

In this connection I refer again to something that I called attention to some time ago, in a report from the Committee on Public Information citing Gen. Pershing as authority for the denial of a report that a sergeant had made. I can very well imagine that a sergeant might see certain things that occurred to an American soldier at the battle front that Gen. Pershing did not see and would not know anything about and would have no means of knowing. I called attention to it at that time, and the doubt that existed in my mind whether Gen. Pershing had ever made any such statement. I am rather confirmed in that suspicion by subsequent developments, as Gen. March, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, has been compelled over his own name to issue a denial to certain statements made by the committee in his name.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 4637.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE STERLING.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the resolutions of the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
October 17, 1918.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of 20 members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The resolutions (S. Res. 322) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Under the second resolution the Presiding Officer appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. SHEERMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. VARDAMAN.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 24, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, October 21, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that Thy brooding wings are over us, Thy loving arms about us, Thy spirit within us, to guide us through the voyage of life; that our physicians have in hand the terrible scourge which has been visited upon our people. May they continue their skill until it shall be removed from the world. We thank Thee that Field Marshal Foch, by his skill, energy, and courage, has in hand the destruction of militarism and autocracy; that all the world may rejoice in peace and happiness; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 19, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the agreement we had the other day, I move that the House adjourn to meet on next Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous agreement, adjourned until Thursday, October 24, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 13111) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire additional lands for the naval training station, naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13112) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire additional lands for the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 13113) to authorize the Chief of Ordnance to enter into agreements relative to repairs to public highways and the cost thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. 13114) granting a pension to Paulina Zabel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Resolution (H. Res. 447) to pay Benjamin C. Green for one month's services; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. WALSH laid on the Clerk's desk a petition of the City Council of Worcester, Mass., protesting against proposed tax on income from municipal bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 24, 1918.

Rev. A. T. Guttery, of Liverpool, England, president elect of the National Free Church Council of England and Wales, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, we thank Thee for the mercies of this day. Its tidings of valor and victory assure us of Thy constant governance in the affairs of men. Save us from pride in the hour of triumph as Thou did save us from despair in the day of trial. Thy call to us is great beyond our merits; we pray Thee to give us grace and power that Thy will may be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Bless, we pray Thee, the President of this Nation and his counselors, and also the allied rulers, statesmen, commanders, and peoples who share our task in these days of war. Let Thy favor abide with our sons, who contend for us on land and sea and above the clouds, and give mercy to our daughters, who must serve and suffer at home.

Remove, O Lord, the illness that afflicts the homes of this land and give wisdom to those who battle with the pestilence that threatens us.

We pray Thee to give victory to our arms, not that we may boast in might, but that through triumph there may come to our troubled world an abiding peace, in which Christ, Thine Eternal Son, shall reign forever.

These blessings we pray in the name of the beloved Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1918.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOE T. ROBINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBINSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

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

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$12,800 required by the District of Columbia for purchases of fire apparatus urgently needed, etc. (S. Doc. No. 293), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$195,000,000 required for the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, etc. (S. Doc. No. 294), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$12,000 required by the Medical Department of the Army for the Army Medical Museum, fiscal year 1919 (S. Doc. No. 295), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer:

S. 3735. An act to provide for enlistments in the National Guard of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to establish a reserve of the Public Health Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Drake Bullard Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to the tax on farm-loan bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Minnesota Pharmaceutical Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., and a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Koch Vegetable Tea Co., of Winona, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed tax on nonbeverage alcohol, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Horace Lowry, of Minneapolis; John R. Mitchell, of St. Paul; Charles W. Gordon, of St. Paul; George H. Prince, of St. Paul; and Eli S. Warner, of St. Paul, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the classification of public utility corporations for taxation by themselves in the pending revenue bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

ABSENT KENTUCKY VOTERS AT NAVAL STATION.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, on last Monday the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] had read a telegram from the vice chairman of the Republican State campaign committee of Kentucky complaining about some action of the commandant at the Great Lakes Training Station, near Chicago. In that telegram the vice chairman complains that a political preference was shown. I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, inclosing one from the commandant of the station in reference to this matter, and I ask that they may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, October 24, 1918.

Hon. J. C. W. BECKHAM,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR BECKHAM: I am sending you herewith a copy of a telegram from Capt. W. A. Moffett, commandant of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, giving the facts with reference to the statement contained in a telegram which Senator New put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I explained the matter to Senator New that Capt. Moffett did exactly right, and has given permission alike to Democrats and Republicans who wish to give opportunity to men to vote who are in the naval service on duty at Great Lakes.

Sincerely, yours,
(Inclosure.)

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Dictated by the Secretary and signed in his absence.

[Copy of telegram.]

GREAT LAKES, ILL., October 22, 1918—9.45 a. m.

Hon. JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.:

With reference my telegram in regard to Senator New, the following telegram just received from Mr. Thatcher, vice chairman Kentucky Republican State committee:

"Your wire to-day. Will send representatives to Great Lakes in accordance therewith. As there is no provision of law in Kentucky for any commission to be appointed to arrange for absent votes, and as party who was there on the 11th instant came as the partisan representative of his party and of Gov. Stanley, who is himself a candidate for office, this committee very naturally was unwilling to accept the result of that party in the matter, especially so as the applications for ballots received through said party's effort were so much larger for the Democrats than for the Republicans, we felt, and feel, that the Republican organization should have the same facilities exactly as accorded to the Democratic organization, and we appreciate the fact that the like courtesy has been accorded us."

As stated before, both parties have been treated exactly alike in all election activities at Great Lakes, and every effort has been made to keep these activities strictly nonpartisan.

W. A. MOFFETT.

[Copy of telegram.]

GREAT LAKES, ILL., October 21, 1918—7.30 p. m.

Hon. JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Navy Department, Washington:

Associated Press reports that Senator New, of Indiana, read in the Senate a telegram from the chairman of the Kentucky Republican State Central Committee that his committee had been denied privilege granted the Kentucky Democratic State Central Committee to get in touch with the Kentucky voters in this station. Our understanding of the law and of Navy regulations is that in the matter of affording opportunity to voters in the service to vote by mail no political party is to be permitted to canvass the voters or to electioneer on this station. Certain gentlemen from Kentucky, with a letter from the governor, arrived here requesting that arrangements be made so that the voters of Kentucky might be permitted to vote by mail. A notice was therefore inserted in the Bulletin, the station daily paper, directing all Kentucky voters desiring to vote to present themselves at the Athletic Building on the morning of October 11, where the facilities would be afforded them. No mention of party was made in this notice. In fact the same nonpartisan procedure was followed with Kentucky as with all other States, the men simply being advised of time and place to assemble.

Later two gentlemen claiming to represent the Kentucky Republican State Central Committee arrived here and said the committee had been told that members of the Kentucky Democratic State Central Committee had been afforded opportunity to canvass the Kentucky voters on this station and asked for similar privileges. When informed of what had been done, and after being shown the printed notice and their attention called to the fact that it was addressed to all Kentucky voters, without reference to party, they apparently were satisfied and left here taking a copy of the notice with them.

This morning a telegram was received from Mr. Thatcher, vice chairman Kentucky Republican State Central Committee, claiming the authorities here had been deceived as to the character of the first delegation, and that in truth and in fact it had been a delegation of Kentucky Democrats who had canvassed the Kentucky Democrat voters, and that as a result Kentucky Republican boys had been denied the right of franchise.

Early this morning a telegram was sent to Mr. Thatcher informing him that while we would refuse to mention political parties, a notice would be published arranging for another meeting of all Kentucky voters at Great Lakes, and that his committee would be welcome at that meeting. No discrimination whatever has been shown in this case, and the procedure has been identical in every respect with all other elections conducted here. I consider Senator New's criticism of me in the Senate, while doubtless based on misinformation, entirely unjust, and request, if you approve, that you take steps to have the facts stated where this injustice can be corrected.

W. A. MOFFETT.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a letter here from Mr. L. D. Greene, who was the representative sent to the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, giving an account of his visit there and what he did. This letter, together with those that have been read, I think show absolutely the injustice done by the telegram which was read in the Senate last Monday. I send this letter to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., October 20, 1918.

