some other business?—A. He is and has been for years interested in the work of the Equity organization.

Q. The Equity Exchange?—A. Yes, sir. He still continues his relations with that organization.

Q. And he actually has some active capacity there that occupies a good deal of his time? The live-stock end, isn't it?—A. I believe he is manager of the live stock and I believe he is a member of the board.

Q. He is vice president, isn't he?—A. I don't know.

Q. Well, it occupies a great deal of his time?—A. No; not a great deal.

Q. Does he devote a great deal of his time to the management of the Nonpartisan League?—A. Quite a great deal of it.

Q. Is he in the same offices with you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is vice president?—A. He is a member of the committee.

Q. There is no office of vice president?—A. Two, Mr. Lemke and Mr. Wood.

Q. One president and two vice presidents?—A. You can put it that way.

Q. And the only way we could ascertain precisely the amount of money that has been turned over to this Nonpartisan Publishing Co. would be to get the books?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And these books are in the possession of Mr. Keyes in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is the same one who could show us exactly what the situation is?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the checks of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. are drawn and signed by Mr. Keyes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is the connecting link between all these organizations, isn't he?—A. He is the man that signs the checks for all of them; he handles most of the money.

Q. Now, this league exchange, what is the nature of its business, that million dollar corporation?—A. Well, I think I had better explain that. You understand, I don't know much about financial institutions and I was very clumsy in answering questions of that kind.

Q. Don't answer anything you can't answer. I am asking you if you know what the business of the league exchange is.—A. Very generally, I do.

Q. What is it, generally?—A. It is the business of financing the political organization.

Q. Known as the Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But its business is given as farm lands?—A. It is organized to handle farm lands, and did undertake to handle some, and would have handled some if it hadn't been for the war conditions.

Q. And it is located in the Giffellian Block?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where the offices of the National Nonpartisan League are?—A. We have an office in St. Paul and one at Fargo.

Q. And Mr. F. B. Wood is president of that concern?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Thomas Keyes is secretary-treasurer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Any other officers?—A. Yes, sir; a board of directors.

Q. And you are a member of that board of directors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is the concern in which you own a hundred dollars' worth of stock?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you own any other interest in that concern?—A. No.

Q. Directly or indirectly?—A. No.

Q. Is all the stock paid up in that; do you know?—A. No; I don't think it is.

Q. Have you any idea what proportion of it is paid up?—A. I think there is something like \$150,000 sold and \$50,000 paid up. I wouldn't be sure; it is about that. They have been paying notes this fall right along.

Q. That stock sold generally to farmers?—A. Almost exclusively.

Q. And you say you have no other interest in that except this hundred-dollar share of stock you testified to?—A. Yes.

Q. No one hold any stock directly or indirectly for you?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you haven't any promise on the part of anyone connected with this organization that you are to have any interest in it in the future?—A. No.

Q. You have nothing to do with the organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a matter of fact, the thing was organized under your direction?—A. At my suggestion, and on the advice of counsel and farmers.

Q. By that, you mean some lawyers?—A. Yes; Mr. Lemke and two or three others.

Q. You were the most active man in the organization of it?—A. I initiated it.

Q. That is true of the rest of the organizations, too, isn't it?—A. It is true of the publishing company.

Q. It is also true of the Consumers' United Stores Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know where the account of this concern is kept, the League Exchange?—A. Mr. Keyes is secretary and treasurer and keeps the account in his office.

Q. The bank account is kept in the Exchange National Bank?—A. I wouldn't be sure.

Q. But the books are kept by Mr. Keyes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The same gentleman whom we referred to before?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is also president of the Consumers' United Stores Co.?—A. I don't know; I don't think that he is.

Q. Now, we will come to this United States Guaranty Co. That has its office in the Exchange Bank Building in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any stock in that business?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the business of that company, if you know?—A. It hasn't done any business that I know of; very little.

Q. You are one of the men that initiated the organization of that concern, aren't you?—A. I have had very little to do with the initiation of that concern.

Q. You haven't any idea of what the nature of its business is, or what business it has done?—A. My impression is that it hasn't done any business.

Q. Who is Mr. G. M. Hutcheson?—A. He is the man that was president of the concern; I think he is yet.

Q. Mr. J. J. Hastings is secretary of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is also the gentleman who had to do with the purchase of the Scandinavian-American Bank at Fargo?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is the same gentleman who used to work for Mr. Grant Youmans at Minot?—A. I don't know how much he worked for him. He has been with the league from the beginning.

Q. But he was at Minot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Keyes is treasurer of that company?—A. I don't know.

Q. You wouldn't say that he wasn't?—A. No.

Q. Would it come to you as a matter of surprise to you to learn that he was?—A. No, sir; I haven't given any attention to that.

Q. He lives in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, let us go to the Consumers' United Stores Co. As a matter of fact, you are the man who originated that concern?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You took more than a merely moral interest in it, didn't you?—A. What do you mean?

Q. I don't know, you stated last time—you said your interest was only a moral one, and I put that up to you.—A. You want me to state again?

Q. What I want to get at again is that you were very active in the organization of that concern?—A. Well, no; I haven't given any of my time to the building of the organization, except a couple of days at the beginning.

Q. Aren't you the man who originated that idea?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are the man who created and originated this agreement that is signed up?—A. Well, I presume that I had as much to do with it as any one of several other men.

Q. When was that commenced?—A. Some time in the middle of the summer.

Q. Around about July?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your first operation was commenced at Kenmare and yourself, Mr. Bowen, and Mr. Brinton went up there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you took Mr. Sinclair, a member of the house of representatives, and started out on the first trip?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That concern has collected something like \$960,000?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Isn't this man Keyes also treasurer of that organization?—A. As I said before, I believe that he is, I wouldn't be positive. I think you asked me if he was president.

Q. I did because I had a note that it was asserted that he was, but we can find that out by him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the main office of that concern is in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the Giffellian Building?—A. In the Guaranty Building.

Q. Have you any idea of where the books of that concern are kept?—A. I think in the Guaranty Building.

Q. And Mr. Keyes has the custody of them, like the rest of them?—A. If he is treasurer, he would have.

Q. You don't know where this concern banks?—A. I think they bank with the guaranty company or with the Exchange Bank.

Q. As a matter of fact, all of these concerns do their principal banking business with that bank?—A. I think so.

Q. Now, as I understand you, then, in this concern you haven't any financial interest whatever?—A. What concern?

Q. The Consumers' United Stores Co.—A. I don't draw any salary.

Q. And you don't own any stock?—A. No, sir; I don't handle any money.

Q. Do you know who draws the checks?—A. I think I do.

Q. Who?—A. I think the checks are signed by the manager.

Q. Who is the manager?—A. Mr. Brinton.

Q. Well, the solicitors up there were secured by you?—A. What solicitors?

Q. What solicitors? Mr. Elliott and Mr. Heck.—A. I presume a dozen or more were secured by me.

Q. So you exercise general supervision over it?—A. Yes; I do.

Q. And you have something to say about the disbursement of the funds?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I am going to put a broad question to you now. As I understand your testimony, you haven't the slightest bit of financial interest in the League Exchange, United States Guaranty Co., the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., or the Consumers' United Stores Co., other than the \$100 stock in the League Exchange?—A. You are correct.

Q. And haven't any promise on the part of any individual or combination of persons that they will carry any interest for you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or that you will derive any profit from it in the future?—A. There is nobody carrying any interest for me.

Q. And you haven't any promise or understanding with any person or persons that you as an individual, you, A. C. Townley, will in the future obtain an profit from this organization if there is any profit?—A. I have no understanding that I will or will not.

Q. You never had any understanding of any kind with reference to those matters?—A. No, sir.

Q. My purpose is to make that just as broad as I can, so you would be understood to testify that you haven't any promise of profit or interest in these various concerns and don't expect any?—A. I haven't any promise or arrangement with those organizations any more than I have with the Great Northern Railroad Co. or the electric-light company of this town, or any other banking institution, or anything else.

Q. You haven't any connection with those concerns—the Great Northern Railroad?—A. Not that I have discovered myself.

Q. You don't control their affairs at all like you do these other organizations?—A. No.

Q. So you will admit there is a distinction?—A. Yes; there is. It would probably be easier for me to break into one of these organizations than the railroad.

Q. If you were so inclined it would be much easier for you to acquire some of their property or money if you wanted it than to get it from the Great Northern or the Hughes Electric Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you got any liberty bonds among your assets? I see you haven't listed any.—A. I believe I bought a liberty bond, that was after the petition was filed.

Q. Have you got it now?—A. I believe I have.

Q. Do you know how much it was?—A. \$100.

Q. Did you use any part of this \$300 that you listed here to buy that bond with?—A. Yes, sir. This liberty bond was purchased after this schedule was made out by Mr. Keyes for myself and the other boys in the office.

Q. For the employees and all of you?—A. I purchased one.

Q. Now, Mr. Townley, you get \$200 a month salary from this league and that is all?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Aside from the expense account?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What latitude are you allowed on the expense account?—A. My expense varies; when I am around St. Paul it is very little.

Q. I am not trying to get the amount of it; I want to get at the latitude as to what you call expenses. Does it include your personal expenses; your home expenses, for instance?—A. No; it doesn't.

Q. Does it include the support of your family?—A. No; it doesn't include clothing and shoes.

Q. How about clothing and food of your wife?—A. No; that is paid out of my salary.

Q. You pay for that out of your salary?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The expense that you refer to covers only the actual expense you are incurring when in and about the business of the league?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For instance, if you travel somewhere, that expense is paid out of the league fund?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And any other expenses, personal expenses, are you allowed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And all this expense money, I suppose, is accounted for on the books of the league?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And whatever information that we need along that line we can find if we are permitted to go into the books of the league?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that the \$300, \$200 from the league and \$100 from the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., represents your entire income from any source during the period you have testified to?—A. I got \$5 dividend on the share of stock in the league exchange.

Q. Aside from that, that covers your entire income?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is all the money you got in from any sources during the period we have testified to?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I assume, of course, that the books of all of these concerns are in St. Paul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Practically every one of them?—A. I think they are.

Q. Have you got an automobile of any kind?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you get rid of your automobile?—A. 1912.

Q. Haven't you had an automobile since 1912?—A. Not for my own personal possession or ownership.

Q. You haven't owned an automobile yourself since 1912?—A. No, sir.

Q. Didn't you own an Overland touring car, 45 horsepower, 6 cylinder, which you insured from the 12th of December, 1916, to the 12th of December, 1917, in your own name, and the application stated it was your own car?—A. That may have been.

Q. That is a fact, isn't it?—A. I don't know. We have had several of these touring cars.

Q. I am asking you about this particular one. I am giving you a good description of it.—A. Where was it insured?

Q. Fargo.—A. Where was it stored?

Q. Ten hundred and fourteen Eleventh Avenue South.—A. We have had two or three of these cars, and probably that is one of the garages that we kept them in.

Q. I am asking you this, if you did not insure this particular car in your own name.—A. C. Townley.—A. I don't believe I did.

Q. Will you say you did not?—A. No; I did not; it must have been insured in my name. I didn't insure it. It might have been done by the office.

Q. The application for insurance was taken out in the name of A. C. Townley and signed by A. C. Townley.—A. It might have been, but I don't believe it. I have no recollection of insuring the car.

Q. That was an Overland car. Now, I will ask you if you didn't have a policy on a 1915 Hudson, 6-cylinder, 40-horsepower roadster sometime along the spring of 1917?—A. Insurance policy?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I don't think so. It might have been done by the office. It might have been taken out in my name.

Q. The application was signed by you?—A. I don't think I signed the application.

Q. If one should show that you had signed it, you will admit you are mistaken?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You won't say positively that your recollection is clear on that?—A. No; I won't, but I am quite sure.

Q. Have you any definite recollection of these cars?—A. Yes, sir; I know the cars.

Q. Do you know where they are now?—A. I think the roadster is in St. Paul. I might add here that these are only two of probably a half dozen or a dozen of that kind of cars that have passed through the hands of the organization.

Q. Now, let's go back to another proposition: Have you any stock in the Scandinavian-American Bank at Fargo?—A. No.

Q. Anybody holding any stock in that institution for you?—A. No.

Q. Or in any other bank in the State?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or elsewhere?—A. No, sir.

Q. You say you only drew \$200 a month out of the National Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Calling your attention to September, 1917, you say you only drew \$200 that month?—A. I said my salary was \$200; I might have drawn more or less.

Q. You wouldn't say you drew \$200?—A. No, sir.

Q. You won't say you didn't draw \$2,600?—A. I didn't draw \$2,600 on my salary account.

Q. You would not say there were not checks drawn to A. C. Townley in that month for \$2,600?—A. There might have been more than that. I have drawn checks—for your information I would say this much—probably in the sum of \$1,000 or \$1,500.

Q. Who is W. G. Johnson?—A. Bookkeeper.

Q. For whom?—A. The Nonpartisan League.

Q. Works on a salary there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Small salary?—A. Yes, sir; \$150 or \$175. I don't know what it is.

Q. Will you explain how he happened to put in the Exchange Bank of St. Paul, in July, 1917, a check for \$10,000, drawn on the publishing company and credited to his account?—A. What time was that?

Q. July, 1917?—A. I don't know as I can explain the detail of the matter. I might say rumors to the effect that the league funds and the publishing company's funds were about to be tied up by some kind of process, might have prompted us to put some money in his name.

Q. You remember buying a great number or a big number of Country Gentlemen from a representative from Brainerd, Minn.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About how many copies did you buy at that time? About 60,000?—A. No; it wasn't 60,000.

Q. Pretty near that, wasn't it?—A. No.

Q. Well, it involved quite a sum of money?—A. I think the check for the first bunch of those papers was \$500.

Q. Do you know the gentleman with whom you dealt?—A. I would know him if I saw him.

Q. The check was drawn by you, A. C. Townley?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Personally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Signed by you personally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What were the other checks you drew later on?—A. Well, I might have drawn another one to pay for next week's issue, or I might have bought an automobile and drew a check to pay for it.

Q. On your own account?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you carry an account now?—A. Yes.

Q. Personally, I mean, as an individual?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where is that account kept?—A. The National Exchange Bank.

Q. Is there anything in it?—A. I don't how much there is in it.

Q. You can't tell us right now?—A. No, sir.

Q. We would like to know how much cash you have on hand?—A. You see it is this way—my salary is \$200 per month; I was in Idaho the other day and the office out there needed money for certain little expenditures and I drew a couple of checks.

Q. On your own account?—A. Yes, sir; in the sum of \$1,000 and advised the office that the checks were drawn for the expense of the organization, and asked them to take care of those checks. And they were to be charged against the account of the manager there. When I was in the State of North Dakota here I drew a check for the price of a Ford automobile on my own account or a half dozen automobiles

and that check would have been taken care of when I got in to the office and the parties who got the automobiles would have been charged with them.

Q. You might, as A. C. Townley, draw a check for half a dozen automobiles on A. C. Townley's account?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you would notify the league office that you had done so and the league then would issue its check to A. C. Townley to take care of the check?—A. In case of emergency where it is necessary to use some money they do for that purpose. I might draw a check for one or two, probably not half a dozen because it wouldn't be necessary.

Q. If it was necessary, you would?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it would afterwards be confirmed by the other two members of the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Never had any difficulty in having them confirm your work?—A. This organization doesn't have very much difficulty. There is harmony and confidence between the members, so there is not very much trouble. They act together very well.