Hon. J. C. W. BECKHAM,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

My DEAR SENATOR: Under a law as enacted by the 1913 session of the Kentucky Legislature providing in substance that voters who are absent from the State of Kentucky, either in the military or naval service, under certain provisions be given the right to register and vote, I was asked by the State committee to proceed to the Great Lakes Naval Training Station to procure affidavits under this law from all Kentucky boys now stationed at the Great Lakes. I requested and received from Gov. Stanley a letter of introduction, which letter in substance stated that I was to afford the Kentucky boys an opportunity to vote, and I presented this letter to the commandant at the Great Lakes Station and received most courteous treatment and consideration. The commandant at the Great Lakes directed or had published in the Official Bulletin a notice directing the attention of the Kentucky boys to the fact that I was there and in the interest of the absent voter, and that they would be given an opportunity at a certain time and place to register for the purpose of voting, and a certain building was set apart for this purpose. As I have just indicated above, all Kentucky boys who requested were given passes for the purpose of voting. I took the affidavits of all Kentucky boys who pre-

sented themselves in this building at the time set apart, both Democratic and Republican, and never at any time made any distinction between the two.

The Republican ballots, which numbered more than 50, upon my return, were delivered personally to the local Republican leaders who assured me that these ballots would be mailed to the county court clerks of their respective counties and that ballots would be sent forthwith to these boys at the Great Lakes Training Station. I never, at any time during the three or four days I was in the naval training station, made mention of the fact that I was a member of any non-partisan commission as our Kentucky law does not provide for a non-partisan commission. I was the only man sent to the Great Lakes and registered all voters who presented themselves for registration, and delivered their ballots to the proper authorities irrespective of whether they were Republicans or Democrats.

Very respectfully,

L. D. GREENE.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I first desire to say that in looking over the RECORD of last Monday I discover that through pure inadvertence I referred to this incident at Great Lakes in the sense that the men had voted, when I meant, of course, that they were registered, not voted. I knew very well, of course, that they had not reached the voting stage and that they were called upon to register and not to vote. With that explanation I will proceed.

Mr. President, it was not my purpose or desire, and I do not think what I said warranted the inference, that I meant what I said on Monday as a criticism of the officers in command of the Great Lakes station or of the Navy Department here. It was a perfectly natural and a perfectly proper thing for the commandant of the Great Lakes Naval Station to accept the representations of a man who presented himself there bearing credentials from the Governor of the State of Kentucky and to permit him as that representative to see the Kentucky voters and to register them, all of which he did.

But, Mr. President, the facts are exactly as I stated them, and the criticism that I made of the Governor of Kentucky I repeat, renew, and emphasize. The fact is, Mr. President, that what was done was to appoint a representative of one party to act in the registering of these votes, whereas I think the spirit of the election laws of this country, if not the strict letter of them, requires that both parties shall be represented in all matters of that kind. For instance, in the State of Indiana a Republican governor appointed representatives of the Republican and Democratic Parties, and those representatives went together to the various cantonments, to the Great Lakes station, and to all places where there are soldiers and sailors voting. They took Republican and Democratic clerks to register them, and the whole matter was done exactly as it would have been done at a regularly constituted election booth at the time of an election. That is the manner in which I think it should have been conducted in this instance, and it is because it was not so conducted that the Republicans of the State of Kentucky entered what I think was a perfectly proper protest; and that is what I put into the RECORD.

I have a further telegram from them since that time, in which they say:

LOUISVILLE, KY., October 23, 1918.

HON. HARRY S. NEW,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Facts are exactly as stated in my former wire. One L. D. Greene, personally a clever gentleman but an active, skillful, prominent Democratic politician of Louisville, was the representative of Kentucky Democratic organization and of Gov. Stanley, candidate for United States Senator; and he went to Great Lakes, as detailed heretofore, to get Democratic and not Republican votes. He went without knowledge, advice, or consent of any Republican organization or candidate. As his credentials from Gov. Stanley were apparently couched in official and nonpartisan terms, and as doubtless the authorities at Great Lakes did not know of Gov. Stanley's candidacy and apparently were not advised thereof, it seems that they were lead to believe that Greene came there purely as the legally authorized nonpartisan representative from Kentucky to arrange for and supervise the preparation and mailing of applications for ballots of all Kentucky voters there, and in consequences accorded to Greene ample opportunity to reach voters there. However, applications for such ballots filed in Kentucky county clerks' offices show twice as many Democratic as Republican applicants for ballots from Great Lakes, although we have every reason to believe that there are as many or more Kentucky Republican voters there as there are Kentucky Democratic voters there. We believe that Kentucky Republican voters there may have better understood the fact that Greene was at the station as the partisan representative of his party than did the station authorities, and doubtless a majority of Kentucky Republican voters there were unwilling to turn in to him or through him applications for ballots. We submit that Greene should have frankly avowed that he visited Great Lakes as the representative of his party and of Gov. Stanley's candidacy, so that authorities there might have provided that representatives of the Kentucky Republican organization might have been present at the time the polling of applications of Kentucky voters was had under Greene's supervision. As stated in my former wire, where a nonpartisan commission is provided by law, as is the case in Kentucky, camp authorities should admit representatives to their camps to assist absent voters in voting exactly on the same terms, and the best plan is to fix the same day or days for this purpose, just as is now being done at Camp Zachary Taylor. The authorities at Great Lakes have wired me that representatives of this committee could now come to Great Lakes and meet voters there as we had asked, and our representatives have gone there for that purpose. Thus our position in this mat-

ter has been recognized and justified. Many Kentucky voters there whose legal residences are in towns and cities requiring registration of voters can not be reached now in time to permit them to take necessary steps enabling them to register and vote, and the Republicans will doubtless lose many votes there on this account; but we hope to yet reach voters there whose residences are in rural districts where no registration is required and to render them necessary information and assistance enabling them to vote. Many thanks for your efforts and courtesy in this matter. All we ask is a square deal, and no fair-minded Democrat would wish to deny this.

M. H. THATCHER,

Vice Chairman Republican State Campaign Committee.

LOUISVILLE, KY., October 23, 1918.

HON. HARRY S. NEW,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our contention has been upheld, and we have received advice from Great Lakes authorities that our representatives may now come there and reach Kentucky voters, as desired by us, and our representatives have gone there, although it is now too late to enable Kentucky voters there living in cities requiring registration of voters to complete in time their papers enabling them to vote. L. D. Greene, the representative of Kentucky Democratic organization and of Gov. Stanley's candidacy for United States Senate, according to his own statement, turned in to county clerks in Kentucky twice as many Democratic as Republican applications for ballots from Great Lakes, whereas there are certainly as many Kentucky Republican voters there as there are Democratic voters there, and as we have every reason to believe there should be more Kentucky Republicans there than Kentucky Democrats. Greene was in no wise the representative of any Republican organization or candidate. No Republican organization or candidate would select a Democratic worker to poll Republican votes, and no Democratic organization or candidate would select a Republican worker to poll Democratic votes. No doubt majority of Kentucky Republican voters at Great Lakes sensed the situation and declined to give their applications for ballots to Greene, the Democratic representative.

M. H. THATCHER,

Vice Chairman Kentucky State Republican Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NEW. I do, for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator a question. I understood the Senator to say that the Democratic applications to vote were about double the Republican applications to vote?

Mr. NEW. The telegram so states.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator to be reading from a telegram. Does he dispute that as a fact?

Mr. NEW. No. I am simply reading a telegram that has been sent to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the telegram states that there were twice as many Democrats as Republicans applying to vote?

Mr. NEW. The telegram states, as I read, "that out of the applicants for such ballots filed in the Kentucky county clerk's office there were twice as many Democratic as Republican applicants for ballots. But the telegram also says there are as many as or more Republican voters there than there are Kentucky Democratic voters there."

Mr. WILLIAMS. That involves one assertion of fact and another assertion of opinion. The assertion of fact is that there were twice as many Democrats; the assertion of opinion is that this particular gentleman thinks that there might have been as many Republicans as Democrats.

Now, has the Senator any information that this man Greene—I understand his name to be Greene—committed any fraud or did anything dishonest or was crooked at all in any respect about either receiving votes or applications? And has that man Greene had any control over these original applications of voters in Kentucky to vote? Could he have controlled it in any way in the world? Did not these applications come even before he went to camp?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, as to what Mr. Greene might, could, or should have done I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not ask that question of the Senator from Indiana. I asked the question what he had done, not what he might, could, should, or would have done.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Mississippi, I desire to say that I am not making any personal attack on Mr. Greene. I am simply saying that to have sent the representative of one party there without consultation with or the knowledge of the other party was contrary to the spirit, at least, if not to the letter of the election laws of this country, and if not contrary to the letter of them, it should be contrary to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood that. Now, I understand that the Senator makes no charge of any description, because he dares not, in his regard—

Mr. NEW. It is not necessary for me to make any charge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean, in your regard for truthfulness you dare not—otherwise, of course, you dare anything, and so do I; but I mean that you dare not, in your regard for truthfulness, make any charge against Mr. Greene having been in any way corrupt or wrong-headed—

Mr. NEW. Oh, Mr. President, that is not the issue here at all, and I decline to enter into any argument on that question. I simply say that the facts here show—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, now, I want to ask the Senator one more question, and—

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to ask the Senator one more question.

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

Mr. NEW. No, Mr. President; I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the Senator declines to yield.

Mr. NEW. I decline to yield for an argument; yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to ask a question, if the Senator would permit me.

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

Mr. NEW. I prefer, Mr. President, to complete my remarks; and the Senator can answer in his own time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Of course I shall not intrude upon the Senator. I merely wanted to ask if there was anything about the return of the vote—

Mr. NEW. Since the Senator merely wants to ask a question, I shall not deprive him of the privilege. The Senator may ask it. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My question is, Does the Senator contend that there was anything incorrect about the return of the votes from those camps?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in answer to that question I will say "No." I have no contention to make upon that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought not.

Mr. NEW. But I do contend, and I renew my contention, that it was wrong in spirit to send there the partisan representative of a candidate for Senator from the State of Kentucky, even though that candidate be the present governor of Kentucky and had authority to send the man there. I do say that in the spirit of fairness, and in the spirit of justice also, to the men who are there at the Great Lakes Station as soldiers or sailors, wearing the uniform of the United States, that they should have been treated with strict impartiality, and that they were not so treated.

I have no criticism to make, as I said before, on the officers of the Great Lakes Station; I have no criticism to make on the Navy Department. My criticism goes strictly and solely to the one point, that the Republican voters of the State of Kentucky—the Republican State organization there—were not represented, were not consulted, and had no opportunity whatever to do what the spirit of the law, at least, contemplates they should have had a perfect right to do.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say a few words here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the Senator from Kentucky had previously addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me just a moment before he asks the question?

Mr. BECKHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to say that I twice served with Owsley Stanley in the House of Representatives for 8 or 10 years—I do not remember how long; possibly only 6 years. I know him to be the soul of honor. I know him to be absolutely uncorrupt and incorruptible, and I do not believe that any insinuation or intimation coming from any source whatsoever, even though it come from a United States Senator, can render impeachable a character which I know to be unimpeachable; a gentleman of gentlemen; standing upon his own shoe soles at all times, with the courage of a gentleman and the truthfulness and integrity of a gentleman.

Now, all that is charged here is that he sent a man, who, as he thought, was nonpartisan, although he was a Democrat, to

receive and collect the votes at a camp; and the Senator from Indiana dares not charge that the man did not receive and collect the votes properly and rightly and truthfully. I have already challenged him to say that, and he has declined to say it. The citizens of Kentucky in those camps voted, and voted their sentiments, and their votes were counted.

Mr. WATSON. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I challenge the Senator to say that they were not rightfully and truthfully and correctly counted.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a moment; one at a time.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield to the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in the first place I have not charged Mr. Greene with having registered some of the Kentuckians at the Great Lakes Naval Station and denied others the right to register. I have made no such charge as that; but the point is that Mr. Greene went there as the representative of one party and one candidate without due notice to the other party and without the other party having opportunity to be represented with him. So we are in the position here of having to take Mr. Greene's word as to whether the voters were all given opportunity or not. With due respect to Mr. Greene, whose integrity I do not for a moment challenge, I do think that he himself would have been in much better position, as everybody else concerned would have been, if a spirit of fairness and justice had been shown in the first instance and both political parties given a right to be represented. That is all there is to it, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Again, Mr. President—

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait just one moment; will you give me a little bit more time?

Mr. President, I now understand that the Senator from Indiana, who is notorious as a partisan Republican, does not dare make the statement that anything was wrong about the receipt or the collection of the ballots or the returns of that election?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. NEW. I do dare to make the statement, not that there was fraud, perhaps, in the manner in which the matter was conducted—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that is all I have asked.

Mr. NEW. But I do dare to say that the proceeding was wrong—absolutely so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, the Senator from Indiana throws himself back upon the original idea that there ought to have been at least two men appointed, or three, and they ought to have represented both parties; but he does not make the statement, and he dare not make the statement, because his regard for truthfulness, notwithstanding his partisanship, is too great for him to make it, that there was anything incorrect or wrong in the vote or returns. He does not deny that every Kentuckian's vote cast in that camp was counted in the election in Kentucky. That is all I want to know; that is all you want to know; that is all the country wants to know. The sum total of an election is this: Were the ballots fairly delivered and fairly counted? Even in the absence of a charge that they were not, I want to say that Owsley Stanley represented the State of Kentucky in this Union, and represented it honestly and fairly, and that if there had been anything wrong in collecting those ballots or reporting them Owsley Stanley would have been the first man in the State of Kentucky to denounce it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

TWO THOUSAND QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present a letter which I have received from the Review of Reviews. There was considerable discussion, Mr. President, as the Senate will remember, in regard to their book "Two Thousand Questions and Answers About the War." They ask me to have printed their explanation. I think it leaves the fact unchanged as to the first edition, at all events, but I ask, in fairness to them, that the letter be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE AMERICAN REVIEW OF REVIEWS,
New York, October 14, 1918.

Senator HENRY CAROT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I am obliged to you for your letter of October 9, relative to the book *Two Thousand Questions and Answers About the War*, which came while I was out of town.

We are naturally anxious that you should have the full and real facts of the episode before you rather than partial evidence that seems puzzling or contradictory to you, and perhaps you will be patient enough to read this explanation:

In June, 1918, we were first apprised of the presence of certain paragraphs in the book which should be changed, and immediately set about a revision, which continued through the summer.

In late August it seemed fairly certain that the revised edition would be ready at or about the time that unsealed circulars, with their slow handling and delivery, could get back orders. Circulars were sent out soliciting subscriptions which could only be filled from the new and revised edition, since we had had no copies of the original book for sale since June.

It was after the mailing of those circulars, from mailing agencies detached from our office, had been under way for about two weeks that the public attack on the book appeared. This was so widely noticed that it seemed best to arrange for additional reading and approval of the book (for instance, by our department of war and our department of justice), to make sure the second edition was beyond criticism, before it was finally printed. This is making the revised edition a month or more later in reaching the public than had been anticipated when the circulars were sent out in late August and early September.

In these circulars there was not, as you note, any reference to the revision of the edition. But you will appreciate from the facts given above, that, the circulars having been written and printed long before the book was publicly criticized, our book department had no criticism to answer and felt the new edition would speak for itself.

It is obviously true that the sample question as to the *Lusitania* warning should not have gone on the circular envelope.

Perhaps it may serve to make you understand how it came about, even while disapproving it—as we do—if we explain that the people in our book department are such fire-hot proallies that they were totally unconscious that these words could be taken as from any but patriotic Americans, for whom the question, "Did the Germans warn about the *Lusitania*?" must absolutely be equivalent to asking, "Did the barbarous Germans insult us by warning?" etc.—the curious historical incident being the thing in mind at the time—with such certainty of our horror and detestation of the crime that followed as to assume them.