Q. So the head of it is in a position to go ahead without being bothered by somebody inquiring into the methods?—A. No; I wouldn't like to have you state it that way. My associates very well understand the methods that we use and the members of the league. Those that don't are at liberty to inquire any time.

Q. I understand you have no objection, as far as you are personally concerned, to an examination of the books of these various concerns to learn if we can whether you got any money from them?—A. I wouldn't think I would have any personal objection.

Q. Have you discussed that matter at all with counsel, the likelihood of an investigation?—A. No; I don't think so.

Q. You are pretty well acquainted in Cheyenne Wells, Colo.?—A. No; not very well.

Q. When were you there?—A. 1911.

Q. Do you know Mr. James Goodnight?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is the husband of Mrs. Townley's sister?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say Mrs. Townley is now in Denver?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know where Mrs. Townley keeps her bank account?—A. National Exchange Bank, St. Paul.

Q. That is the only one you know of that she has?—A. That is the only one she has.

Q. Do you know whether or not Mrs. Townley is carrying quite a sum of money in her name which really belongs to you?—A. Oh, she carries \$100 or \$150.

Q. A small amount?—A. Yes, sir; there was \$87 in her account when it was garnished.

Q. Has she any property accumulated since 1915?—A. A little household goods.

Q. No real estate?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has she any diamonds of any value?—A. I haven't seen any.

Q. If she got those you didn't know about it?—A. Yes; she got those without my knowing anything about it.

Q. But you are quite sure aside from these small sums that Mrs. Townley hasn't any bank account?—A. I am quite sure.

Q. You would be very greatly surprised if it should develop that she had quite a sum of money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Agreeably surprised probably?—A. Yes, sir. She didn't have any when I married her, and I haven't seen her have any since except what I gave her myself.

Q. Well, I assume, of course, that whatever she has got she got from you?—A. You are correct.

Q. Now, with reference to these lands in McKenzie County that we talked about, originally you and your brother purchased those lands from the Northern Pacific Railway?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under contract?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you made a deal with the Schusters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Adler?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And sometime in July, 1913, you entered into an option contract with them whereby you transferred title to this property to Mr. Adler as trustee?—A. I don't remember the time, but when the crop went to pieces, or proved it was going to pieces, to secure them for money they advanced we transferred title of lands that we held on contract to Schuster Bros.

Q. With the understanding that it would be reconveyed?—A. In the event we won out, yes, sir.

Q. Or in the event you sold some of your property?—A. Yes, sir; and I went down the next year to sell it.

Q. That option still in existence?—A. No, sir. I think they have sold a good deal of the land since then. I know they have sold some of it.

Q. I will show you this paper and ask you if this is a copy of the contract?—A. I believe it is. I have no doubt about it at all.

Q. That agreement, however, has, as I understand it, lapsed so you don't claim any interest, either you or your brother?—A. No; I don't claim any interest.

Q. In these various lands?—A. No.

Q. These Schuster brothers and Mr. Adler live in Illinois?—A. Mr. Adler and two of the Schuster brothers live in Illinois; the other Schuster brother lives at Wibaux, Mont.

Q. Still there, is he?—A. Yes, sir; I believe so.

Q. Does Mr. Thatcher act as the auditor for these various companies?—A. Mr. Thatcher audits the books of the league and the League Exchange.

Q. Is he still in St. Paul?—A. I believe he is. He was there a month ago. He is very familiar with the accounting and bookkeeping system. He has been our auditor since we started.

Q. What is the name of his auditing company?—A. I think it is the Equitable Auditing Co.

Q. Is there any other organization that I haven't mentioned here that is the outgrowth or is collateral to the National Nonpartisan League of the same nature?—A. Not yet organized.

Q. You haven't organized anything else yet?—A. No, sir.

Q. Well, then, we can say you are willing to testify positively that this \$200 and the \$100 is the only source of income that you get of any kind?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you want the court to understand that you haven't any interest or haven't received from these concerns one dollar over and above the salaries since the organization of the various institutions?—A. Not for my personal purposes.

Q. That is what I mean, coming to A. C. Townley to be used for himself?—A. You mean by that money I would use to buy land?

Q. As you see fit, as your own?—A. Without any relation to the organization—that is correct. I would have you understand and have it appear on the records that I have spent much more than this \$200 a month, drawn checks for much more than this \$200 a month, drawn checks for much more than that, without having anybody countersign those checks, for the purpose of the organization.

Q. That is what I am inquiring about.—A. What you want is money I drew and used for myself.

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is it exactly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And as I understand you, you say you drew checks personally for a great deal more than that without anyone countersigning them, but that money was used for purposes of the league or other organizations and not for your personal use?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But my question is limited to money that you received as an individual for which you didn't have to account to anybody?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is limited to this \$200 and \$100?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you haven't any promise or agreement with anybody at any time or any place that you are to get any more out of these institutions?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the form of money, stock, or anything of that sort?—A. No, sir.

Cross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. Now, in regard to the Nonpartisan League, that is a political organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know the powers and duties generally of the chairman of the Republican State central committee or Democratic State central committee as to the finances during the campaign?—A. Yes; I do, in a general way.

Q. As president of the Nonpartisan League, your powers and duties, are they similar to those?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you spent any money or used any money of the Nonpartisan League outside of the salary paid to you for your own personal use?—A. I have not.

Q. The affairs of the Nonpartisan League are managed by an executive committee, I understood you to testify?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that committee pass upon the salaries of yourself—that is, when they were fixed—and of all the different employees?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it pass upon the affairs generally of the organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what powers and authority you have is subject to their supervision?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And review?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when any expenditures of considerable amount are made, as to buying automobiles, and so on, so you first consult the executive committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And their decision is final as to whether you should act?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you drew these checks you have testified to upon the league, was that passed upon and explained and approved or rejected by the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how about the books of the organization, are they audited?—A. They are.

Q. How often?—A. I think it is three or four times a year.

Q. By whom?—A. By the Equitable Auditing Co.

Q. Are those reports submitted to the different members of the executive committee?—A. Yes, sir. I get a copy and I think Mr. Wood gets a copy.

Q. You know you get a copy?—A. I know I get a copy.

Q. And these reports are discussed at times, are they, by the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the financial conditions of the organization looked after and discussed?—A. Yes, sir; most carefully.

Q. Have you any interest in any shape, form, or manner in any of the finances of the Nonpartisan League? Could you draw a personal check, over and above your salary, without violating a trust?—A. You mean a personal check for personal expenses or purposes?

Q. Yes, sir; personal expenses or purposes.—A. No, sir.

Q. There is no understanding with the organization that you can draw checks on the organization over and in addition to your salary?—A. For personal purposes? There is a very distinct understanding that I can not.

Q. My questions that I shall ask here are as regards your own personal purposes. I shall not go into the political side of it. That is a thing I don't think concerns us here. You have seen rumors in the newspapers that you owned a \$65,000 home in St. Paul. Is there any truth in that?—A. I am supposed to be living in it.

Q. Where do you live?—A. Sherman Hotel.

Q. How many rooms have you got there?—A. One room just now.

Q. Did you have more?—A. I have got one room rented now. We have two rooms in the Sherman Hotel when my wife and little girl are there.

Q. Now, in regard to those automobiles that were supposed to be insured in your name—do you know anything about them?—A. I don't remember. I don't believe they were insured in my name. If they were insured they were insured by the organization. I never insured a car in my life.

Q. Are they your property?—A. No, sir; they are the property of the organization.

Q. You have no interest in them whatsoever?—A. Except as a member of the committee of the organization; no personal interest.

Q. Do you use them?—A. Sometimes.

Q. For what purpose?—A. Purposes connected with the organizations. I suppose I have used 50 different cars since I started to work for the organization.

Q. Now, in connection with the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.—did you receive any money from them?—A. \$100 a month.

Q. Have you any interest or do you expect any money from that organization in addition at any time to that \$100 a month?—A. I have no interest.

Q. Will you state briefly the purpose of that publication?—A. The purpose of the publication is to serve the purposes of the political organization, to be its official organ, to carry its propaganda, advertise its candidates, and elect them.

Q. Do you know whether it was originally intended to make any profit out of that organization by Mr. Wood or Mr. Fox, or was it just for the purpose of assisting and carrying out the purposes of the league?—A. I didn't initiate the organization of that paper for the purpose of making profit for either one of them, but for the purposes of carrying out the work of the Nonpartisan League.

Q. There is a very close understanding and relation between the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. and the Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that understanding is with the executive committee, is it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With Mr. Fox and Mr. Wood?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any right or authority to take any money from the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. other than that \$100 a month?—A. I have not.

Q. For your own personal use?—A. No, sir.

Q. Now, in regard—A. I would say here that I can use some of the money of the publishing company for political purposes.

Q. That is, when you say you can, you mean the Nonpartisan League can?—A. Yes; I as an individual can't; but I as head of the nonpartisan organization can.

Q. Who directs and controls the editorial policy of that paper?—A. Well, in a very general way I direct and control it by putting in charge of the paper men who are competent to make the paper serve the purposes for which it was organized.

Q. When you say "I," do you mean yourself personally?—A. As a member of the committee.

Q. Now, in regard to the Consumers' United Stores Co., will you tell us briefly the object and purpose for which that was started?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Consumers' United Stores Co. was organized for the purpose of cutting out unnecessary expense of distribution of necessities that the farmers and members of the organization have to buy?—A. For the purpose of eliminating as much waste in the distribution as possible.

Q. Under the articles of that corporation could you use or divert any of the funds to your own personal use?—A. I couldn't, as I understand it.

Q. It is testified that they had paid in about \$960,000; do you mean in cash?—A. No.

Q. How much of that is in cash, or do you know?—A. Well, I don't know. I don't think there is more than \$15,000 or \$20,000 in cash—a very small part of it.

Q. Could you tell us who were the prime movers in the organization of the United States Guaranty Co.?—A. Mr. Hastings and Mr. R. O. Richards, a South Dakota man—a league man.

Q. As a matter of fact, did the executive committee of the league or yourself have very much to do with the organization of that institution?—A. It was organized at the suggestion of this South Dakota man.

Q. Has it done any business that you know of, to speak of?—A. No.

Q. Have you any agreement or have you any expectation to get any money or property from that organization?—A. I have not.

Q. Have any funds ever been paid over to you from any of these organizations for other than political purpose or purposes, as just stated, in regard to the stores company, for your own personal use?—A. No, sir.

Q. What was the original purpose of the league exchange? You stated it was for the purpose of selling real estate. Do you mean real estate or the purpose of getting immigration?—A. I mean for the purpose of handling real estate for the farmers—members of the organization and the farmers.

Q. Was its object to cut down the commissions?—A. Yes, sir; emphatically so. Mr. Lemke, if you will permit, I would like to say here that the Nonpartisan League up to the time the league exchange was organized had been financed very largely upon farmers' notes loaned to the organization. Farmers had given their personal notes to the organization upon which to borrow money, and they handed them over to the organization without any security or collateral or any assurance that they would ever get them back.

Q. Accommodation notes?—A. Yes, sir; and to avoid the burden and the irregularity of going out and asking a man for a \$5,000 or \$10,000 note on which to borrow money, without giving him any security, we organized the league exchange and sold stock in that corporation and used the league exchange to serve the purpose that the accommodation notes had been serving up to that time. And it served its purpose in aiding the organization, but incidentally we hope to make it of use to the farmers of the State otherwise, through handling of real estate or anything else that may be done to earn some dividend or interest. The stock is very much distributed. I don't think very few own more than \$200 worth of stock, and very few over \$100 worth.

Q. Have you any financial interest, directly or indirectly, or do you expect any financial reward in property or otherwise from any of the following organizations in the future, the Nonpartisan League, the League Exchange, the United States Guaranty Co., the Consumers' United Stores Co., or the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. I don't.

Q. Excepting your salary?—A. Excepting my salary.

Q. Or such salary as the executive committee of the league or different officers may allow you in the future in those organizations at their discretion?—A. I presume it is understood, though, that I hope some time to own property outside of my clothes.

Q. You hope that some time in the future they may give you a larger salary, but there is no understanding?—A. I hope to own property and have a part in some business enterprise some time. That is commonly understood when a man undertakes a procedure of this kind, that it is for the purpose of enabling him to stand on his own feet, but I have no expectation or arrangement or agreement with any of these organizations that you mention by which I will get a larger salary, or own them, or profit financially from them.

Q. You wish to wipe the slate clean so you can begin your life anew financially; is that it?—A. I think that is it.

Q. Without being interfered with by garnishment proceedings, etc.?—A. Yes, sir.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. You say that this procedure is started so you can stand on your own feet?—A. By that, Mr. Murphy, I mean so that I won't be hounded to death by fellows that sold me that junk that they called machinery.

Q. How about the men who sold you labor?—A. The men who sold me labor are possibly with one or two exceptions paid.

Q. There are several exceptions in your schedule, aren't there?—A. I don't think there are very many.

Q. Aside from that you expect your salary to be raised right after this proceeding is closed and you get your discharge in bankruptcy, if you get a discharge?—A. No; I don't expect it to be raised, and it won't be raised.

Q. Do you expect these various other institutions who are not paying you a salary now to start in doing it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Your expectation to accumulate property is that you will accumulate it out of the salary you have been drawing?—A. I might not always continue to work for this organization. I might go back to the farm, you know. I like to farm.

Q. Those ideas are purely speculative, however. What I want to get at, you haven't got any understanding that as soon as you can get clear from your creditors and stand on your own feet they will raise your salary?—A. No, sir; not only no understanding, but the salary won't be raised. Mr. Lemke, Mr. Wood, and myself are not working for the salaries we get.

Q. Isn't it a fact there were three new corporations organized in the State on the 21st day of January?—A. I don't know.

Q. One of them a briquetting company?—A. I don't know when it was organized.

Q. Well, recently within the last few days?—A. I understand a corporation of that kind has been organized by Mr. Hastings and others.

Q. And there was another that Mr. Hastings organized, other than this briquetting company, that the league leaders are interested in?—A. I don't know anything about that.

Q. You haven't been consulted with reference to that?—A. No, sir.

Q. And Mr. Keyes, as far as you know, is not treasurer of this new organization?—A. I don't think so.

Q. Now, Mr. Lemke asked you a question on direct examination with reference to the funds of the Consumers' United Stores Co., and he put it this way: You haven't any right to use the funds of that concern at all for your own personal purposes, and you said you hadn't. Now, I am asking you whether you have any control over the funds of that organization for other purposes than your own personal purposes?—A. Indirectly.

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. Well, Mr. Brinton is manager of that Consumers' Stores Co., and Mr. Brinton is very closely associated with and understands the purpose for which it was organized, and he is there working out the purposes of the corporation. Now, through Mr. Brinton, I can direct, in a measure, the use of those funds for the purposes of the organization.

Q. This corporation is only incorporated for a small amount?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And only a few people that hold stock in it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know who they are?—A. No.

Q. Mr. Elliott one of them?—A. I presume he holds some of it. I don't know. I left the management to Mr. Brinton.

Q. You don't hold any stock in it?—A. No.

Q. But the understanding with the men that put the money in is that only a certain percentage is to be used for actual store purposes and the rest of it may be used for carrying on what you call educational work and propaganda?—A. Let me state it more fairly. By the agreement with the farmer a certain percentage of the money must be used for the purpose of establishing a store, but it doesn't say that all of the money may not be used; that any of the money above this percentage that must be used for the organization of the same may be used for educational purposes or to further the work of that organization.