Such "legends," as you doubtless know, are sometimes printed on advertising circulars with the idea that a striking topic will arouse curiosity in the person receiving the missive sufficient to insure its being opened and examined. Other legends, not open to criticism, were used on the envelopes of other blocks of circulars sent out to distribute this same book.

In your letter of October 9 you offer to have our formal statement printed in the RECORD. We should appreciate your doing so and a fuller and more exact statement is inclosed for that purpose, if you are still inclined to do this.

Thanking you for your very evident intention to be fair to us,

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES D. LANIER.

THE ACTUAL FACTS—"TWO THOUSAND QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE WAR."

Erroneous statements having been printed concerning the publishing of the volume "Two Thousand Questions and Answers About the War," the actual facts are here set down:

In February, 1918, the book was finished by editors employed by us for this special work. Some portions of the compilation were made up of matter written and published in Australia and in free circulation there under the British censor. Of the paragraphs which were found later to be out of harmony with the policy and attitude of America, practically all were from this Australian matter. That these paragraphs did not challenge the attention of the editors before publication was due to their British origin and to their free circulation in countries of our allies.

In April the volume was published.

One hundred copies were sent by us for review to some of the most prominently patriotic Americans and to a few distinguished persons among our allies. Only commendations came in return, including one from a well-known college president, saying that he was using the book as a textbook for his lectures on patriotism and another from King Albert, of Belgium, characterizing the volume as "another example of the earnest way our great ally is proceeding to further the cause of right and justice."

Between four and five thousand copies of the first edition were sent to subscribers. Not one adverse criticism came from them to us, all this showing how easy it was to overlook 20 or 30 paragraphs out of 2,000.

In June a friendly critic brought to our attention these paragraphs. Immediately and on our own initiative we canceled the orders for a second printing and set about a thorough revision.

The first edition had before this been exhausted; no more copies of it were ever printed. Circulars sent out two months later were therefore obviously and of necessity to distribute the revised edition.

To make sure that the revised edition should be beyond criticism we asked the French High Commission to America, our own War Department, and our Department of Justice to read, revise, and approve every word of the book as rewritten. The details of the revision were under the direction of a university professor of history obtained through the suggestion of the authorities at Washington, we having asked for the suggestion.

In September a violent public attack was made on this book, which the publishers had withdrawn from print more than two months before, this being fully known.

Accompanying the attack were pretended extracts from the book, which, by omitting sentences and context and changing the wording, gave an erroneous impression of the spirit and intent of the volume.

It was of course intended that the original edition should be 100 per cent American.

The revised edition speaks for itself.

THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS Co.

THE BLACK SLAVES OF PRUSSIA (S. DOC. 296).

Mr. LODGE. I ask to have printed as a public document a very brief pamphlet entitled "The Black Slaves of Prussia," by the bishop of Zanzibar, Rev. Frank Weston, D. D., addressed to Gen. Smuts, of the Transvaal, giving an account of German treatment of the native tribes. The article is very short, and I think it will be read with the deepest interest by all the Senate as it was read by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SHALL THE HUN PAY NO PENALTY FOR ALL HIS CRIMES?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article printed in the *Detroit Saturday Night*, of date October 19, 1918, under the heading of "Shall the Hun pay no penalty for all his crimes?" This article purports to give, I think, in chronological order a number of the more important crimes against humanity which have been clearly established. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD as an answer to the following statement made by Prince Maximilian, the German chancellor, in his address before the Reichstag of two days ago, in which he said:

Our first and last thought is for the brave men who are defending themselves against superior forces, and whom we must defend against unjust charges. No one must think he can attack our army without also attacking the honor of our people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the *Detroit Saturday Night*.]

SHALL THE HUN PAY NO PENALTY FOR ALL HIS CRIMES?—HERE ARE SOME SAMPLES OF HIS OFFENSES, FROM WHOSE JUST CONSEQUENCES HE IS NOW BRAZENLY ATTEMPTING TO ESCAPE—IS THE WORLD TO HELP HIM DO IT?

[By N. H. Bowen.]

During the past few months there has been a marked increase in the number of people in America who believe that there should be proper steps taken, when the end of the war is reached, to punish those who are guilty of having caused it in the first place and those who have inspired or committed the awful crimes and excesses that have marked its course.

There is also in Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other allied countries a very powerful demand for legal action against the criminals, and this demand has been expressed with especial force since the recent peace flurry and the renewal of Hunnish "frightfulness" on sea and land.

The following is a very much abbreviated list of crimes committed by the Germans and their allies during the war. It is not intended to be complete—the specific cases cited are merely samples. Many heinous misdeeds, such as diplomatic lies, plots against neutrals, murders of neutral citizens, destruction of neutral property, are purposely omitted, as the list is already long enough. The purpose is to present to the reader some material on which to base a conclusion as to whether the modern Huns ought to be allowed to go their way after the war, unpunished and unmarked, like men with clean hands and souls.

DEEDS OF THE U-BOAT PIRATES.

They sank the steamer *Lusitania*, with 1,906 souls on board, of whom 1,134 perished, including hundreds of women and children, and then struck a medal to commemorate the heroic event.

They sank British and Swedish merchant ships in the North Sea in the fall of 1917 and shelled the lifeboats, killing many civilians. The details were reported by the Norwegian newspapers.

They sank the British ship *Belgian Prince*, made the survivors leave the lifeboats, which they wrecked, and then submerged with their victims helpless on the deck of the submarine. The story was told by the chief engineer of the *Belgian Prince*, who was rescued, 33 of his comrades being drowned.

They shelled the United States transport *Ticonderoga*, killing many, after the steamer was helpless, and submerged while a lifeboat with 17 survivors was tied to the submarine. This occurred after the Germans had opened the present peace negotiations.

They sank the Japanese ship *Hirano Maru*, drowning about 300, and fired two torpedoes at the American destroyer *Sterrett*, which was picking up the survivors.

They sank the Irish Channel mail steamer *Leinster*, with about 750 aboard, of whom only about 150 were saved. This boat is described as a coasting passenger steamer about like the boats plying from New York to Fall River. The victims were of course mostly Irish, for whose welfare the Germans have been so solicitous.

They torpedoed the steamer *Admiral Ganteaume*, with 2,500 refugees on board. Luckily, only 50 lives were lost. This was the first notable attack on a nonmilitary craft by a submarine, and was especially criminal because it was committed in broad daylight, when it must have been evident that the boat was crowded with civilians.

They torpedoed the steamer *Falaba*, and the crew of the U boat laughed and jeered at the victims struggling in the waters. Among the 111 victims was an American, L. C. Thrasher, perhaps the first to perish from this cause.

MURDER OF CIVILIANS.

They murdered 32 civilians in the Place d'Universite at Liege. This was established to the satisfaction of the Bryce Commission of Inquiry.

They massacred about 400 civilians at Andenne, Belgium. The authority for this is the Bryce report.

They killed many scores of civilians (perhaps 200) at Dinant, many of these being "executed" in the prison courtyard.

They massacred about 50 civilians at Gerbeville, France. (Report of French commission.)

At Haut-de-Vormont, France, they murdered a widow, Guillaume by name, 78 years old. This old woman's body was mutilated. (French official report.)

They put to death 50 innocent priests and thousands of innocent Catholics. (Statement of Cardinal Mercier.)

They killed 26 priests in the diocese of Malines alone. (Belgian official report.)

They tortured and shot the priest of Duechen, Belgium, an invalid, aged 87. (Belgian official report.)

They killed, near Beaumetz, France, two old men and an old woman, whose bodies were found by the British in a garden, with the brains hanging from their cloven skulls. The only excuse discovered was that they had refused to bake bread for the Germans. (Reported by the Bryce commission on the testimony of a British sergeant.)

They murdered 4,500 noncombatants in Serbia in August, 1914. Some were buried alive, many tortured, etc. This is the testimony of Prof. H. A. Reiss, of the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, who made an inquiry for the Swiss section of the Geneva convention.