Q. I have before me one of your printed blanks, a buyer's certificate, and it reads, in substance, thus:

"It is expressly understood and agreed that the purposes for which we pay the said sum of \$100 are: That 90 per cent of all money subscribed herein shall be used by said company to establish a store at _____ until the sum of \$10,000, in cash or notes, shall be so applied. All surplus subscribed over the said sum of \$10,000 may be used by the company, either to establish and maintain a central buying agency or wholesale establishment, or to carry on educational work or propaganda along all lines deemed by the board of directors of the Consumers' United Stores Co. to be in the interest of or beneficial to farmers, and for the assistance of farmers' organizations such as relate to the economic, educational, or political interests of the farmers, or both."

That is the substance of it?—A. That is a correct copy.

Q. And those are printed in English and German?—A. I don't know about German.

Q. Don't you know as a matter of fact that it had been printed in German?—A. No; I don't know it.

Q. Now, for these general purposes, aside from the money that is used for the actual operations of the store, that have been mentioned here, you can control the distribution of the money with reference to those purposes?—A. With my associates I can.

Q. I wanted to show, Mr. Townley, to be frank with you, that your relation with this organization and the others is quite close, and you are more or less of general manager and director of them all, in the distribution of the funds and otherwise for these purposes.—A. For the purposes stated in the agreement.

Q. And that is a fact, isn't it?—A. Yes, sir. I am not, however, as closely connected with that as I am with the political organizations. I don't handle any money and don't sign any checks.

Q. The detail is taken care of by somebody else?—A. The detail and all the work.

Q. You can't tell me whether Mr. Keyes is treasurer or cashier?—A. You said he was president?

Q. I said I had a report that he was president.—A. I know he is not both of them.

Q. Of course, that is possible; but the chances are that he keeps the same position with that company—that was the intention to have it all centralized, and Keyes is the key to the whole thing? Isn't that the idea?—A. I think so.

Recross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. Now, Mr. Townley, what is the general purpose of all of these organizations—for the purpose of making profit?—A. No.

Q. Tell in a few words what the object is. Is it philanthropic or benevolent or what?—A. The purpose of this organization is to forward and protect the work of this progressive movement, or this movement that looks to the members as progressive.

Q. Is it for the interest of the people who belong to this league, or, rather, for the masses than the few, more equal distribution of the good things of life?—A. It all aims at a proper arrangement of the marketing system.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. That is, with reference to the Consumers Co.?—A. All of these organizations.

Q. That is, with reference to the purposes of this organization it might better be stated as to what you conceive to be the interests of the consumers, you and your associates—right or wrong, it is what you conceive to be their interests?—A. What I and my associates, and my associates are the farmers.

Q. They have nothing to say about the actual distribution of the funds? The man who signs one of these notes has nothing to say about where the money goes?—A. He has a right to say whether he signs it or not.

Q. But what I want to get at—after he signs and pays his money up the distribution of that money is under the control of yourself and your associates and not in the farmer?—A. He signs a contract and agreement, by which he agrees to do so much—gives a note for \$100—and we agree to protect him in so far as we can under the agreement for that consideration.

Q. And he agrees to take your judgment in the distribution of this money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you exercise that judgment, and when you say this is all for the advancement of the farmer it is what your judgment dictates is for their benefit or betterment; whether it is right or wrong, it is the judgment of yourself and your immediate associates?—A. Part of the plan, read and explained to the farmer and agreed upon with them.

Q. A plan approved by yourself and your immediate associates?—A. And agreed to by the farmer.

Q. And you have a clause in that agreement that if any one of them—in order to keep out of court—that if a farmer objects and wants his money back you will give it back to him with 10 per cent?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the purpose; so if anybody sues you, you can give it back and keep out of courts?—A. I can state it better than that.

Q. Well, probably you could, but I get the purpose of it, don't I?—A. We make better progress talking to farmers than to lawyers.

Q. I haven't any doubt. You haven't very many lawyers signed up?—A. Well, some want to come in.

Q. Lemke has got a kind of monopoly on it? They can't break in?—A. Yes; he got in on the ground floor.

Recross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. You have stated that the owners of the Courier-News—in your previous testimony you stated, I believe, it was the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. Isn't that due to the fact that you have not clearly distinguished between copartnership as a legal entity and the individuals forming it?—A. Well, I haven't given much attention to the matter. It has been more in your hands than it has in mine.

Q. May I not ask you this question, The way you look at it, Fox and Wood are the same as the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

By the Referee:

Q. Mr. Townley, was the money advanced by the Nonpartisan League to take over the Nonpartisan Leader and the Courier-News, or was this money that was advanced by the owners of those papers now?—A. It is advanced by the publishing company to take over the News.

Q. You don't understand my question. I am trying to find out—I understand the farmers own the Nonpartisan League and have moneys in the league. I want to know whether the league's money bought these papers?—A. No. You see, in the first place, the Leader was published on a contract. Fox and Wood began to publish the Nonpartisan Leader on a contract. The company that published the Leader was paid out of the subscription price of the Leader, and when the Courier-News was taken over it was bought by money belonging to the publishing company, not the Nonpartisan League.

Q. Then the Courier-News and the Nonpartisan Leader are owned by the owners?—A. The owners of the publishing company.

Q. And not by the Nonpartisan League?—A. No, sir.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. Those funds originally came from the farmers?—A. Yes, sir; like everything else.

Q. And were used for the purpose of acquiring these papers under the direction of yourself and associates?—A. The funds came from the subscription price.

Q. The \$5?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is the same fund that went to buy the Courier-News?—A. Yes, sir.

Recross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. Mr. Townley, when the Leader was first published what company published it?—A. The Cooperative Herald, the Equity Publishing Co.

Q. And when that contract was made for the publishing that was made by whom, the agreement?—A. Fox and Wood, I believe.

Ed F. Wood having been called as a witness by the trustees was duly sworn, and testified as follows:

Direct examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. You are the Ed F. Wood testified to here as the owner of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How old are you?—A. Twenty-seven.

Q. What was your business before you became connected with this organization?—A. Farming.

Q. Own any farm lands yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much?—A. Half a section.

Q. Where?—A. Near Deering, 157-81.

Q. North of Minot?—A. Northeast of Minot.

Q. Still own that land?—A. I have an equity in it; yes.

Q. When was it you became connected with the Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?—A. In the fall of 1915.

Q. Had you known Mr. Fox for some time before that?—A. I had.

Q. How long?—A. About—oh, I suppose six months.

Q. You had met him through Mr. Townley?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where?—A. Met him in Minot.

Q. What was his business?—A. Organizer.

Q. For the league?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your business was also organizer?—A. Yes, sir; exactly.

Q. You didn't put any money of your own into this Nonpartisan Publishing Co. aside from dues in the league? You didn't make any personal investment in it, did you?—A. It wasn't necessary.

Q. Well, you didn't, necessary or not necessary?—A. No; I didn't.

Q. And neither did Fox, did he?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. You fellows got together and said we will organize this company and get \$5 a head out of each one of these members for running this paper, did you?—A. We considered starting this paper and running it in the interest of the Nonpartisan League.

Q. Who put the idea in your head?—A. I don't know. I get an idea once in a while.

Q. Well, we all do, but sometimes we learn from others. Didn't you get an inspiration from some other source, or was it spontaneous?—A. We had talked about it considerably.

Q. With Mr. Townley?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a matter of fact, the main idea was that of Mr. Townley, wasn't it?—A. There had been a lot of people talking about it.

Q. Well, I am not speaking about anybody else except Mr. Townley. He is the man that made the suggestion that you form this organization?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you and Fox have had nothing to do directly with the management, control, and operation of that concern since its organization, have you?—A. Not directly; no.

Q. You haven't been down there in Fargo but very little of the time?—A. I have been there quite a little.

Q. Traveling around the State most of the time?—A. This last year I have been up on my farm.

Q. All of 1917?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Been on the farm?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. Fox, where has he been?—A. Fox has been organizing for the league. I don't know where.

Q. Traveling around?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And this concern has been going on without the attention or direction of either one of you copartners?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you don't know anything about its financial condition?—A. In a general way.

Q. You don't know much about it?—A. We left that to the men who are paid to do that business.

Q. Leave it to the employees?—A. Yes; exactly.
 Q. You copartners walk away and leave the business to the employees to take care of it?—A. No, sir.
 Q. Do you get any salary?—A. No, sir.
 Q. Have you ever got a penny as an individual?—A. No, sir.
 Q. Do you know if Fox ever has?—A. Yes; I have got traveling expenses on one occasion.

Q. Well, that is what actual money that you paid out?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. So you haven't, in fact?—A. No, sir. I never received any salary.
 Q. You haven't received a penny?—A. No, sir.
 Q. And, as far as you know, Fox hasn't either?—A. No, sir.
 Q. And if that concern has made any profit you don't know what became of it?—A. It wasn't organized for profit.
 Q. If that concern has made any profit, you don't know what became of it?—A. Well, if any was made, it was used in the interests of the Nonpartisan League.

Q. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. No; I don't.
 Q. That is your opinion—you mean that is what you believe?—A. Absolutely.

Q. But the fact is something that you can't testify to—you don't know what became of the money or who used it or where it goes, do you?—A. I know that whatever money, if there is any money made out of the corporation—

Q. It is not a corporation, is it?—A. Or the publishing company.
 Q. The publishing company is not a corporation, is it?—A. No.
 Q. Now, this paper does a great deal of advertising, doesn't it?—A. I imagine so.

Q. You don't even know that—do you read the Nonpartisan Leader?—A. Occasionally.

Q. I call your attention to the copy of the 21st of January, and ask you if it is not a fact that there is a great deal of advertising matter in there, quite a bit of it?—A. Yes.

Q. It is, as a matter of fact, an advertising medium used to quite an extent?—A. Yes, sir. It is a good medium. I don't know how far it is patronized.

Q. You don't know even that?—A. Not to what extent it is patronized.

Q. You are not familiar with any of the details?—A. I leave that to the newspaper men.

Q. And you don't know what money they make out of advertising?—A. I don't.

Q. Or what becomes of it?—A. No, sir.
 Q. You are 27?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Married or single?—A. Married.
 Q. You spent most of your time on the farm in 1917?—A. I did.

Q. You are game warden, State deputy?—A. Yes, sir.
 Q. And occasionally you go around on that business?—A. I did on a few occasions.

Q. Where is Mr. Fox?—A. I couldn't say where he is right now. The last time I saw him he was in St. Paul.

Cross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. What was the purpose, as you understand it, of the Nonpartisan Leader or Publishing Co.?—A. The purpose of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. was to publish a paper in the interests of the farmers of North Dakota for good government.

Q. You are not concerned with the profits as much as the interests of the farmers as you see it in the publishing of that paper?—A. No; I am not concerned in the profits.

Q. If there are any profits made, does it meet with your approval or consent that they should be used by the Nonpartisan League for political purposes?—A. Absolutely.

Q. You have no arrangement or agreement with Mr. Townley that he is to receive more than the salary stated?—A. Not any.

By the Referee:

Q. Mr. Wood, you and Mr. Fox bought the paper—did you get a bill of sale when you bought it?—A. There wasn't any paper.

Q. You just started it and bought machinery gradually, as the dues came in?—A. When the paper was started it was published by the Cooperators' Herald on contract.

Q. How long was it published that way?—A. Oh, I don't know, about from the fall until the spring, some time.

Q. When did you acquire a plant of your own?—A. It must have been along in May—April or May—some time before the primary election. I don't just remember exactly. In the spring anyhow.

Q. Now, have you signed any agreement—is there any agreement in writing whereby it is understood that there are to be any profits in this paper, as far as you and Mr. Fox are concerned?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. Have you anything to show your ownership of the paper, of the publishing company?—A. Well, I don't know. I have got some stock in the Courier-News.

Q. That stock in the Courier-News was bought with the proceeds from the Nonpartisan Leader?—A. I think that is the idea.

Q. And that stock is your own?—A. It is in my name; yes, sir.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. Where is it?—A. It is in safety deposit vault in St. Paul?
 Q. In your safety deposit vault?—A. Well, I use it.

Q. It isn't yours, though?—A. I don't pay for it; no.
 Q. When did you decide to move to St. Paul?—A. I haven't moved to St. Paul.

Q. I mean the office of the company?—A. The league or Nonpartisan Publishing Co.?

Q. The publishing company?—A. That was moved down there not very long ago.

Q. As a matter of fact you didn't have anything to do with it?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. You weren't consulted?—A. Mr. Townley is paid for directing the work of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co., and he gets men that are competent and capable to handle that business, and I don't know anything about the printing business.

Q. He runs the whole thing, and you are willing to trust him to do it?—A. Yes, sir; if I wasn't, I wouldn't hire him.

Recross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. When you say Mr. Townley, do you mean Mr. Townley or the Nonpartisan League?—A. I mean the Nonpartisan League.

Q. Is there any agreement of copartnership between yourself and Mr. Fox?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, you say you started the paper; that you didn't buy it. When you first started, who did you deal with to print it?—A. A. M. Baker.

Q. Did you and Mr. Fox agree to pay him, or was the league back of it?—A. I don't remember exactly. I think I was there at the time the arrangements were made.

Q. You never received any funds from Mr. Townley, or did you receive any funds from Mr. Townley to start this paper with?—A. No.

Q. The only funds you received were from the subscriptions and the subscribers gotten for you from the membership of the Nonpartisan League through the Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. As a matter of fact you have never had anything to do with that paper at all, except nominally?—A. Well, Mr. Fox and I own the paper.

Q. In name only?—A. Well, we own the paper; and as long as it is properly directed and run in the interests of the farmers of North Dakota we are satisfied to have it run that way.

Q. You own the paper, and do you own a majority of the stock in the Courier-News?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And never put a dollar into either one of them?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much are those papers supposed to be worth?—A. I don't know.

Q. Have you any idea?—A. No, I haven't—an approximate idea.
 Q. Well, give us an approximate idea.—A. The Messenger says they are worth \$70,000.

Q. Are you willing to take the Messenger's word for it?—A. Not altogether.

Q. If you have got any amendment to make to that, how much would you say they are worth?—A. I would think the Courier-News perhaps worth \$40,000 or \$50,000.

Q. And how about the Leader?—A. I believe the Leader is being published on contract now.

Q. I am not asking about that. I am asking about the value of this property that you claim you and Fox own?—A. Well, I haven't—the Leader has been growing considerable, and I haven't paid much attention to it. In fact it is worth considerably more than when it was started.

Q. That may be true, but that doesn't answer my question. As a matter of fact, you don't know anything about it, do you—what it is worth, who is running it, how it is being run, who is financing it, what the bills are, who are paying the bills, or any of the numerous details in connection with the operation of that institution?—A. I know it is being run to suit me.

Q. You haven't anything to say about it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean to say that you and Fox could go down there and fire anybody connected with both of those institutions and take charge to-morrow?—A. Not to-morrow, I don't suppose, but as owners of the papers we could.

Q. You don't intend to do that?—A. Not as long as the paper continues in its present capacity.

Q. Do you ever dictate to these gentlemen what you want done?—A. Why, no. We make suggestions once in a while and they are acted on.

Q. Now, you stated when I was examining you that you were satisfied with the way Mr. Townley was running the paper?—A. I am.

Q. And then Mr. Lemke brought out of you that you meant the Nonpartisan League. You don't pay the Nonpartisan League?—A. No.

Q. You pay Mr. Townley \$100 a month?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he is the man you look to?—A. Oh, I didn't understand his question exactly.

Q. You misunderstood Mr. Lemke's question?—A. Yes; if I said that.

Recross-examination by Mr. Lemke:

Q. Do you mean the publishing company is run in the interests of the National Nonpartisan League?—A. Yes; that is what I thought you meant.

Q. Has Mr. Townley any financial interest in that paper?—A. Not outside of the \$100 a month he gets.

Q. As a matter of fact, is the relation between the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. and the National Nonpartisan League very close?—A. Yes, sir; very close.

Q. Practically one?—A. Yes, sir; I might say so.

A. C. Townley, recalled as a witness, testified as follows:

MR. TOWNLEY. The Nonpartisan Leader was organized as a copartnership as a matter of protecting the members of the Nonpartisan League. The Nonpartisan Leader has not been organized as the property of the Nonpartisan League, because it would have been easier for the enemies to convince the members that they were liable for all of the debts of the organization and they wouldn't have joined, and they would have been liable for the debts of the organization. Whenever any machinery is purchased the manager of the paper or Mr. Wood signs notes, and the copartnership is liable and nobody else is liable. If the paper makes a mistake, it is the mistake of the paper and not of the organization, and Mr. Wood or Mr. Fox were not urged and no arrangement was made with them to publish the paper, because they are newspaper men or publishers, and have a wide experience, but because they understand the purpose for which this paper was to be run, and will, in so far as their ownership enables them, protect it in serving that purpose, and are not running the paper for profit, but to serve the purpose of this organization and protect the organization. Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox are in a position, just as you, Mr. Murphy, and anybody else, would be in a position if they wanted to demand the whole \$5 to take the paper to-morrow and run away with it, or use it against the organization, but any time they did that their contract would shortly expire.

Redirect examination by Mr. Murphy:

Q. But the main purpose is to have a nominal copartnership for the purpose of fixing liability somewhere?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But the intimate relations between the league and the publishing company are such that in everything except form, the external form of the thing, the league really owns the paper?—A. That is practically correct but not actually correct.

Q. Of course, your statement contains the substance of what your counsel and advisors have told you the legal effect is?—A. Yes; and the psychological effect on the membership. We bought some machinery when we started to publish the paper, and if there was one there were twenty-five league members came in and wanted to know who was in debt for that machinery. Mortgages had been filed, and they wanted to know if they had to pay. If they had to pay they wouldn't have stayed very long in the organization.

Q. So you got up this idea to escape this feature of it?—A. Yes, sir.

By the referee:

Q. The only interest I see that this proceeding has in the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. is whether or not this property, of quite a value, the Nonpartisan Leader and the Daily Courier-News, is in position that it is just held nominally until such a time as there is a division made of it, so that in the course of events you would get an interest in it. Are you at any time going to get an interest in these properties?—A.

Well, I have no arrangement and no understanding that I will either own the Nonpartisan Leader or the league or the farmers that are members.

Q. Not the league, but the Leader and the Courier-News?—A. I have no arrangement.

Q. And Mr. Fox and Mr. Wood and the other stockholders of the Courier-News have acquired their rights in the paper just through—just as holders for themselves to relieve the league from any liability?—A. As holders for themselves. When we undertook this enterprise we had no knowledge whether it would succeed or wouldn't. And if it had not been a success Mr. Wood and Mr. Fox would have been holding the sack for the machinery they bought at that time.

By Mr. Murphy:

Q. As a matter of fact, in the fall of 1915 you had a pretty good idea?—A. We were successful in this measure that we had a half-bushel basket of post-dated checks, none of which had been paid, and which nobody said would be paid.

Q. But they were paid?—A. They were paid finally.

Q. You had an idea they would be?—A. I had very high hopes they would be paid.

Q. A whole half bushel of them?—A. Yes, sir; \$6 checks.

Q. So that, when these gentlemen started in in the fall of 1915, they knew they had this half bushel back of them?—A. They weren't good enough so any responsible publishing house would look upon them as security. We had to take a publishing house without much experience.

Q. Had to have a lot of faith?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Lemke:

Q. Isn't it a fact that some of the publishing companies refused to have any dealings with the political league as such?—A. Not only the publishing companies, but several others.

Q. They wanted somebody better, either corporation or individual, outside of the league with whom they would do business?—A. They wanted to do business with something that had a better standing than the league at that time.

Q. Weren't some checks thrown back, saying that the league had no legal standing or existence because it was not incorporated or was not a copartnership?—A. Not some, but hundreds, thousands, of them.

Apart from collecting \$16 dues from farmers in politics and making certain other concessions to farmers in politics, who demand seed from the Government, Mr. Townley may be all right. The Minnesota papers report that he has recently been indicted for seditious utterances. At any rate, he and his league are not much in favor with the governor of Minnesota, as the following report from one of the St. Paul papers shows:

Governor Scores Nonpartisan League as Treasonable in Letter to Officer—Burnquist Refuses Invitation to Attend Rally to Stir Class Division—Townley Organization Called Propagandist—Executive Denounces Party of Discontent as Attracting Pro-Germans—Affiliation with Law Violators is Charged—Statement Recites People's Council, Industrial Workers of the World, and Red Socialist Activity.

Charging the Nonpartisan League with disloyal propaganda and arraigning its heads for stirring up factional and class feeling when the country should be working solidly and wholeheartedly for winning of the war, Gov. J. A. A. Burnquist to-day delivered the most scathing condemnation of the A. C. Townley organization that it has yet received.

The governor's condemnation of the league and its heads was made in a letter to Arthur Le Sueur, former socialist mayor of Minot, now "executive secretary" of the league, declining an invitation to address the league's coming campaign rally.

THE GOVERNOR'S RALLY.

The governor's letter follows:

"DEAR SIR: Your invitation to address the Nonpartisan campaign rally is declined by me for the following reasons:

"The name of your league implies that it is nonpartisan, but in fact there is no organization more partisan. At this time, when other political parties are trying to put aside, for the good of the country, any factional spirit that might exist, your organization is doing everything within its power to increase it.

"At the time of our entrance into the European conflict your organizers condemned our Government for entering the war. When it became apparent that this course would result in disaster for their organization they changed their course and made an eleven-hour claim to pure loyalty; but, notwithstanding this claim, the National Nonpartisan League is a party of discontent. It has drawn to it the pro-German element of our State. Its leaders have been closely connected with the lawless I. W. W. and with the red socialists. Pacifists and peace advocates, whose doctrines are of benefit to Germany, are among their number.

CATERERS TO LAW VIOLATORS.

"Those in charge of the league have catered to that faction of labor which has violated the law and been opposed to compliance with just orders of duly constituted authority. The leading agitators in your party have through their speeches and the circulation of contemptible falsehoods encouraged disrespect for honest and patriotic men in public positions. These self-appointed leaders, with whom you are associated, have been and now are endeavoring to get farmers to oppose business men and employees to oppose employers. They state, in your party principles, that 'the great thing the farmers need to-day to win is to stick by your organization to cooperate with wage workers' organizations in the cities and together win control of the powers of the State government and then the National Government.'

PEOPLE'S COUNCIL RECORD REVIEWED.

"You, who sign yourself as the executive secretary of the league, were connected with the people's peace council, which, through my proclamation of August 28, 1917, was barred from holding meetings in this State and thereafter in Wisconsin and Illinois, but which was invited to North Dakota by its governor, who was elected through the efforts of your league. The cheering and the applauding of the unpatriotic utterances of Senator LA FOLLETTE at your last convention put a stamp of disloyalty on it that can never be erased. Your present publicity agent lost the position he held at that time because he supported LA FOLLETTE's unpatriotic ideas, and after his discharge by his employer he was employed by your nonpartisan league. Another of your leaders, Joseph Gilbert, called a director and manager, I believe has been convicted by a jury because of his disloyal utterances. He,

together with Mr. Manahan, attorney for your organization, patriotically used a strike situation here to advance the political interests of the league.

SAFETY BOARD MALIGNED.

"These two men have maliciously slandered public-spirited members of the public safety commission in an effort to bring together the farmers and wage earners for the political purposes of your political party's self-constituted leaders, who are neither real farmers nor real laborers but self-seeking demagogues whom the actual farmers and the actual laboring men of our State will sooner or later find are nothing but pretended friends—wolves parading in sheep's clothing.

"You, who appear to be the executive secretary of this organization, were the attorney who defended the murderers in the I. W. W. trouble on the range two years ago and who has assisted the I. W. W. organization which has publicly announced that it is its intention ultimately to take the farms from the farmers, whose headquarters since the commencement of the war have been raided by the Federal Government and whose members are now taking refuge in such organizations as the National Nonpartisan League.

LEAGUE INIMICAL TO FARMERS.

"How, under such circumstances, the farmers of Minnesota, who have been threatened with the loss of their farms, who have time and again been compelled to appeal to peace officers for protection against members of this lawless, anarchistic organization, can now join a league with promoters whose sympathies have been with this lawbreaking Bolshevik element in our society, is well nigh incomprehensible. The only explanation that can be given is the fact that some of the leaders and organizers of the Nonpartisan League are evidently not yet known as well to the farmers and laborers of our State as they are to those who have had more experience with them.

"Another reason for declining your invitation is the possibility of construing my presence at your partisan campaign rally, by some, as an endorsement of your propaganda. It is of course the duty of the governor to be fair to all classes, and to oppose any program which is apt to result in a division of our State into classes. Such arraying of class against class would be welcomed by the enemies of our Republic, for such a course will tend to defeat our Nation in this war, and will eventually mean the dissolution of our form of government and the undermining of the economic and political freedom of our people. He who, in normal times, needlessly arrays class against class is most often the ambitious demagogue, but any individual who will do so when our Nation is in a life and death struggle is knowingly or unknowingly a traitor to his State and to his country.

"In declining to speak at your party's rally I wish to say, further, that for me there are during this war but two parties—one composed of the loyalists and the other of the disloyalists. The only party whose cause I shall strive at this time to advance is the party composed of those Americans who, heart and soul, are loyal to their country. The only issue that to me is paramount at this time is the winning of this war, and that can not be done 'if our house is to be divided against itself' through false accusations on the part of political agitators, such as those who head your organization.

OPPOSES ANTIWAR AGITATORS.

"The only party and politicians whom I am in this campaign going to oppose are that party and those politicians who for party purposes, by innuendo or otherwise, are discouraging our people by claiming this is a war begun by the rich, or that the burdens of the conflict will fall more heavily on one class than another, or make statements which in some other way will lengthen the conflict by creating dissatisfaction at home and thus indirectly cause the death of additional thousands, if not millions, of our fellow citizens on European battlefields.

"We all agree that war profiteers should be dealt with as drastically as it is possible to deal with them, but it can not be said this is 'a rich man's war,' for those who have gained most from it would have made greater profit if the United States had not entered it.

"I hold no brief for any class, but to make the farmers or laboring men believe their sons are discriminated against in this war, as implied in your statement of principles, is treasonable conduct, for the rich man's sons are conscripted proportionately to a greater extent than the sons of the farmers and laborers.

FARMERS MOST FAVORED.

"This is apparent because of the exemption of those needed to support their dependents and the exemption allowed because of agricultural and industrial pursuits. Up to this date about 5 per cent of the male population of this country has been called, and 90 per cent of the war taxation has come from business profits and income, falling mostly on those best able to pay it. If anyone for money reasons would strive to continue this war or make unreasonable profit through the carrying on of the same, such an individual is as much of a traitor to his country, but no more of a traitor, than he who would use this time to divide our forces through the creation of class hatred and factional discontent.

BIG BUSINESS ATTACKED.

"Your leaders are continually attacking what you term 'big business.' Personally I am as strongly opposed as anyone to what is known as government by 'big business.' I would be equally opposed to a government by any particular industrial class. The public official who would allow himself to be controlled by the self-appointed guardians of some certain element of society would thereby render himself unfit to hold public office.

"If I, as governor of this State, would permit myself to be put in a position where I could be compelled to cater to any particular set of men, or where I could not be fair to organized or unorganized labor, to farmers' organizations or any other organizations, to big business or little business, I would be unworthy of the confidence of the voters of our Commonwealth, who can freely or secretly exercise their right of franchise without the payment of \$16 to unscrupulous schemers for the privilege of voting or being told how to vote.

DOUBTS SINCERITY OF PURPOSE.

"Knowing as I do the political ambition of your organization, and the false charges that some of its leaders and agents have made through your official newspapers against honest and patriotic public officials, I can not believe that back of the invitation you have sent me is any sincerity of purpose. The failure on the part of anyone to turn over the State government to those of your officers who have assumed the organization of the alleged nonpartisan league and the control of the millions of dollars collected from its members will undoubtedly create opposition, but I know that such men, pretending to be friends of some particular class and deceiving some well-intentioned people, can not long continue their policy of deception, for the patriotic farmers in the country and the loyal laboring men in the city know that

their true friends are among those who strive for the maintenance of law, order, and justice, and especially in this, the most serious hour of our history, for that unity of the American people essential to the successful termination of the war."

To the foregoing it will be illuminating to add this additional report of the Townley bankruptcy proceedings. It is from one of the St. Paul papers of a day or two ago:

LAWYERS RULING NONPARTISANS KEPT SECRET—CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS REFUSED IN BANKRUPTCY HEARING; UNCERTAIN THAT THEY EXIST—HEAD DRAWS OWN CHECKS—PERSONAL ACCOUNT OF PRESIDENT IN MANY BANKS, IS TESTIMONY—SOME BOOKS DESTROYED.

[By Larry Laurence.]

As long as the good right arm of A. C. Townley does not become paralyzed, his authority for personally expending the funds of the farmers in the Nonpartisan League would seem to be secure. For the "good of the cause" Townley can draw a check for any amount against the funds of the league and spend it how and where he will, it was brought out in bankruptcy hearing before Referee Gideon S. Ives in the St. Paul court yesterday.

Deposition of Mrs. Blanche Staake, formerly of Dilworth, Minn., declared that during the summer of 1916 at Detroit Lake Mrs. Townley had said that she had deposited for her husband in her own name \$61,000, to prevent his creditors from obtaining money due them. Mrs. Townley denied this and the statements of other depositions presented.

BY-LAWS A MYSTERY.

If there are any by-laws or constitution setting forth the purposes and limitations of the organization known as the Nonpartisan League, the whereabouts of this document or documents is made a mystery by officials and attorneys of the league, according to yesterday's evidence.

Thomas M. Keyes, who admitted he is supposed to be the custodian of all documents, said he did not know if such documents existed. Attorneys refused to produce them in court.

TOWNLEY'S ACCOUNT.

Accounts of the Nonpartisan Publishing Co. are kept with the accounts of the Nonpartisan League, and Mr. O'Leary, the personal secretary to Mr. Townley is one of the directors of the Consumers' Store Co., creating a zigzag line leading to the head of the organization. No papers are known to exist that set forth the power or limitations of authority of Townley or accrediting him with any specific duties, and if they do exist, attorneys for the league say they will not be produced.

Thomas M. Keyes, cashier of the Nonpartisan League, treasurer with the league exchange and former treasurer pro tempore of the United Stores Co., yesterday outlined for the first time the system by which the league maintains a "Townley account," subject exclusively to Townley's ideas on expenditures for "the good of the cause."

WHERE IS AUTHORITY?

The testimony of Mr. Keyes regarding Townley's authority to disburse the funds follows, the questions being asked by Attorney Frank Murphy, of Minot, N. Dak., seeking to discover what funds Townley may have had that are subject to the demand of creditors whom he owes \$79,000:

Q. Then you say there are articles of association in existence.—A. There were.

Q. You do not know where they are now?—A. I do not know.

Q. Your counsel has just informed you they are in existence and he has them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Although the general records are supposed to be in your custody?—A. Yes.