They killed by murder, starvation, or hardships, with all the accompaniments of cruelty imaginable, thousands upon thousands of Armenians, the number having been estimated as high as half the Armenian population, totalling perhaps 4,500,000. While the Turks were immediately responsible, the Germans are morally so, having refused to interfere to save the Christian victims of their allies.

They executed a little French Boy Scout because he would not reveal information about the French troops. This was revealed by a letter found on a dead German officer, who described the boy's proud courage before the firing squad, and added the bochian comment: "Infatuated wretch! It was a pity to see such wasted courage."

MAKING WAR ON CIVIL POPULATION.

They dropped bombs on Antwerp, the first atrocity of this kind, killing many civilians.

Their warships bombarded the British summer resort towns of Scarborough and Whitby, killing many civilians.

They made repeated air raids on Paris and London, dropping bombs in purely residential sections and killing in all hundreds of civilians.

They bombed Bucharest from airplanes, killing hundreds of people, including many women and children.

They repeatedly shelled and bombed the open city of Nancy, killing many civilians.

They bombed the city of Padua, killing many civilians.

They repeatedly shelled Paris with long-range artillery, under conditions making anything but indiscriminate destruction impossible. One shell struck the church of St. Gervais during a service and killed nearly 100 people, mostly women and children.

CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

A Bavarian soldier wrote to a girl in Germany that at "Batonville" (Badonviller) he bayoneted seven women and four young girls in five minutes. (French official report.)

Near Ypres they shot two girls, about 6 and 8 years old, whose dead bodies were found in the upper room of a house by British soldiers. (Belgian official report and Bryce official report, evidence being given by at least two witnesses.)

They violated Belgian nuns. This is on the authority of Cardinal Mercier, who states in his letter to the cardinals and bishops of Germany, that to his knowledge there had been several outrages of this kind. He describes the evidence as "very precise," but quite naturally refused to subject the victims to a public inquiry.

At Malines, near Antwerp, a German soldier, one of a squad of eight, impaled a child of 2 years on his bayonet and carried it off down the street. This incident was sworn to before the Bryce Commission by a Belgian citizen and his wife, testifying separately, and giving the same details.

At and near Louvain the Belgian commission of inquiry reports a number of girls and women were raped, some of them by many soldiers. Corroboration of this is furnished by Gen. von Boehn, commanding the Ninth German Army, who told the well-known American correspondent, E. Alexander Powell, that he had sentenced two of his soldiers to 12 years' penal servitude each for this crime. Twelve years!

At Dinant they "executed" 12 children under the age of 6, half of them as they lay in their mother's arms. The younger children were the child Fievet, 3 weeks old; Maurice Betamps, 11 months old; Nelly Pollet, 13 months old; Gilda Genon, 18 months old; Gilda Marchot, 2 years old; Clara Gruy, 2 years and 6 months. (Recorded by Minister Brand Whitlock, on the authority of the Bishop of Namur.)

At Bailleur, near the Franco-Belgian frontier, at least 30 women and girls were violated during eight days of German occupation in 1914. Sworn evidence of this was presented to the Bryce Commission, and Prof. J. H. Morgan, of the University of London, states that the testimony shows at least five officers were guilty.

At Bailleur "in one case, the facts of which are proved by evidence that would satisfy any court of law, a young girl of 19 was violated by one officer while the other held her mother by the throat and pointed a revolver, after which the two officers exchanged their respective roles." (Prof. J. H. Morgan in German Atrocities; An Official Investigation.)

KILLING NURSES AND THEIR PATIENTS.

They torpedoed the British hospital ship *Llandovery Castle*, with 258 people, only 24 being saved. Fourteen Canadian nursing sisters were drowned. The testimony of the survivors shows that the submarine tried to sink their lifeboats.

They sank the British hospital ship *Glenart Castle*, about 150 lives being lost.

They bombed the American Red Cross hospital at Jouy, France, killing two and wounding nine of the hospital personnel. This hospital was plainly marked, there being a cross 100 feet along on the lawn, visible from several thousand feet in the air.

They bombed a Canadian hospital, with lighted Red Cross signs, and killed many doctors, wounded, and nurses.

They torpedoed the Russian hospital ship *Portugal* in broad daylight in the Black Sea, causing the death of 21 nurses, 24 other Red Cross workers, and 40 sailors. The vessel was plainly marked, and the torpedo was fired from a distance of some 30 or 40 feet only.

WANTON PROPERTY DESTRUCTION.

They shelled the famous Rheims Cathedral until it was a ruin. They blew up the ancient castle of Coucy, one of France's most famous medieval monuments, without military reason.

In their retreats in France they have burned whole villages by the score without possible military advantage.

They destroyed a large part of the city of Louvain in an orgy of ruthlessness.

They deliberately destroyed the trees and vines of the French farmers in territory they were evacuating.

They have destroyed the farming implements of the French rural population.

They severely damaged the cathedral at Padua and destroyed priceless objects of art in that and other buildings.

They blew up the Cathedral of Noyon by set bombs on evacuating it during the past summer.

They destroyed many buildings at Cambrai by set bombs.

At St. Quentin the French captured a German officer with a wagonload of explosives which he said he had been told he had two days to distribute through the city.

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS.

Sixty-three British prisoners died of the "tree punishment," being roped to the trunk of a tree on a flat board, and left 24 to 48 hours, even a week, without water or food. (Reported by the Chicago Daily News correspondent, Edward Price Bell, on the authority of statements secured by the ladies' emergency committee of the British Navy League.)

The Germans in one prison camp trained sheep dogs to bite the prisoners. (Reported by Ambassador Gerard.)

The Austro-Hungarians punished Russian prisoners at Dunaserdagell by screwing them up in collars. (Sworn to by many prisoners and a Russian Sister of Mercy to a Russian commission of inquiry.)

In the earlier days of the war especially British prisoners were mistreated and insulted by the civilian population, who spit upon them and perpetrated worse outrages.

The German military and medical staffs deserted the prison camp at Wittenberg during a typhus epidemic in 1915, when 60 British and French and a still larger number of Russians died of this disease.

THE HUNS' FOUL FIGHTING.

They have poisoned wells in many localities. Proof of intent is furnished by a document captured recently, issued to the One hundred and eighth Battalion of German Infantry, and dated September 5, 1918. It says: "All wells should be poisoned."

They have been using explosive bullets against American troops. (Reported with details, by Edwin L. James, the New York Times correspondent.)

They have killed opponents who have surrendered. Proof is furnished by letters of German soldiers sent to Ambassador Gerard, protesting against this violation of the laws of war.

They have violated the use of the white flag, firing on opponents after pretending to surrender. The Bryce commission says: "There is, in our opinion, sufficient evidence that these offenses have been frequent."

They have abused the Red Cross. The Bryce commission received much testimony of this nature, and there have been several reports of similar treachery against American troops. Lieut. W. J. Harcourt, One hundred and twentieth Machine-Gun Battalion, Thirty-second Division, when in Detroit some weeks ago, described the killing of Michigan troops from a church tower at Clerges from which the Red Cross flag was flying.

They have used civilians as a screen against allied fire. (Authority of Minister Whitlock and Cardinal Mercier.)

ROBBERY AND LOOTING.

They systematically robbed all enemy countries by the Rathenau plan of exploitation, the total value of this governmental loot being, as estimated by Andre Cheradame, several tens of billions of francs.

They confiscated in Belgium alone machinery and new materials worth \$400,000,000 in the first four months of the war. (Belgian official statistics.)

They destroyed sources of economic wealth in Belgium (not including destruction of private property) to the amount of \$1,000,000,000. (Belgian official statistics.)

They have removed machinery from Belgian, French, and Polish factories and taken it to Germany, this being part of the avowed plan to ruin the industries of countries which would compete with Germany after the war. (Corroboration of intent given by Deputy Beumer in the Prussian Diet, February, 1917.)

They made requisitions of goods totaling over 83,000,000 francs at Antwerp before March 18, 1915, for which only 20,000,000 had then been paid. The Frankfurter Zeitung stated, December 21, 1914, that the German policy was to make payment "in such a manner that no money shall be sent to Belgium during the period of the war."

They have organized regular loot detachments in the army, the members bearing white arm bandages and special identification cards. Special attention is paid to private residences.

In violation of The Hague conventions, which Germany signed, they fined Belgium, in December, 1914, nearly \$100,000,000. In November, 1915, they decreed that this fine of 40,000,000 francs a month should be paid indefinitely. A year later they increased it to 50,000,000 francs a month, and in 1917 to 60,000,000. Besides, heavy fines were imposed on towns and villages. Total fines imposed on Belgium to August 10, 1917, were \$328,000,000 (Official Belgian statistics.)

They fined Lille, a city of about 200,000 before the war, \$12,000,000, with an additional threatened fine of \$200,000 a day for delay in complying with their demands. (In proportion Detroit would in like circumstances have been fined about \$50,000,000 and \$800,000 a day.) Levies of this kind were commonly accompanied by the threat to burn the town in case of noncompliance.

They stole machinery and raw material worth about \$15,000,000 from the Polish city of Lodz.

The German soldiers have individually robbed and looted like the Huns and Vandals of old throughout the war, both by the testimony of the allies and of themselves.

"A thousand thanks for the beautiful things you sent me; the furs are magnificent, the rosewood furniture is exquisite, but don't forget that Elsa is always waiting for her piano." (Letter from a German officer's wife, left behind in a French chateau.)

ENSLAVEMENT AND DEPORTATION.

They have deported many thousands (100,000 as long ago as November, 1916, according to Minister Whitlock) of Belgians and forced them to work in Germany. Vernon Kellogg, formerly of the Belgian relief commission, says: "The deportations . . . were the most vivid, shocking, convincing single happening in all our enforced observation and experience of German disregard of human suffering and human rights in Belgium."

They imprisoned the directores, foremen, and 81 workmen of Mr. Lenoir's factory at Mons for refusing to work in the service of the German Army. (Cardinal Mercier.)

They fined the city of Tournai 200,000 marks for refusing to submit deportation lists to the German commander.

They forced Belgians to work at shell making in Berlin. (Ambassador Gerard.)

They deported thousands of men, women, boys, and girls from Lille, giving them in the first instance 90 minutes to prepare for departure. (German official document.)

They deported from Lille and vicinity and from Alsace-Lorraine, to work behind the German lines, many girls from 15 years upward, separating them from their mothers and families.

They forced Belgian women to dig trenches back of the Flanders front. (Authority of Belgian legation at Washington.)

They gravely mistreated and exposed deported Belgian civilians to make them work, using torture by extremes of heat and cold. Many died or were ruined in health. (Information gathered by Belgian Government.)

They enslaved 250,000 Polish workmen who were in Germany in August, 1914, forcing them to remain and labor, and they later lured or forced 250,000 more to come. (Deputy Trompczynski, of the Prussian Diet.)

JUST KULTUR.

"September 3 (1914). Still at Rethel. * * * The houses are charming inside. The middle class in France has magnificent furniture. We found stylish pieces everywhere and beautiful silk, but in what a state. * * * Good God! * * * Every bit of furniture broken, mirrors smashed. The Vandals themselves could not have done more damage. This place is a disgrace to our army. * * * I couldn't resist taking a little memento myself here and there. * * * One house was particularly elegant. * * * I found a splendid raincoat under the staircase and a camera for Felix." (Captured diary of an officer of the One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment, Twelfth Saxon Corps.)

The Germans "observed" the provisions of international law concerning making payment for requisitioned articles by giving fake "bons"—i. e., if a pair of horses were taken, the bon, written in German, unintelligible to the French or Belgian peasant, might be for a chicken. Later the form itself was omitted. (Vernon Kellogg.)

They circulated in Spain propaganda telling of the quantities of loot they have taken in France and Belgium, including these specifications: High-grade watches, 417; average watches, 5,016; underwear, 18,073; embroideries and women's handkerchiefs, 15,132; umbrellas and parasols, 3,705; silver spoons, 1,876; bottles of champagne, 523,000. The document also boasted that Alsatian children had been fined for refusing to study the "beautiful German language," and explained that while the Germans had fewer British prisoners than the latter have Germans, the severe treatment accorded the Englishmen had "secured a superior moral effect." (Authority of United States State Department, which investigated the document and found it of German origin.)

They broke into French tombs and committed acts of terrible vandalism. Henry Wood, United Press correspondent with the French armies, is authority for the statement that at Bray St. Christophe, Champion, Amy, Beauraines, and Crapeaumesnil all the more promising tombs in the cemeteries had been dynamited and the coffins stripped not only of the metal lining but of any objects of silver that adorned them. Not in a single instance were the remains placed back in the tombs, and it can only be supposed that they were scattered to the four winds.

They committed in many French residences acts of bestial nature, leaving a record such as no truly civilized people would be willing to have registered against it. There is plenty of evidence of this, including that of Baroness Huard, in the American Magazine for August. Leaving her chateau in France before the German advance in 1914, she locked her personal letter, in a desk, left a card testifying to their nature, and locked into one of the drawers, so that it was plainly visible, a small silk American flag. She says she now laughs at her trusting confidence that the boches would tender honorable treatment to a woman or a flag, for after she returned to the chateau the flag was found in one of the bathroom pipes, which had to be cleaned for sanitary reasons.

This was in September, 1914, two years and a half before America was in the war, and the chateau was occupied by his excellency Gen. von Kluck, commander of the western German armies, and this heinous act, which would have been unworthy of an ape, must have been committed by a member of his military family.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. From the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 596) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill; but before the request is put I desire to say that it is somewhat unusual to make such a request pending the conclusion of morning business. The bill, however, will have to go to conference, and if this session of Congress is to adjourn or recess on the 29th of October, it is absolutely necessary for great speed to be made with this bill. I hope to have a conference this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow reports of committees to be made? A number of Senators are waiting to transact morning business.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will yield for that purpose as soon as this matter is disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. It is out of the regular order, is it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator makes a point of order, that is the end of it. I have said that I would yield to him in a few minutes, and I do not think that will interfere with the matters which he has in mind.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New Mexico and other Senators wish to make reports.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield for any formal matter.

Mr. LODGE. What I have in mind is merely formal matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I withdraw the request, Mr. President.

DISTRICT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12549) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was agreed to.

HAMPTON, VA., BRANCH NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 13036) transferring jurisdiction and control for the period of the war over the Southern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the Secretary of War for use for Army hospital purposes, and I submit a report (No. 597) thereon.

I am going to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill, and in that connection I want to say that the reason I make the request is that the wounded soldiers are coming over from Europe faster than the authorities are able to find hospital facilities for them. There is an old branch home at Hampton, Va., that can be utilized for this purpose, and this bill is designed to effectuate that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon submits a report from the Committee on Military Affairs and asks for its immediate consideration. Is there objection?

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

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

DISTRICT PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. REED. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably the bill (H. R. 12404) authorizing the construction of a building for the Public Health Service in the city of Washington, D. C., and I submit a report (No. 599) thereon. It is a very short bill, and I ask to have it read, after which I desire to make a request for unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the construction of an additional building for laboratory purposes and research work and for enlarging and remodeling the present animal house connected with the Hygienic Laboratory, Public Health Service, Washington, District of Columbia, at a limit of cost of \$250,000.

In carrying the foregoing authorization for additional buildings to the Hygiene Laboratory into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury may enter into contracts or purchase materials in the open market, or otherwise, and employ laborers and mechanics for executing the work as in his judgment may best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of the authorization herein made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to advise the Senate that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is at the present time without a chairman; but, as the ranking member of that committee, I called a meeting. A quorum did not respond, and thereupon the bill was carried to the members of the committee, and the committee polled, it being the opinion of those who were present at the meeting that the bill was an emergency measure and ought to receive immediate consideration; so that I owe it to the Senate to say that the report is of this nature.