AUTHORITY DOUBTFUL.

Q. You know of no other records or files or documents of the Nonpartisan League that would show the power and authority of Mr. Townley with respect to the disbursement of the funds of the league?—A. No, sir; no.

Q. No document has ever been in your possession dealing with that matter?—A. No.

Q. You refuse to produce the records and documents dealing with the power and authority, if there is any, given to Mr. Townley with respect to the handling of funds of the Nonpartisan League?

Mr. LEMPKE. We refuse to produce the articles of association for political reasons, which has no bearing on Mr. Townley's affairs.

RECORDS ARE REFUSED.

Q. Have you any records in regard to what his authority is in respect to the league?

Mr. MANAHAN. That is immaterial as to whether he has any funds.

Q. But you will not produce them, Mr. Lempke, if you have any?—A. No.

Q. Have you got any; will you answer that?—A. I decline to answer.

Q. Mr. Keyes, do you sign all the checks of the Nonpartisan League?—A. I countersign them.

Q. And they are signed by Mr. Townley?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are merely an employee of that organization?—A. Yes.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield? I want to tell the origin of this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAER. When I came down here to Washington I came from one of the greatest wheat-producing countries in the world. I came from what is known as the bread basket of the world, and I wanted to specialize in food production. I went to see Mr. Hoover to find out what I could do to help increase the food supply, and Mr. Hoover is the man who suggested this measure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am inclined to think the gentleman is not so much influenced by Mr. Hoover as he is by the president of the Nonpartisan League.

Mr. BAER. And Mr. Hoover said Congress could make appropriations to make advances to the farmers, against crops and animals.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can not yield further. I have tried to compliment the gentleman by saying that he is the first representative of his organization in this House, and he has had so much influence here with the members of the Agricultural Committee that they adopted his language, his methods, and his quotations in their report. Did the gentleman

from North Dakota quote Lord Rhonnda about the needs of the allies? Yes; and the Committee on Agriculture adopted the language of Lord Rhonnda. Did the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] quote the language of David Lubin, of Rome, on the necessities of agriculture in the United States? Yes. Look in the report of the Committee on Agriculture and you will find that our usually careful Committee on Agriculture adopted what the gentleman from North Dakota said was said by David Lubin, of Rome.

Mr. BAER again rose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I can not yield. Did Herbert Hoover say anything to the gentleman from North Dakota, and did the gentleman from North Dakota say it to the Committee on Agriculture? Yes. Look in the report of the Committee on Agriculture and you will find there the exact language of the gentleman from North Dakota. All these things the Committee on Agriculture accepted from the representative of the Nonpartisan League. They swallowed his bait, hook, line, and sinker, and they have brought his bill into the House somewhat modified and sugar-coated for the benefit of both parties. But did the gentleman of North Dakota [Mr. BAER] tell the Committee on Agriculture what the Secretary of Agriculture said about his \$50,000,000 free-seed bill for indigent farmers? Not a word.

Mr. BAER. Can the gentleman tell what the Secretary of Agriculture said?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the Committee on Agriculture say what the Secretary of Agriculture said? Can they quote anything the Secretary of Agriculture said in support of this bill?

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I challenge any one of the Committee on Agriculture to say what the Secretary of Agriculture, who had large appropriations for the purchase of seeds for the farmer, said. I challenge them to quote him in one single word or line indorsing this socialistic proposition of the gentleman from North Dakota which you gentlemen propose to swallow.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The Secretary of Agriculture was against the proposition and so stated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There you have the testimony of an honest man. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. And a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. An honest man and a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No. Now let the brilliant chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. LEVER] place his hand on his heart and declare before high heaven that these boys of ours over yonder in the trenches must be supported by this \$10,000,000 grab bill. I summon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] as a witness to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States says that this matter of seed is already provided for, and that we do not need to give seed away to men who have nothing to pay for the seed. Boiled down, what is the proposition of the bill? Every honest farmer, every hard-working farmer, every farmer who has got property and character enough to get loans from a bank, or anybody else who will trust him, can get all the money he wants for seed; but any farmer who has been shiftless, who has not been thrifty, who has not saved up, who has not built a home, who has not got any of the tractors that my eloquent friend from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] was referring to, can go to the United States Treasury and get \$450 on his promise to pay it some day. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And to show that the disease is contagious, Mr. Chairman, I insert, under leave granted, a dispatch from this evening's Washington Star showing that the Russian reds would also like to have the American taxpayers furnish them seed on similar terms:

RUSS PAPERS TELL HOW UNITED STATES CAN HELP—COULD ARRANGE CREDIT ON FAVORABLE TERMS TO PEOPLE, THEY EXPLAIN.

Petrograd, Russia, March 23.—Semi-official newspapers, commenting on several cables received by the soviet government from America, expressing sympathy with Russia and offering detachments to the red army, say that America could render more substantial help, which would be greatly appreciated. Having spent more than 50,000,000,000 rubles (\$25,000,000,000) in an unfortunate war, Russia is unable to buy the necessary goods with cash, and especially to pay in gold.

America, they say, could meet the needs of the Russian people by arranging a credit on favorable terms. With such credit goods and supplies Russia's political and military organizations would soon become stronger, the country would quickly revive, and be enabled to acquire the wealth by which it could fully pay America for the assistance rendered.

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

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

Mr. DEWALT. It is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DEWALT. I defer to the chairman of the committee for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], always interesting, always vigorous, usually wrong [laughter], has made a terrific assault upon this bill and upon the committee which is responsible for reporting it favorably to the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls upon the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to put his hand upon his heart and give to this committee of the whole any testimony to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture was favorable to the proposition now under consideration. The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not quite say that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania very shrewdly asked me to show any testimony upon the part of the Secretary of Agriculture that he favored the original proposition introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER]. That, of course, is a trick of one long used to the game. I say that in no spirit of criticism to my genial friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I referred to the \$50,000,000 Baer bill.

Mr. LEVER. I want to give testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture on the bill that we are considering. We are not considering the \$50,000,000 appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not reported as the bill of the gentleman from North Dakota by the committee?

Mr. LEVER. It is a substitute bill for the bill of the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is not the name of the gentleman from North Dakota attached to the bill?

Mr. LEVER. Now, I want to read a letter to me dated March 20, 1918, which has already been read into the Record by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY]. It is as follows:

MARCH 20, 1918.

DEAR MR. LEVER: As you know, when the Secretary recently appeared before the Committee on Agriculture he stated that he would be sympathetic with any plan that could be devised and operated on a business basis for assisting farmers in the spring-wheat areas who are unable to secure credit for the purchase of seed. The Secretary, as you know, is attending a series of war conferences which are being held in the South under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. I have called his attention to the bill (H. R. 7795) which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture on March 8, and I have received word from him that he believes the plan proposed would be workable, and also that he favors the new measure and urges its immediate passage.

That is what the Secretary of Agriculture said.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. When the Secretary was before our committee with the original Baer bill before it calling for \$50,000,000 appropriation, and that part of it which authorized the expenditure of the money in selling seed wheat on time to the farmers, did not the Secretary oppose it and say that that was not good business, and have his remarks ever been printed?

Mr. LEVER. No; and the gentleman from Texas knows why; because they were taken in executive session at the request of the committee and of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Was it not further understood that they were to be edited, and the parts permissible to be printed were to be printed, and now the Secretary takes backwater and we have not the testimony printed before the House?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that the Secretary of Agriculture has just returned to Washington. I had a talk with his secretary the other day about these notes. He tells me that the Secretary has not had time to look them over, much less to revise them. As I recollect it, the Secretary stated before the committee that if it would give him a workable plan he would be in favor of it as a means of increasing the acreage of wheat to the limit.

Now, the trouble with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that they are obsessed with the name of the bill. There has not been a single argument presented by the leaders of this body—and I say it deliberately without fear of contradiction—against this bill except that it happens to originate in a particular way. As far as I am concerned, I have been here 16 long years in this body—I do not know how long I will be here—but I say this to you, that if I were the worst partisan in Congress I would bury my partisanship in order that my country's life and honor might be saved. [Applause.]

I may say further to you, my friends—and I am sorry the gentleman is not on the floor, but I think I can say it without violating any confidence—that a greater man in this country

than the Secretary of Agriculture has indorsed this bill. I believe that at the proper time I shall be able to read into the Record, if this picayunish opposition continues, a letter from no less a man, no less a distinguished patriot, than the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The chairman and other gentlemen on the committee have been quoting the Secretary of Agriculture this afternoon.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. I have always been told that a chairman had to have two qualifications—to know his bill and to have patience.

Mr. LEVER. I hope I have both.

Mr. LAZARO. I know the gentleman has both, and the question I want to ask is if, in his judgment, this is a good bill?

Mr. LEVER. I say unhesitatingly, and I have said it in the gentleman's absence on matters of importance, that the only reason that would make me support the bill is that the time may come when there is great danger of breaking the bread line between this country and our allies and our fighting forces at the front, or inaugurating a bread line in our own country, and if I thought I could prevent it by an increase of the wheat production by 1,000,000 bushels by the expenditure of \$7,500,000, it would be worth the expenditure—yes; if it were \$7,500,000,000, as far as I am concerned. [Applause.] I am in favor of this bill.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this bill would have no place in this House if it were not for the fact that we should strain every nerve to raise every pound of food possible. It is difficult for those who have never had any practical experience in a new country, a country that is just being developed, to understand the conditions that exist in such a country at that time.

Some years ago I had an experience in North Dakota, and I do not know that the conditions there then were such that the failure of the crop was an extremely serious matter. The banks were unable to finance the farmer. Those of us who have spent our lives in countries where money can be had and where security can be given may not be able to understand that the banks in a new country, where their resources are limited, can not finance the farming community. I believe that the Representatives who have spoken on this bill have endeavored to present the facts. I believe there are localities where settlers have gone who are not the owners of the land, but who have simply filed their claims and have invested their all in the purchase of farm machinery and farm stock, and I know that a failure for them would put them out of business. If it be true, as has been stated, that the probabilities are that we will be able to raise in the State of Montana alone thirty or forty million bushels of wheat if we pass this bill that we otherwise would not raise, I believe that alone is sufficient reason why it should be passed.

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

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. An even more important bread grain in Montana at this time is rye, and I have offered an amendment to include rye among the cereals that may be purchased under this bill. That is the cereal the production of which can be very largely increased, most largely increased, in that Northwest section.

Mr. KREIDER. I thank the gentleman for his information. What I was going to say was this: Along about 1890, 1891, or 1892 I was largely interested in farming wheat in North Dakota, and I know that bankers and banks there were absolutely helpless after two failures of the crop to supply the necessary seed for the farmers. I am told that counties in Montana have passed laws or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of \$10,000 to lend the farmers with which to purchase wheat. That is an inadequate sum. They will require more money; and I see no reason, if it be true, as we are told it is true and have reason to believe that it is true, that we should get all of the wheat we can to the allies and our soldiers abroad, I see no reason why men should get on the floor here and denounce this bill as a graft bill when they have passed bills here that would make this bill look like 30 cents.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has given us his experience as a wheat farmer. With wheat at \$5 a bushel for seed, and with a limit of \$450, is it not important that the matter should be left in the discretion of the Secretary, and that amount raised so that the real farmers can get the seed?

Mr. KREIDER. Primarily this bill is designed to assist the beginners who have approximately 160 acres of land.

By unanimous consent Mr. KREIDER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DEWALT: Page 4, line 6, strike out "\$450" and insert "\$600" in lieu thereof.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose in any argument that I intend to make to accuse anyone of insincerity. I desire to give to everyone on the floor of this House the same credit for sincerity that I would request for myself in regard to any measure. Nor would I, on the other hand, say that this is a matter of partisanship, and therefore I disagree with my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. It seems to me that the only question before us is this: Is this really a good bill? There, again, I beg leave to pass a remark in correction of one of the statements of the chairman of this committee. If this is not a good bill, even though the President of the United States might countersign the same, it should not be passed, and I resent, for the President, the intimation that he would favor legislation on partisan grounds, whether good or bad. I take the broad ground that when I came to Congress I did not resign my manhood, and I take the further stable ground that I did not resign my intellectual power, and I did not give that into the care and keeping of anyone except my God and myself. [Applause.]

Therefore the plain question here is, Is this a good bill? And if it is we ought to vote for it, and if it is not we ought to vote against it. What is the fault in this proposition? In the first place, it is a regular Pandora's box. It seeks to give to everyone in a particular locality \$450 for the purchase of seed. If this be a Pandora's box, I want it opened wider. I had intended in proper time, but I was excluded by limitation of debate, to offer the very wise, the potent, and far-reaching amendment that it should include buckwheat. Why buckwheat? I come from the great State of Pennsylvania. Alongside of the boundaries of Pennsylvania is the great State of New York. The grand hills of Pennsylvania and New York in the fall of the year are clad with the fleecy white of the ripened buckwheat. This buckwheat goes into the making of buckwheat cakes, and therefore we should have buckwheat for our soldiers from Pennsylvania and New York, because there are more in the draft from Pennsylvania and New York than from any other two States in the Union because of population. But I am not satisfied with buckwheat. I want also to include sorghum, because buckwheat cakes are not good unless we have sorghum.

Then, more than that, I desire that the southern people shall be taken care of in this matter, for we are to have lots of colored troops who will be charged with the defense of this Nation, and the Lord knows and the negro thinks that there is nothing better than "possum fat and lasses," and so I intend to include molasses before I get through with this. Just see how ridiculous the proposition is. If the men from a restricted district are to be given money to purchase seed, then why not say that every man who raises sheep in a certain restricted district shall be given \$450 for the purpose of raising sheep, in order that we may have the wool supply increased, because that is also necessary for the clothing of the people who are at the front. Let us go further. Let us say that every man who raises cattle shall get \$450, because we need hides to make boots, and the soldiers must wear boots or shoes.

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

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, it reduces itself to an absurdity, and that is what it is.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to increase the food supply of the country. Whether it will accomplish that purpose or not we do not know, but it is intended in good faith for that purpose. I have offered an amendment to include rye among the cereals that may be purchased, because of the fact that in the northwestern mountain section of the country the largest possible increase of production of bread-making cereal can be secured through the raising of spring rye.

It is the one absolutely sure crop in all that subhumid section, and if we are to assist the farmers of that section in the matter of seed we should certainly furnish them with seed rye as well as wheat. The bill therefore ought to be perfected by including rye among the cereals that may be purchased and sold to farmers.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I recognize the importance of aiding and encouraging agriculture. It is the greatest industry in the United States and one of the most important at the present time. It occurs to me that to increase the products and yield of the

farm, if it can be done legitimately and in a way that is upright, would be quite the proper thing to do as a war measure. Now, I remember Congress voted the President of the United States the authority to use the Army and Navy and all the resources of our Republic for the winning of the war. I have heard the chairman of the committee say that this is a patriotic measure, a war measure, and an emergency measure, and I want to say that what he said about that appeals to me.

If this will aid in putting down or winning the war, then I am in favor of it. But I want to say that under the war powers given to our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States can buy and take over every ounce of seed wheat and every other crop there is in the United States. He can hire men to put it in. He can hire it cut. He can do that to-day outside of this bill just as well as he can send men into the forest to cut timber. I have read something of the testimony in this case, and may I say the more I looked into it the more complicated it and its origin became to me. I read how the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] came before the committee and said that they had had no rain down there for a year and a half and they wanted this bill in order to aid them. Then I read about that bobtailed moth or some kind of a blight and the drought up there in North Dakota or Minnesota, and I find that they wanted this bill up there to aid them because they have had a failure of crops. Then I read from the reports that Minnesota had 66,000,000 bushels, North Dakota 61,000,000 bushels, and South Dakota 47,000,000 bushels of spring wheat last year—1917.

I was over in the Senate this morning and I heard a joint resolution from South Dakota, passed by the Legislature, both Senate and House, of South Dakota, stating that they did not want any of this aid and they did not approve of this "punk" talk that is going on down here in Congress, as far as that State is concerned. I heard the lady Congresswoman [Miss RANKIN] from Montana proudly reciting how much wheat they raised out there in Montana year after year, until I thought that was the greatest wheat-raising State in the world. It is not a shortage of seed. It is but an assistance and aid to the farmer that is wanted in the spring-wheat region because of crop failure. Now, if we are going to render aid to the farmers, let us begin right. Up in my State we have a patriotic governor, a modest, plain, splendid business man. He took the money in his pocket, and when the boys from Michigan and Wisconsin in the cantonment at Camp Custer were without rubbers and were catching cold and threatened with pneumonia and it seemed that the Government could not get rubbers, the governor went down to Chicago and the next day sent back 17,000 pairs of rubbers for the boys. [Applause.] That was no Indian gift.

He is not asking that we have any spring wheat; he is not asking to have them replaced. Our Federal reserve banks will allow the farmer to put his note in the bank for six months and that will be sufficient time to grow the wheat. Our National and State banks up in Michigan will loan money to any honest farmer for the purchase of seed or for buying young stock, and they are not too particular about any security, either. Up in our State we are expending \$870,000 this spring for farm tractors—1,000 of them. Seed corn is now being shipped into Michigan by the carload from South Dakota and sold for \$5 per bushel in order to aid the farmers to plant their crops. Michigan is a wonderful State, and if you gentlemen in those States into which the blight and rust comes and in which droughts last for a year and a half will settle and do your farming there you will avoid all that trouble. I invite you to come and live in Michigan, with its grand schools and church spires piercing the blue vault of heaven. It is one of Uncle Sam's best and greatest of States. It has the oldest agricultural college and the greatest university and schoolhouses on nearly every four corners; where the fields are veritable gardens and the people are prosperous.

Mr. VARE. Is the gentleman going to vote for the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I can hardly tell; I want to see what the bill looks like when we get through with it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if the intent and purpose of this bill is all that is claimed for it, then it ought to receive the unanimous vote of this body. We appropriate money by the billions to aid in winning the war. I am glad we are able to do so. And I for one want to do everything possible to win. This contest has settled down to one between the United States and Germany. I am both for my country and winning the war. To me there is no semblance of a doubt as to the outcome if only our allies can hold out until we can develop our strength on a war footing. If England and France can withstand the attack of the entire forces of our enemies in solid mass, then it must follow that

when our Army is equipped and added to the forces of our allies we must win. No better fighting men ever fought in battle than the American soldier. He is not excelled in courage, intelligence, or endurance when put to the test. Already he has proven his prowess to the enemy; and, as stated by Paul Jones, "We have not commenced to fight yet."

And may I add to those of us who will not be called on to bear the brunt of battle that it is our duty to encourage and render every possible aid not only to our soldiers but to our country as well. We should never be found wanting in our support at any time. There is one thing each and all of us can do, and that is to support and sustain the morale of our Army. We should not be too quick at every turn of misfortune or when everything is not going to please us to criticize and say, "I told you so." We have a splendid chance now of winning while our allies are fighting.

Some cry "Peace!" "Peace!" There can be no peace at the present time. All this peace talk is utter nonsense just now. It is even worse than nonsense. All the talk about peace hurts now. All the peace we could get now would be the peace that would go with unconditional and abject surrender. Peace talk now is encouraging to the enemy. It is near treason and must be stopped, if no other way than by bullets. Look at Russia and what Germany did to that country. We are richer than all the central powers put together. Our forefathers fought for our beloved Republic, with its opportunities and benefits for a home for us as free men. In 1823 President Monroe declared that neither North nor South America should thereafter be open to European colonization. President Cleveland in 1895 reaffirmed and sustained the Monroe doctrine in settling the Venezuelan boundary. Dewey did not hesitate to challenge and defy Germany at Hongkong in 1898, when he told the German commodore prince, brother of the Kaiser, in command of the German fleet, that if he interfered at Manila he must take the consequences. Let us not relinquish. Let us encourage our Army while in the fight. Let us encourage our allies. The great stay-at-home army must understand it has a task to perform in supporting and sustaining those in the field. Let us be sure that we are helping and not knocking. We set out to lick Germany. We can do it. It will take time, but we will do it. And in the name of our homes and our country let us stand together like one man and exert every effort and every means to do it. Let us catch every spy and impose the penalty of a traitor on him. We ought to have commenced that before now. If this bill will aid in winning the war, let us vote for it. The chairman of the committee said it was a war measure. But while we are at war can not the same thing be and is not the same thing said of every bill. This bill limits the loan to \$450 to any one farmer. The Government lets the money through the bank or county agent and has security on the growing crop. If some law could be passed by which a farmer could get a short-time loan in every part of the country to put in and harvest his crops, I am sure it would aid production.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is the greatest of all American industries. We have a population estimated at 110,000,000, one-third of whom reside in the country, and are actively engaged in agriculture. This Congress is composed of 435 Members, all of whom are interested in the question of agriculture, but perhaps not more than 30 of whom either reside on farms or are directly engaged in farming or make that their business when at home. Agriculture is likewise the most scientific of all industries. It can not be wholly controlled by human endeavor or any human invention. It is dependent on the elements. It must have sunshine; it must have rain; and these are not affected by human ingenuity. The crops are destroyed by frosts and storms; they are subject to pests and insects. The farmer has an endless task to cultivate and secure his crops. His is no sinecure. Turn the clock forward or turn the clock backward, it makes no difference to him; his work is from sun to sun, and eight hours labor a day would leave to him a half holiday.

The farmer is urged to plant more crops in order to feed those who raise no crops, who live in the cities, and are not engaged in agriculture. The farmer is patriotic. He must supply the food to feed the Army and his sons to fight the battles. "Back to the farm" was a familiar slogan before war was declared. I, for one, know that a young man will not remain on a farm merely as a matter of sentiment, when he can do better in the city, or at some other kind of work. Neither do I blame a young man for bettering his conditions. The social life in the city is attractive. There are many opportunities for the young man in town which do not come to him on the farm. This does not mean, however, that farm life is not agreeable and most enjoyable.

For the purpose of inducing the farmer to raise more wheat the President has fixed the price of wheat at \$2.20 per bushel

for the year 1918. We raised 417,347,000 bushels winter wheat and 250,359,000 bushels spring wheat, making a total of 667,706,000 bushels wheat in the year 1917. It is hoped by fixing the price of wheat that there will be increase enough to make our production of wheat this year 1,000,000,000 bushels.

When the price of wheat was reduced by the President to \$2.20 a bushel, the price to the farmer dropped on the same day 45 cents per bushel, while the price of bread remained the same. This was a clear loss to the farmer.

An increase of \$1 per bushel for wheat only adds 1½ cents to a 16-ounce loaf of bread; 4½ bushels of wheat will make a barrel of flour. The bran and middlings pays the grinding, and a barrel of flour will make three hundred 16-ounce loaves of bread.

The average yield of wheat in Michigan last year was 12 bushels per acre. It cost \$23 to plow the ground, furnish the seed and fertilizer, harvest, do the thrashing, marketing, and pay interest of 5 per cent upon the fair value of the land, with nothing for the wear and tear or loss on implements. Anyone thinking this is too much, let him figure it up and see; and then if the profit is too large in his estimate, he ought to buy a farm and try farming for a while.

It is splendid of those who never lived on a farm to tell the farmers to raise more wheat and farm products. Did you ever hear of a farmer telling the manufacturer to make more implements, cloth, automobiles, or furniture? Last year the farmer was told to raise more potatoes. The farmer did so. Now, the market has failed him. The farmer is asked now to raise more breadstuffs. He is patriotic. He will do his best. But as one interested in farming may I suggest for the farmers to ask the Government to produce and supply more coal. Nor would I limit it to the request of the farmer. I hope every coal man will make a like request upon the Government and miners for more coal. Then there is the municipal coal yards and the chambers of commerce. They can all help to get coal. We ought to commence now. Last year we were told to wait until fall. Let us not wait this year. As an emergency matter affecting our homes, let us not delay getting in our coal or planting every acre of land possible to crops, and we will be strengthened in winning the war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment and this section is now concluded. The vote is on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 37, yeas 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the vote just taken disclosed the presence of a quorum—37 and 63.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and twenty-four gentlemen are present—a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Those in favor of taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number have risen. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to provide for and secure the voluntary mobilization and distribution of farm labor for the production and harvesting of agricultural crops for the year 1918, and to advance railroad fares and other actual traveling expenses for the transportation of such labor, upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as he shall prescribe. For

carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, available immediately.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 4, line 22, after the word "immediately," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

"Provided, That agricultural labor actually engaged in agriculture and needed for cultivating or harvesting crops where engaged shall not be mobilized for transportation hereunder, nor shall agricultural labor be removed from any State in violation of its laws."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will permit, I will say that I consulted members of the Committee on Agriculture and submitted to them this amendment that the gentleman submitted to me, and there is no objection to its adoption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the mobilization plan of farm labor contemplate the moving of farm hands north from California or Washington, say, and then to Montana, for instance?

Mr. LEVER. They are not engaged in farm labor of that kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I thought that was the mobilization plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. What is the question?

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the gentleman explain a little the reference to the removal of farm labor in violation of the laws of the several States?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to interfere with the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] at all, or take his time, but I desire to offer at the proper time a motion to strike this entire section from the bill. I want to know just when that motion should be made. Is it in order now?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will send it to the Clerk's desk it will be submitted at the proper time.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], just propounded to me, about what we mean by the part of the amendment which provides that they shall not remove labor from any State in violation of its laws, I will state that you will find in a great many of the States that labor solicitors are designated as "immigrant agents," and they are prohibited from operating in a great many of the States in certain seasons of the year when labor is engaged, and when it would break contracts to take it away; and they are prohibited from operating at all without any licenses almost all the year in a good many respects. We do not want to put the Secretary of Agriculture and his agents in the position of violating those laws, and therefore that provision should be inserted here.

Then as to the other, the provision is that laborers shall not be removed when engaged in agriculture and needed in cultivating and harvesting the crops where manifestly it would be a disastrous and foolish thing after crops were begun and had partly been made and completed, but not gathered, to remove the labor away from there, because there is a scarcity of farm labor everywhere, and in the South in particular.

Everybody knows that our labor is largely colored labor, and a proposition in midsummer to give them a free ride to Kansas or Montana or anywhere else would denude the cotton and corn farms of their labor in less than 48 hours. A colored man likes to ride, and especially ride free, and if you were to rig up a train half a mile long and put on the timetable the statement that its first stop was at Hades, and that all colored people could ride free, it would be crowded to the doors. They will go, no matter where they are going, and even if they think they will never come back; and if you remove them from where they are taking in a crop, that crop will be a loss, and they may never come back.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. VARE. I can not understand why you want to decry the negroes of your community and at the same time say that their labor is so important.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am not decrying the negroes, but I am decrying the inducements to take them away at the time when

our crops require attention. We think a great deal more about the colored man than many communities do where there are not so many of them, and we do not propose to vote for a measure here which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture and his agents can take them away from us at the time when our crops are at the most critical stage, and when it would be most destructive to the agricultural interests of the South.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I did not quite catch the language of the amendment as it was read. As I understand it, it would not prevent that sort of labor going voluntarily?

Mr. STEVENSON. No. It provides against their being mobilized; those who are engaged in agriculture and who are needed where they are engaged for the purpose of cultivating and harvesting a crop.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. I heard the gentleman's reference to that part of his amendment which says that the provision shall not operate if in violation of State laws.

Mr. STEVENSON. No. That is not the amendment. The amendment provides that they shall not transport labor out of a State where it is, under those circumstances, contrary to the laws of the State to transport it.

Mr. ELSTON. In explanation of that the gentleman said some States have laws against soliciting labor.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; soliciting labor and especially removing labor.

Mr. ELSTON. Under that provision no solicitation of labor under this act would be made at all if the provisions of State laws provided against that kind of thing?

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman does not understand the amendment. It provides that there shall be no soliciting or removing of agricultural labor from a State in violation of any law against it.

Mr. ELSTON. Agricultural labor is all this bill refers to, is it not?

Mr. STEVENSON. You heard the statistics quoted here yesterday showing that there is a shortage of agricultural labor in every State and community in the Union, and you can not help the situation by removing agricultural labor from one place to another. The proposition, as I understand it, is to develop agricultural labor by gathering up the unemployed in the cities and the unemployed everywhere and getting them mobilized and marshaled into the agricultural ranks, where they can be trained to become agricultural laborers.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In view of the argument of the gentleman from South Carolina, I want to ask him if he thinks the Secretary of Agriculture would take farm labor from South Carolina in a way to injure the agriculture of South Carolina?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not know whether he would or not, but I found out a good while ago, in my experience in the State legislature, that if you make it plain in legislation that people can not do what you do not want them to do they will not do it, but if you do not make it plain that they can not do it they may try to do it, and the demoralization of our people because of the fear that they may do it and the knowledge of the fact that they can do it is almost as bad.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What laws have you in South Carolina to prevent the shipping away or taking out of labor?

Mr. STEVENSON. There is a law against soliciting and removing agricultural labor by any agent, either from the State or anywhere else, at a time when it is injurious to the agricultural interests, and there are similar laws in every southern State and in practically all the agricultural States.

Mr. HOWARD. I desire to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Before the gentleman proceeds, let us see if we can not limit this debate. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina to control the time?

Mr. LEVER. No; the Chair to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know then who desire to occupy time?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the large number of gentlemen who have indicated their desire to speak I will withdraw my request temporarily.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this provision ought to stay in this bill without any amendment or else this whole section ought to go out, one of the two. If you can not

pick up farm labor in one community that is already mobilized and move it from one State to another, then the whole section is not worth a thrip. That is the whole wisdom of the provision, and if that is not its intent, then it does not amount to a row of pins one way or the other. The amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] prohibits that. In the State of Georgia, for instance, we have a statute which provides that you can not entice farm labor even from one farm to another, and if you do it you commit a misdemeanor.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VARE. Do the farm laborers vote in the gentleman's State?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes; the farm laborers vote in Georgia. And if it will be any relief to the gentleman's conscience or his mind, I will say to him that the intelligence of the people of my State is about as good as that of the people of the gentleman's State.