I want to say to the Senate that the representations which have led to this action are very well set forth in a report which I have prepared, and I will read a portion of it to the Senate:

The following memorandum, prepared by the Director of the Hygienic Laboratory, will adequately explain the necessity for the proposed building:

When the request was originally made for an additional building at the laboratory it was with the view to a reasonable and proper expansion of the work of the institution. Within the past year, however, circumstances have changed so that it is no longer a question of providing space for the inauguration of additional researches, but of finding room in which to carry on the work already underway, which war conditions have made it necessary to expand in a way that was not foreseen even a year ago. The control of serums, viruses, toxins, and analogous products imposed on the service by law is exercised through this laboratory. The expansion of the work and the increase in the amount of testing required by war conditions has been such that the facilities are not adequate for carrying the work on in a proper manner. It has been found necessary to require all manufacturers to submit samples of every lot of serums required for the treatment of pneumonia and meningitis for testing prior to furnishing the same to the military forces or for sale to the civil population. Further expansion of this work in the near future will become imperative, and, unless additional space is provided, can be performed only in a most inadequate manner.

The report follows along that line. In a word, the medical authorities at the head of this work state that the war has so increased the work that it is absolutely necessary to have this building at once, and hence the bill has been reported, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

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

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

DISASTER AT MORGAN MUNITIONS PLANT.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I desire to submit a report, and to make a statement to the Senate regarding it. The report is upon Senate resolution No. 317, submitted a few days ago by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The resolution provides for an investigation of the recent explosion in the State of New Jersey and asks an appropriation not exceeding \$5,000. When the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I, of course, wondered what the functions of the committee would be with respect to such a resolution. I recall the incident of some months ago, when the late Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hughes, submitted a resolution authorizing an investigation of the strike upon the street railways in the city of Washington. At that time I expressed it as my belief that some committee of the Senate should inquire into the advisability of making such an investigation. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate at that time recommended to the Senate that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for the purpose of having that committee inquire into the necessity for the investigation. It involved an expenditure of public money, and I assume that there should be no expenditure of public money unless there is a necessity for it. The Senate at that time, however, declined to refer the resolution to the Committee on the District of Columbia, agreed to the resolution, and authorized the investigation.

When this resolution was referred to the committee I was still of the opinion that somebody should make an inquiry as to whether or not that investigation should be made. I conferred with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who submitted the resolution. I suggested to him that I thought it was my duty to make an inquiry of the War Department to find out whether or not the War Department was already investigating the accident in New Jersey, and whether or not the facilities of the War Department were, in the opinion of the department, adequate to meet the situation. The Senator from New Jersey requested that that be not done, and stated that he did not believe that the committee should obtain any information from the War Department as to what was being done. Upon his request I have made no inquiry of the War Department in regard to this matter, and I do not know what the War Department is doing with reference to it. I have reason to presume, however, that where a catastrophe such as that has occurred the War Department, which is to receive the product of the factory, is making an investigation, and that the truth will be known, and proper safeguards will be taken in the future. Personally I do not believe there is a showing here which makes it apparent that this investigation is necessary.

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

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. I know that the Secretary of War is investigating. I happened to be in the Intelligence Bureau of the War Department in connection with another matter, and I know that the War Department is now investigating this question.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am glad, of course, to get the information which the Senator from North Carolina presents. I had every reason to believe that such an investigation was being made.

Mr. OVERMAN. I believe, therefore, that I will ask for the regular order.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the regular order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Unanimous consent has never been given for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. Does the Senator from New Jersey present a report?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to know who demanded the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina demanded the regular order, which is entirely within his rights.

Mr. OVERMAN. I shall object to the consideration of the resolution. What is the use of discussing it now? I know that the War Department has a force investigating it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order being demanded, the presentation of committee reports is in order. If there be no committee reports to be presented—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from North Carolina will permit me—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is making a report to the Senate. It is a verbal report and I submit that it is entirely in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not intend to prevent the Senator from speaking, but I hope this matter is not going to be discussed, because I am going to object, if nobody else does, to the present consideration of the resolution, for the reason that I know the matter is now being investigated by the War Department.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Very well. I wanted to make this statement, however. I have discussed these matters with the two other members of the committee who are here, and who, with myself, constitute a majority of the committee. They believe that the resolution should be favorably reported to the Senate. I am simply the acting chairman of the committee. Under the circumstances I deem it my duty to report it to the Senate favorably, and I so do, with the explanation which I have made.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am going to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this resolution, and I hope the Senator from North Carolina will not object until he hears what I have to say.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to prevent the Senator from saying whatever he desires to say, nor do I desire to be discourteous to him in any way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be very brief.

Mr. OVERMAN. But I shall object, for the reason that I know from Gen. Churchill that this matter is being thoroughly investigated by a splendid force of men in the Intelligence Bureau of the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. OVERMAN. I shall object to the present consideration of the resolution, but I do not want to prevent the Senator from making his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presentation of reports is in order.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from North Carolina objects?

Mr. OVERMAN. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a point of order. I did not understand that the Senator from North Carolina objected to a statement being made by the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina some minutes ago demanded the regular order, which is the presentation of committee reports; and in the absence of a withdrawal of that demand, the Chair felt it his duty to proceed with the business of the Senate in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not want to prevent the Senator from New Jersey from making a statement.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey submit a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I submit a request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his request.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not understand what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business has not yet been concluded, and until it is concluded it is within the power of any Senator to demand the regular order, which has been done. The regular order is the presentation of committee reports.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator receiving unanimous consent to proceed with his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey will proceed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the reason why I requested the immediate consideration of this resolution is the fact that at the present time there is a very urgent need of a proper investigation of the storage of explosives at this plant and other plants in New Jersey by industries that are manufacturing munitions.

After the explosion at Morgans, where 7,500 pounds of trinitrotoluol exploded and destroyed buildings within a zone of 30 miles and rendered homeless practically 10,000 people, it was recognized that the storage of these explosives was a menace

to the lives and property not only of the towns and cities adjacent to that plant, but within 30 or 40 miles of it. At the present time there is a reign of terror in that section of New Jersey, because it is known that in five magazines there is 150,000 pounds of trinitrotoluol, and in another magazine 600,000 pounds; and if those magazines were struck by lightning, or an explosion were created by fire, it would mean practically the destruction of half of New York City. At the present time the people in those adjacent towns are terrorized, and they are asking for an investigation in order to force the proper distribution of that explosive so that their homes and their lives may be safeguarded.

The War Department may be making an investigation; but the object of my resolution is to ask the Military Affairs Committee to inform themselves as to what the War Department is doing, and also to make an investigation in that section of the country to ascertain what is being done by the other manufacturers there to safeguard the lives of citizens, and as a basis for legislation, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] very properly suggests, in order that we may know what to do to pass the proper regulations to safeguard the people in that district.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is to hinder the Committee on Military Affairs from now making an investigation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This is a resolution simply authorizing them to do so.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not necessary for them to have any such authority.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. They need the money to do it with.

Mr. OVERMAN. They do not need \$5,000 to make the investigation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Possibly not. They will not use it if they do not need it. I hope the Senator will recognize the fact that this would alleviate the conditions in my State at once by assuring the people there that a committee of the Senate is going to investigate the conditions. I hope the Senator from North Carolina will withdraw his objection.

Mr. MYERS. Will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to state to the Senator, as the Senator from North Carolina seems disposed to object, that the committee need not necessarily use all of the \$5,000, but only so much as may be necessary to make the investigation.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senate has adopted a resolution now authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to summon every man in New Jersey before it. The committee has full authority to summon everyone down here and to go into an investigation without passing a resolution to send a committee up there to New Jersey and spend the money of the people. When it is already being investigated by the War Department, and the Military Affairs Committee now acting under a resolution passed through the Senate can investigate it thoroughly, what is the use of passing another resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presentation of the reports of committees is in order.

Mr. OVERMAN subsequently said: I am informed that the Military Affairs Committee wants to have the resolution offered by the Senator from New Jersey passed. Therefore, as the committee is willing to have it passed, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 317, instructing the Committee on Military Affairs to make an inquiry into the causes which brought about the recent disaster at the Morgan Munitions Plant, New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, in the resolution which was passed this morning the last clause is incorrectly drawn. It provided that the sum of \$5,000 should be appropriated. I ask unanimous consent to change the verbiage of the last section so as to provide that the appropriation from the contingent fund shall not exceed \$5,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to will be reconsidered and the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to strike out:

Resolved further, That the sum of \$5,000 be appropriated from the contingent fund of the Senate to cover the expenses incident to this inquiry.