Now, if you can confine the transfer of labor to the State, then this section is not worth the paper it is written on. If you can not pick up farm labor in Oklahoma and take it over into Nebraska to help harvest the wheat crop at the time when it is needed there, then what is this section intended for? The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] gets up here and says that in a few minutes he is going to read a letter from a very distinguished citizen of this country, whom we all honor and love, in support of this bill, and yet the gentleman emasculates the very purposes of the bill by agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

If the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina prevails, and if this section remains in this bill, then it is the most vicious section that I have ever seen. The purpose of the section is so that you can pick up large bodies of agricultural labor and transport them from one State to another, and that the Government of the United States can advance the railroad fare to do it to save the grain crop of the Nation. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] by his amendment will tie the hands of the Government in gathering the grain crop. Now, if there is a shortage of labor, and you are going to permit these people to go into your State and offer free trips and free meals on this "joy ride" to the farm laborers of this country, the truth of the business is that one-third of the labor of this country will be riding on the railroad trains all the time when they could be engaged in gathering the crops and planting other crops. I say this is the greatest legislative monstrosity that I have ever seen in my life, and instead of being a benefit to the farmers you are injuring them. And when the world is on fire and American boys and French boys and English boys are dying in Europe this very minute, we are here fiddling around with a puny little seed bill that does not amount to a hill of beans, and we have been occupying the time of the American Congress with it for two long days. It makes me sick. Talk about doing something! Why do you not do something that amounts to something? The gophers will eat up all this seed out there in the deserts of Montana if you send it there. It is a perfect monstrosity, and I am disgusted with this debate and these patriotic appeals that are being made in support of it, when it does not amount to a bawbee, and every man supporting it knows that it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEY) there were—ayes 24, noes 54.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of the committee for more than a minute or two. Attention has been called already to conditions that exist with respect to the labor supply in certain sections of our country. If you at this time of year hold out the mere suggestion that anybody has the authority to invite the labor on the farms in my section of the country to go joy riding on a train to the western part of the country at the expense of the Government, you will demoralize conditions in a way that will do forty times more harm than we can hope to overcome by any good to result from this bill. I would say to the friends of this bill, as one who yet reserves decision as to how he will vote on this measure—I will say to you most interested in the bill that if you hope to see it pass it would be the part of wisdom to adopt this amendment and cut out this section of the bill. There are some States, as was said by the gentleman from Georgia, that have statutes penalizing the practice of enticing away labor. I am not in-

formed whether that is true in all of the States in his section of the country, but there is such a statute in Alabama. I dare say it is not the case in all the States to be affected.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Department of Labor and the Agricultural Department now has in every State of this Union representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the industrial end of labor, and they are scientifically and intelligently gathering all the surplus labor to put in places where they belong. They are doing it in the gentleman's State and in mine this minute.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am not informed that there is being carried on any interference with farm labor throughout the country. If it is, it has not been called to my attention, and I think I represent a section that would be the first to suffer. It is all right to resort to such methods to secure labor peculiarly fitted for work in shipbuilding or other activities indispensable to successful conduct of the war, but not to take laborers from one farm to remove them to another.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the object, to keep your section and mine from suffering by proper cooperation of work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman think that if we appropriate enough money and invite labor to travel at the expense of the Government we are asking the I. W. W. to the successful conduct of the war, but not to take laborers from

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not know how it would work in that connection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. STEAGALL. I know what labor conditions are in my part of the country, and I know what it means to invite the negroes of that section to change employment and to take trips across the country at the expense of the Government. I don't think the Secretary of Agriculture would desire to interfere in such fashion. But to give any one power to do so would necessarily disturb conditions.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing the proposition.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee, has a preferential right.

Mr. WELLING. I will yield in favor of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUBEY. If the Chair and the House will agree to allow me five minutes after the gentleman from Utah concludes, I would be glad to have him speak now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to have a few minutes to favor the striking out of the section.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no limitation of time.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time for debate on this paragraph may be extended, and after the gentleman from Utah has five minutes I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, I want three minutes.

Mr. DYER. I want three minutes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall conclude in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto shall conclude in 30 minutes. If the Chair is to control the time the Chair will have to take the names of Members who are to have the time.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we need to play politics any longer; we are going to pass this bill this evening or we are going to quit. I object.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina makes a point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members present, a quorum.

Mr. RUBEY. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I want every gentleman on the floor who is opposed to this section to give me his attention, and certainly you can do that for the period of five minutes. Let us discuss this for a moment, and let us see what the proposition is upon which we are about to vote. Under the law which we passed last summer we made an appropriation of \$2,000,000, in which was included a proposition to mobilize the labor of this country. Two hundred thousand dollars of that two million was set aside for that

purpose. The President of the United States, from the large emergency appropriation given to him, set aside \$800,000 for the same purpose. That \$800,000, added to the \$200,000, made available a million dollars to be used for the purpose of looking after the labor situation throughout the country. That money was placed at the disposal of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture, and they have cooperated in its expenditure and in formulating plans for the work. With that money they have been organizing their forces and mobilizing the labor of this country.

They are doing it now. Under the provisions of section 2 of this bill we are simply appropriating \$2,500,000 to let them go right on with the work that they are now doing. That is all there is to it. We have in this country now the voluntary mobilization of labor. It is a voluntary proposition from beginning to end. This section provides for the voluntary mobilization of labor. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina a moment ago, which was defeated, should have been adopted—not that it is necessary, because it is not absolutely necessary. Everyone knows, or should know, that the Secretary of Agriculture is not going down into your State or my State or into any other State and take agricultural labor from work in which it is employed and take it somewhere else. He is not doing that now and he is not going to do it in the future. Under the provisions of this section that sort of thing will not be done.

I have here a statement from the Department of Agriculture. I will insert it in the RECORD for the information of the House. I wish that I had time to read it from beginning to end. This statement sets forth, in brief, what is being done and what has been done since the law was enacted last summer. It is dated March 28, which is to-day, and was furnished me this morning from the Department of Agriculture. It says:

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. HARRISON.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF FARM MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1918.

Immediately upon a request that this office take up for the Department of Agriculture a study of farm-labor conditions and practical methods of meeting the situation, we detailed a number of men from the regular staff of the office for field work in States from which the most urgent requests for help had been received. These men immediately began the work of establishing suitable organizations for handling the situation, particularly with reference to gaining correct information as to the actual needs of farmers for labor, and information as to the extent and nature of available sources of labor for farm work. With the approval of the food-production bill by the President in August, we were provided with emergency funds to carry on our farm-labor work and to extend our facilities of service in that direction. We immediately began the appointment of farm-help specialists upon the joint recommendation of the extension service and State council of defense in the States concerned. The country as a whole was divided into four general sections, with a supervising farm-help specialist appointed in charge of each section. To date 38 farm-help specialists have been appointed, some of them in charge of two States. Appointments are now pending in the other States.

Our farm-help specialists have taken up the work in the most active manner. The organization for handling the farm-labor problem includes, first, the county agricultural agents and the farm-bureau men or community committee men in each county. In every State the services of these men have been gladly given in cooperation with our farm-help specialists in meeting the labor situation. The total force of men in the extension organizations, including the farm-bureau men, is more than 100,000 for the whole country. Our farm-help specialists are also receiving the cooperation of the State and county councils of defense, State commissioners of agriculture, State commissioners of labor, in States supplied with such officials, and of farmers' and business men's organizations of all kinds. The Department of Agriculture has a standing agreement with the Department of Labor by which the latter department cooperates with us in supplying help requested from their employment offices.

Our farm-help specialists have been actively engaged during the past two months in effecting an organization for taking a farm labor and crop census, which is now in progress in 46 States, with reports received from 2 States. In connection with this survey, in which more than 6,000,000 farms were visited, the public-school systems were utilized cooperatively to the fullest extent. Moreover, in one State the city school children took a complete survey of available farm labor. All farm-help specialists are now actively engaged in the program of bringing about an intimate business cooperation between the town and country. In Kansas our farm-help specialist has found 50,000 city residents with previous farm experience willing to work in the harvest field if their services are required. Similar results are being secured in Pennsylvania, New York, South Dakota, Utah, and elsewhere.

I want to read from that statement what has been done in one State, the State of Kansas:

The farm-help specialists are now actively engaged in the program of bringing about an intimate business cooperation between the town and the country. In Kansas our farm-help specialist has found 50,000 city residents with previous farm experience—

They are not men who have never been on a farm, but there are 50,000 of them in the State of Kansas who have had previous farm experience—

willing to work in the harvest fields if their services are required. Similar results are being secured in Pennsylvania, New York, South Dakota, Utah, and elsewhere.

In every State in this Union to-day they are getting together the information, they are finding the men who have had farm experience. They are getting them, not from the farms where they are now at work, but from the cities and the villages.

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

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

Mr. RUBLEY. I sincerely hope that the amendment to strike out section 2 of this bill will not prevail.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer—a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate upon this amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEAGALL) there were—ayes 35, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAGSDALE: Page 4, line 19, after the word "prescribed," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment be now closed. If the Members will indulge me for a moment. I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that all debate on this particular amendment be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, upon that I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. HOWARD and Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Utah rise?

Mr. WELLING. To move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman from Indiana comes too late. [Cries of "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the pro forma amendment to strike out the last word of section 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I had not thought of discussing this bill and expected to be content with voting for it after it had been perfected by the Committee of the Whole House. Some statements were made here yesterday, however, in general debate which it seems to me ought to be answered.

It has been contended that this bill was a "raid upon the Treasury"; that it was designed to aid some particular small section of the country as against other sections; that it was vicious class legislation; and that it was recognizing an organization of farmers who were the least worthy representatives of their class.

I do not belong to the Nonpartisan League referred to. It has no standing in the State of Utah, which in part I have the honor to represent. I am as much opposed as any man here to the organization of farmers as a class to work against other elements in our political life as a class. I represent farmers who work out their problems through the regular channels of our political organizations, and I shall not want to come here and represent them if they array themselves in one political group to fight other elements in our national life. I fear, however, that much of the debate here yesterday was calculated to bring about that very result.

Food is the most important single element in the war. You can not train men or fight them without it; you can not build a battle plane or launch a boat unless your workers eat. Every

arm of allied power would drop palsied and useless within a week if the ceaseless stream of food from the American farm was suddenly stopped.

The American farmer knows this as well as any other man in the world. You have sent his son to the trenches while he has enlisted at home to win this war. He manifests the same degree of patriotism and devotion that he has shown in every past struggle for human liberty.

Every consideration of self-interest has been appealed to. Our boys from the farms are in the trenches with your boys from the city, and every farmer feels that the protection and care of these boys—your boy and his boy alike—is largely in his keeping.

The men who serve here from these agricultural States represent these farmers, and it is fair to assume that they have the same degree of patriotism and intelligence in pointing out the needs of agriculture in America as you possess in calling attention to the needs of its commerce, or its munitions, or its shipping, or its manufactories. They would be false to their duty if they failed to do it, and I apprehend they will not shrink from that duty because of any charge of sectionalism or of class interest.

But in a large sense this legislation is less important to Montana and Utah and the Dakotas than it is to Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York.

The farmers of the West in asking for this relief were not thinking primarily of their own interests or their own profits. Indeed the element of profit has already been taken from him by legislation fixing the price of wheat and sugar. Every intelligent man to-day knows that there is little profit to the farmer in either crop.

You have fixed the price of the output of these western farms, but you have left the farmer a victim of the Harvester Trust and the other combines which multiply the prices of the equipment he must have to grow his crop and to move it to the markets of the world.

It would be futile to attempt, within the narrow limits of this debate, to show this in detail; but one single item in connection with the price of wheat will illustrate the entire question. Wheat and beets are the chief agricultural crops of my district and of my State. The farmer realizes \$1.80 per bushel net for his wheat. This wheat reaches the market in sacks manufactured in Calcutta. It costs him, in normal times, to sack his grain about 4 cents per bushel. Wholesale dealers are now distributing the sacks for the 1918 wheat crop to retail dealers. They are quoting a price on these sacks of 32 cents each. It will cost these farmers 16 cents per bushel to sack their grain this year, as against 4 cents before the war. What is true of sacks is true of binder twine, labor, and farm machinery.

The price of wheat was not fixed to help the western farmers. Immediately after the price was fixed wheat dropped 40 cents per bushel. The price was fixed in the interest of the consumers of wheat here and throughout the allied world.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WELLING. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to know when wheat was reduced and fell 40 cents a bushel whether the price of bread followed it down?

Mr. WELLING. I am not prepared to discuss that problem. It is a digression I do not care to go into.

Any stimulation this bill can possibly give to the production of wheat in the West is not a benefit to the West, where the wheat is grown. It is a benefit, primarily, to the congested centers of the East and to the war industries of the Nation. The men who stand here pleading for this pittance are not thinking of local self-interest. They are working to supply our allies and our armies and our industrial life with a product more vital at this moment than men, or guns, or ships. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WELLING. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELLING. This Congress will lose all sense of justice and proportion if it fails to recognize this. We vote billions of dollars to stimulate railroad efficiency and protect stock investments in railroad and other securities. We have justified cost plus contracts at the instigation of the hogs at Hog Island and elsewhere. We have poured advance payments into the laps of contractors to speed up production in every line of war activity. The farmers of America have approved this action

as an economic necessity. They will feel that the worst sort of class discrimination has been practiced against them if this meager assistance is not granted freely.

I think the relief asked for in this bill will not reach the farmers of my State or benefit them. There are but few men in Utah upon our farms who are so improvident as to be without seed at this late day. Few men in my State will be willing to mortgage their crop to get a loan of \$100 for seed. The banks of Utah and its Council of National Defense have anticipated this need and made every provision to meet it. The money provided in this bill will, in my judgment, never, to any extent, be taken from the Treasury of the United States. But, if the wheat farmers of the West can be made to feel, by favorable action upon this bill, that they are being considered and recognized, it will in every way assist them to meet with fortitude the additional burdens of this colossal conflict.

If gentlemen really comprehended the serious and grave problem of food shortage in America to-day, I think they would pause before taking a single additional farmer for the military service of the Nation. Not because he is unwilling to serve; not because he is less patriotic; not because every fiber of his nature is not beating true to the instincts of patriotism in this war. But because the highest form of service, the truest patriotism, and the loftiest ideals of humanity can be best served by the devoted efforts of these valiant men who work in the silent and unrewarded fields where no bugle blows and no crosses for heroic service are distributed. Alone beneath the stars at night he is fighting as faithfully as any man who ever faced a foreign foe.

At home last fall I saw and talked with hundreds of these men whose unremitting toil had added to the Nation's life and wealth. There was no word of criticism. They assumed that all were working and serving alike to sustain the Nation in the supreme crisis of this war. With insufficient help they toiled, not 8 hours but 12 and 14 hours a day, to make up for the absence of their sons. Every man was willing to have his own burdens multiplied in order to help out in the conflict.

It will be a sad day for America if this class of its citizenship should lose faith in the justice of her institutions or the righteousness of her laws.

You may have your Industrial Workers of the World, your foreign element, striking in factories and mines; there may be agitators who can temporarily organize an inconsiderable element of these farmers themselves against their own best interests, but the American farmer is still the greatest bulwark of American liberty to-day. He is quite as patriotic and loyal as any man who stands behind and supports the flag of this great land. He serves with less thought of profit and greater love of liberty than any other element in our population. He has consecrated himself, his boys, and his all to the cause of human liberty in this war. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto shall close in five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. I have an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. In 20 minutes. The gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from North Dakota, the gentleman from South Dakota, and the gentleman from Kansas. I wonder if we can not agree—

Mr. DILLON. Suppose the gentleman from Michigan gives three minutes to each Member who has a bona fide amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota may have three minutes, the gentleman from North Dakota may have three minutes—

Mr. NORTON. I have an amendment, and I want five minutes, but I will try to finish in three.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from North Dakota I am going to move to rise as soon as we pass this section.

Mr. NORTON. I have not spoken to-day.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Maryland takes three minutes—I withdraw that—the gentleman from Kansas takes three minutes; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] takes three minutes. I ask unanimous consent that debate may close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes, the time to be parceled out by the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if it is his purpose to rise after the 20 minutes is exhausted and if he will now ask unanimous consent to do that; otherwise I shall not agree to this 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say in response to the gentleman from Texas it is my purpose to rise—

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I will ask the gentleman to make that request and see if the committee is willing to do it.

Mr. LEVER. I want to make a statement; I am sure the committee will take my word. It is my purpose to ask the committee to rise after this section 2 is passed and section 3 is read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Now, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has control of the time.

Mr. NORTON. I have an amendment which I ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORTON: Page 4, line 22, after the word "of," strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the amendment that I propose provides for an increase in the amount to be given the Secretary of Agriculture to mobilize farm labor.

Unlike several of my good friends who have discussed this bill to-day, I do not believe that in passing this bill, or in enacting this proposed legislation, the Congress would be doing any more than it should do for the agricultural interests of the country.

I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to a cartoon which I hold in my hand, by Herbert Johnson. This cartoon appeared a short time ago in the Saturday Evening Post. I wish I could show this cartoon to each Member of the House at close range. The cartoon pictures an old farmer sitting in an outside office room waiting his turn to see the man in the private office. On the other side of the door from the farmer, and in the private office, are a number of business men, manufacturers, merchants, and men representing the so-called business interests of the country. These men are holding a conference with a representative of the President of the United States. It appears this representative may be a member of the Council of National Defense. The cartoonist pictures this representative of the President as saying to the business men with whom he is conferring: "The Government will help you get labor, advance you money, buy your products, assure you a good profit." In the outside office room, where the farmer is sitting, on the wall are a number of big placards. One of these placards reads:

We must have food! Society ladies will volunteer to help on the farms.

Another reads:

America must feed the world! Boy Scouts and school children replace farm laborers.

Another reads:

Food supply of first importance! Two million trained men taken from farms for other industries and Army.

The old farmer reading these placards as he waits and having overheard what the representative of the President has told the business men to whom he has given audience muses to himself and says, "Why don't he say that to me."

This cartoon has been the inspiration for a little verse by Mr. M. C. Miller, of Jamestown, N. Dak. It is very apropos to the discussion of this bill. I want to read it to you. I believe members of the committee will not only enjoy it but will also appreciate and be impressed by its logic and by the force of the argument it carries:

WHY DON'T HE SAY THAT TO ME?

The farmer sat in the anteroom,
Awaiting his turn to see
The man our President chose to meet
Production's emergency.
He heard him tell the industrials:
"We'll furnish cash and supplies
And liberal profit also grant
If to these demands you rise."
Then the farmer mused: "I can not see
Just why he doesn't say that to me."
"To subdue the wastes and till the soil
I have scripped and worked and slaved;
Three poor years and interest on loans
Have taken all I have saved.
Now, without cash and badly in debt,
I long to answer your call,
And give you, Woodrow, what you wish—
A victory crop in the fall.
But how to do this I can not see
Unless you decide to say that to me.

"I'll do my best with the bit I have,
The limit I'll go with you,
But I long to treble last year's crop
And bring a real bumper through.
I'd like to produce till you cried 'Enough,'
I'd like to block roads and trails
With solid trains to the great seaboard
Of wheat on your State-owned rails.
This I could do, these results you'd see,
If you would only say that to me."

[Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I have sent up an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DILLON: Page 4, line 19, after the word "prescribe," in line 19, insert:

"Provided, Well-known and reputed criminals and vagrant classes of alleged laborers shall not be transported from one State to another."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that. It is not germane to this bill.

Mr. DILLON. It is a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to be heard?

Mr. DILLON. Yes. It is a limitation upon this bill. It seems to me we have the right to restrict the kind of laborers that are going to be imposed on the people. It seems to me it needs no argument. It is a limitation.

I will ask the gentleman to withhold his point of order anyway. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, recently I had a letter from one of my farmer constituents, stating that he had entered into a contract with a farm laborer in which he agreed to pay for one year's labor on his farm at the rate of \$104 a month.

The farmers in my district are well able to pay for farm labor, but they want honest labor. In my State, our assessment roll shows \$2,400 for every man, woman, and child. Every man, woman, and child has on the average \$261 in the bank.

We are able to pay for our farm labor, but we want efficient labor. We have had some experience during harvest times in the past when the freight trains would come in from the East. There would be upon the tops of every freight train many honest, efficient laborers, and at the same time there were floaters, gamblers, and criminals from all parts of the country. Our jails were filled with criminals. I want to say to this committee we want to reserve our calaboses and our jails for our own citizens. [Applause.] We usually, in many of the towns, are compelled to have extra police to maintain order against the criminal classes that float in upon these occasions. In some instances citizens have organized and refused to allow them within the gates of the city. Many of them will not labor, will not work, will not toil. There are frequently robberies and larcenies and murders committed by some of these criminal classes. We ask you to protect these great farming sections of these States against the gambling and criminal classes. There ought to be a thorough examination made before any free rides shall be granted to the criminal classes. [Applause.]

The farmers of my State want an honest market and efficient farm labor. If they can get it, they will produce the food products. The people of my State are able to take care of local conditions in so far as seed is concerned. In those sections of the country where they have had a shortage of crops the aid provided in this bill is badly needed; it will help in increasing production and will help to win the war. To show the position taken by our State legislature in session last week I append the joint resolution passed by the legislature of my State:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota assembled in extraordinary session at the State Capital, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That whereas there has been a bill introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 7795) to appropriate money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed grain and feed for stock in certain enumerated Northwestern States, of which South Dakota is specifically named as one needing such Government aid:

"And whereas South Dakota is now honestly advertising the prosperity of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the legislature now in extraordinary session, with representatives present from all sections of the State, singly and collectively, declare that to the best of their knowledge and belief the

farmers of South Dakota are not asking for Federal aid to procure seed and feed; and that the State is amply able and willing to aid, if necessary, any farmer who needs aid and that the few individual or isolated cases that may exist, if any, can and will be taken care of either by township or county aid. And, further, that the advertising South Dakota has received through H. R. 7795 has done her a great injustice, as South Dakota has never been more prosperous than now, as proven by competent authority; be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this resolution be prepared by the Secretary of the Senate and delivered by United States mail to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States; to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; and to the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota now serving in the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

W. H. MCMASTER,
President of the Senate.
W. N. VAN CAMP,
Secretary of the Senate.
A. C. ROBERTS,
Speaker of the House.
W. GARDNER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I ask for a vote on my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 10, yeas 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEVER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, there has been a very strong effort by some distinguished members of this committee to stampede the committee into defeating this bill. However, in my judgment, the time that we have spent here upon it has been well spent, because it has been shown that the majority of the members of this committee are willing to look beyond and ahead of their own personal interests, and the majority of them are willing to forget the fact that this legislation does not give their own particular portions of the country any special benefit. I have supported this bill because I feel that it is needed to help win this war. The district I represent can not in any special way be benefited by it, because it is located a long way from this section. Other gentlemen here have supported the bill patriotically, led by the splendid chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. [Applause.] I want to say that whatever may have been said here by gentlemen, mostly by distinguished Democrats on the other side, in criticizing him has been said without avail, because Republicans and Democrats alike in this committee know that in the chairman of the Agricultural Committee we have a man who stands first and last for his country against party and against politics. [Applause.] He is an able chairman of this committee, and the fact that he has been able to lead us through the stampede that has been organized against this bill is an evidence of the fact not only that he is strong and popular with the members of this committee, but also an evidence of the fact that this bill has merit, that it is needed; and the fact that some gentlemen desire to defeat it because they are afraid of losing some of their cheap labor, afraid that it will be drawn to fields where it will receive more pay, is not going to defeat the bill. The right of the people of this country to go where they can go and get the best wages has been the law of the Nation in the past, and I hope that this bill, written into law, will establish for all time to come the fact that men shall not be held in servitude in any section of this country, but that the right guaranteed them by the Constitution to go freely from one part of the country to another will be enforced to the end of the history of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I ask to trespass upon your time briefly to call attention to the fact that the report of the Committee on Agriculture on the pending bill contains this statement:

The Committee on Agriculture recognizes that the farm-labor problem is the most serious one that confronts the American farmer to-day.

In that particular I agree with the committee, and it may be of interest to you to know what we are doing up in Michigan in relation to that. I believe we will secure labor upon the farm when we are ready to compete with the wages that are paid to the laboring man in the cities, factories, and elsewhere. I read from the Detroit Free Press of March 26, the day before yesterday. This is one of the leading papers in the State of

Michigan, circulating throughout the United States, and has this to say:

HELP FOR FARMERS BEING RECRUITED—VACATIONISTS, IN ADDITION TO BOYS, SOUGHT FOR WAR WORK.

To make sure there will be ample labor to cultivate and harvest crops, the United States Public Service Reserve started Monday a State-wide campaign here to enroll men who can give part time to the raising of an adequate food supply.

The campaign, according to J. T. Lynn, State director, has nothing to do with the boys' reserve. It is an entirely different movement to supplement the other endeavors in increasing the food supply by utilizing labor that would not otherwise be put to farm work.

"There is available a host of men," said Mr. Flynn, "who will be able and glad to devote a part of their time this summer to farm work, if the country needs them. College students, professional men, clerks, and other employees who have vacations should be willing to give them this year to productive work out of doors."

"Men who heretofore have worked at farming are sought especially. Already employers in many communities are getting together and agreeing to give up some of their men for limited periods to work on neighboring farms."

It is expected to raise an emergency force of 500,000 men throughout the United States who can give from one to two days to a month on neighboring farms. A special card has been prepared for the enrollment. It will have questions as to the time a recruit can give, between what dates and in what locality, and what the previous experience has been.

The local headquarters are at 43 Washington Boulevard, in charge of William B. Wreford.

This is one solution of the great problem of farm labor. It shows what Michigan is doing to solve the question. The action taken by this State can be taken by others. It is a question of organization not only for men but women and boys as well. Now is a time when everyone is called on to do his duty, and with sufficient help the solution of farm labor and production of sufficient food will be easy. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That, in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor or any other Federal, State, county, or municipal department, agency, or officer, or with any person or with any association of farmers, board of trade, chamber of commerce, or similar organization.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the committee substitute for H. R. 7795, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 419).

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on S. J. Res. 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

T. W. SIMS,
SAM RAYBURN,
S. E. WINSLOW,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
HOKE SMITH,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAYBURN. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that.

Mr. NORTON. I withdraw the point temporarily.

Mr. RAYBURN. The only thing this does is to allow the relatives of the men who are captured and in German prisons to take out insurance for them. The time expires April 12, and I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point.

Mr. NORTON. Does the bill permit anyone other than the soldier to make this application for insurance unless the soldier is a prisoner of war?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all, unless he is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy.

Mr. NORTON. It does not permit the relative of a soldier to take out insurance for him—

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, yes.

Mr. NORTON. If he is not captured?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, no; not at all. It allows anybody in the permitted class of beneficiaries to take out insurance for any man who before the 12th of April is a prisoner in the hands of the enemy.

Mr. NORTON. The 12th of April of this year?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, the conference report accepts the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. The Senate receded absolutely from its amendment.

Mr. NORTON. I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

TRAINING OF MEN ABOVE MILITARY AGE.

Mr. TILSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of physical training in the Army and Navy, and especially of men above military age.

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

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3401. An act to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy; and

S. 3404. An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any naval or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense punishable by confinement in the penitentiary by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officer's reappointment.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. RAGSDALE, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until Friday, March 29, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Ashley River, S. C., from the Standard Wharf of the Virginia Chemical Co., to Lambs, with a view to improving the channel to a depth of not less than 8 feet (H. Doc. No. 1001); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Little Sarasota Bay, Fla., from Sarasota Bay to Venice (H. Doc. No. 1002); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Harbor at Corea, Me. (H. Doc. No. 1003); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Buffalo Harbor, Buffalo Creek, and Buffalo Ship Canal, N. Y., with a view to increasing the

dimensions thereof to meet the demands of present and prospective commerce (H. Doc. No. 1004); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of mouth of the Cowlitz River, Wash., for the purpose of determining the advisability of the construction of a jetty or other means of deepening the channel (H. Doc. No. 1005); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MAPES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9956) to provide for the building of houses within the District of Columbia for Government employees and others, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 420), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9900) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell war supplies, materials, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 424), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9570) to amend articles 52 and 53 of section 1342 of the Revised Statutes as amended by an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 423), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8848) to correct the military record of John P. Chesley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 421), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of George Le Clear, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 422), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9744) granting an increase of pension to Henry Langly, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 11100) to amend section 92 of the act approved April 30, 1900, entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," as amended by section 8 of chapter 258, 36th Statutes at Large, approved May 27, 1910; to the Committee on the Territories.

Mr. RUSSELL: Resolution (H. Res. 295) regulating admission to the gallery; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 270) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State of South Dakota, indorsing the peace terms of the President of the United States and pledging cooperation and hearty support in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11101) granting a pension to Anna R. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11102) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11103) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 11104) granting a pension to Christian R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 11105) granting a pension to Mirinda E. Lineback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11106) for the relief of Robert W. Pool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McLEMORE: A bill (H. R. 11107) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11108) granting a pension to James D. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11109) granting an increase of pension to Rosalie I. L. McCoy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11110) granting a pension to James H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 11111) granting a pension to Annie Elizabeth Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11112) granting a pension to Martha E. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 11113) granting an increase of pension to John Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 11114) granting a pension to Melissa O. Downs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 11115) granting a pension to Christie Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 11116) granting a pension to Effie Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 11117) granting a pension to Mary A. Ames; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11118) granting an increase of pension to James McCammon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 11119) granting a pension to Jeanette Spencer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11120) granting an increase of pension to Harvey H. Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America offering the services of that organization to the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution adopted by a meeting at Petersburg, Alaska, held under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union asking for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Bar Association of the Hawaiian Islands favoring an increase of salaries for their judges; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also (by request), resolution of the St. Edna's Literary Society, Camden, N. J., relative to the independence of Ireland and other small nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of the Oakwood Farm Club, Macon, Mo., asking that the minimum price of \$1.50 per bushel

for all good corn unsold be established; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Missouri Federation of Women's Clubs against increase in postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Memorial of Employees' Association of Lower Naugatuck Valley, Conn., favoring passage of bill relative to payment of excess profits and income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of the Scandinavian Temperance Union, of Moline, Ill., representing 2,000 voters, for the prohibition of the use of grains or other foodstuffs in the manufacture of malt, vinous, or fermented liquors during the period of the present war in order to further the conservation of food; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of members of the Southern Medical Association, supporting House bill 9563, to give officers of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army advanced rank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Waseca County (Minn.) Clergymen's Association, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. J. B. Jackson, William E. Mason, Mabel L. Queen, Mrs. L. P. Norvell, and 39 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Woonsocket (R. I.) District Medical Society, favoring passage of Senate bill 3748 and House bill 9563, creating advance rank for officers of Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Memorial of Polish people of New Britain, Conn., protesting against the new partition of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Memorial of Weleetka (Okla.) Council of Defense relative to crushing propaganda of the Huns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of Civil War veterans of Los Angeles, Cal., asking an increase of \$25 per month in pensions of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of the eleventh congressional district of New York relative to deporting enemy aliens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Wakefield, R. I., favoring passage of act granting citizenship to American women who marry foreigners; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Workingmen's Independent Political Club, of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of the act to give soldiers and sailors the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Memorial of Bethany English Lutheran Church, of New Castle, Pa., favoring war emergency prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, New Castle, Pa., for war emergency prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of John Dillon Literary Club, of Meriden, Conn., pledging loyalty and allegiance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Cleavenger Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Spencer, W. Va., favoring the passage of pension legislation granting soldiers of the Civil War \$50 per month pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.