And insert:

Resolved further, That the expenses incident to this inquiry be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, the same not to exceed \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the recent disaster at the Morgan Munitions Plant, near Perth Amboy, N. J., October 4 and 5, resulted in the loss of scores of lives, the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property belonging to the United States and to private owners, and the rendering homeless of thousands of citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate be, and it is hereby, instructed to make an inquiry into the causes which brought about said catastrophe, whether by accident or work of alien enemies or agents thereof; what precautions had been taken to prevent such an accident; what plans have been adopted, if any, with a view to the rebuilding of the plant upon a safer basis; what measures have been determined upon, if any, toward the protection of similar munition plants elsewhere.

Resolved further, That said Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance, to send for persons and papers, and to do such further acts as may be necessary to secure any and all information desired in the furtherance of this inquiry; and that a report of the finding of such committee shall, upon its conclusion, be made to the Senate not later than December 6, 1918.

Resolved further, That the expenses incident to this inquiry be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, the same not to exceed \$5,000.

JAIL AT GUTHRIE, OKLA.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report (No. 598) back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12438) authorizing the conveyance of the United States jail and land on which the same is located at Guthrie, Okla., to Logan County, Okla. I call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to the bill.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It is a local bill and is in conformity with the custom in respect to such jails.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey, by proper quitclaim deed, to the county of Logan, in the State of Oklahoma, the United States jail, at Guthrie, Okla., and all the lands set apart therewith.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5004) to fix the mileage to be paid to officers of the Army, active and retired, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, contract surgeons, expert accountant of the Inspector General's Department, and others connected with the Army, and also providing for reimbursement for actual expenses of travel and a flat per diem in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5005) to assist in the demobilization of the armed forces of the United States at the close of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MARY B. RICHARDS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 323), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary B. Richards, widow of Charles N. Richards, late keeper of stationery of the United States Senate under the Secretary of the Senate, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ROY WRIGHT.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (for Mr. SIMMONS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 324), which was read and referred

to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Roy Wright, brother of Cortez L. Wright, late assistant clerk to the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 325), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the investigation ordered by the Senate on September 19, 1918, under resolution (No. 307) authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, to call for certain evidence and documents relating to charges made against the United States Brewers' Association and allied interests, and to report to the Senate thereon, and to employ an assistant clerk at a salary not to exceed \$5 per diem, for a period not to exceed four months; and to incur traveling expenses in connection therewith, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate or of Congress.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Mr. NEW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 327), which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Acting Judge Advocate General, Brig. Gen. Ansell, be, and he is hereby, directed, if not incompatible with public interest, to send to the Senate all correspondence in that department with the Secretary of War, or any Assistant Secretary of War, or with The Adjutant General, on the question of the appointment or the commissioning of officers in the office of the Judge Advocate General.

PROPOSAL OF PEACE WITH THE GERMAN PEOPLE.

Mr. GORE. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 326) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas the President, in his note of October 14 to the German Government, stated that it is within the choice of the German Nation to place itself in a situation to negotiate peace, "if peace is to come by the action of the German people themselves";

Whereas the President, in his note to the German Government, under date of October 23, declares that "concluding peace and attempting to undo the infinite injuries and injustices of this war the Government of the United States can not deal with any but veritable representatives of the German people": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate advise the President as to its readiness to consent to a treaty concluding a just and acceptable peace made "with the German people themselves" through representatives elected for that purpose in accordance with the methods proposed by the President.

PRICE OF COTTON AND WHEAT.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have addressed to a constituent in regard to fixing the price of cotton, and also an article which I prepared for the Forum, and which has been published in that magazine, in regard to fixing the price of wheat, together with another letter or two which I send to the desk.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

OCTOBER 17, 1918.

Hon. VICTOR HARLOW,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

MY DEAR HARLOW: I am pleased to acknowledge your letter of late date, requesting me to report as to the recent agitation in regard to fixing a price on raw cotton. I appreciate the opportunity which your request affords.

The price of cotton vitally concerns the people of our State. Oklahoma is one of the leading cotton States. Cotton is our leading agricultural product. Last year we produced 959,000 bales. Its aggregate value, including seed, was about \$140,000,000. The farmers of Oklahoma planted this year for a million bales or more. They have already incurred the expense of planting and cultivating a crop which would, under favorable circumstances, have yielded a million bales. Owing to the drouth they will gather in the neighborhood of only about 400,000 bales. It has therefore cost the farmer, on the average, more than two and a half times as much to produce a bale of cotton this year as it cost last year. Notwithstanding the seemingly high price

this year, many farmers in Oklahoma are, no doubt, selling cotton at less than the cost of production. Last year the average price was 25 cents a pound. This year the average price ranges around 32 or 33 cents. The agitation in regard to fixing the price of cotton drove the price down about \$30 or \$40 a bale. This cost the South some \$450,000,000. It cost Oklahoma alone many millions.

This loss to the producers has been attended by no corresponding advantage to the consumers of cotton goods. It is estimated by high authority that cotton manufacturers are still selling the finished product on the basis of 40-cent cotton. Some estimate that at the present price of cotton fabric the manufacturers could afford to pay 50 cents a pound. I do not profess to have expert knowledge upon this point.

The fundamental objection to fixing an arbitrary price upon farm products is the fact that the cost of production can not be ascertained or even estimated in advance. The weather risk is always an important factor and is sometimes the principal factor in determining the cost of production. This weather risk can not be separated from the business of farming. It can not be ascertained in advance. Prices can not be fixed without taking this unknown factor into consideration. If too much is allowed for weather risk, it is unjust to the consumer. If too little is allowed, it is unjust to the producer. Nothing but divine foresight could ascertain it in advance. This risk does not characterize the ordinary commercial and industrial enterprise. The Government has fixed—not an arbitrary but an agreed price on iron, steel, copper, coal, etc. These prices are fixed on the basis of cost plus a profit. If prices are to be fixed at all, they ought to be fixed on that basis. No producer should be required to sell his product at less than the cost of production. He can not continue to do so and survive. If the Government, however, should determine that it is necessary to the winning of the war for producers to sell at less than cost, the farmers will, if the rule be made universal, be the first to yield and the last to complain. They only demand that equal justice which the President has called "the heart of democracy."

I need not say that the farmers are willing to bear any burden, to make any sacrifice necessary for our success. They only wish, as they have a right to wish, that such sacrifices should be fairly apportioned among all classes of their fellow citizens. Certainly public policy forbids that we should cripple or embarrass any class of producers, particularly the farmers. This would hinder the great work of reconstruction which must follow the war. In this splendid service others may play a more conspicuous but none will play a more important part than the American farmer.

There is no law authorizing any officer or department of the Government to fix a price on cotton. Cotton was at one time voted into the food-control act, but we succeeded in voting it out. Up to the middle of July the crop promised to be 15,000,000. Certain southern bankers took fright. They held a meeting in Washington on July 17, urging the Government to fix the price on cotton. On July 18 a meeting was held on the part of the southern Senators and Representatives and the commissioners of agriculture and the presidents of the leading farm organizations of the cotton States to protest against fixing a price on cotton. The farmers have been constant in their opposition to such policy. They remembered that when cotton was selling at 6 cents a pound in 1914 nothing was done by the Government to uphold the price or to help the farmer. They do not think that anything should be done now by the Government to put the price down or to hurt the farmer. The cotton farmers also saw that when the Government interfered in the one single instance of wheat, with the price of an agricultural product it reduced the price from \$3 to \$2.40 a bushel. However much this helped the consumer, it did not help the producer. All the tracks led into the cave, none of them led out so far as farm products were concerned. On the other hand, the packers, the millers, steel mills, the copper mines are realizing exceptional profits under agreed prices. As you know, I have always maintained a steadfast opposition to any policy of fixing the price on agricultural products. For the reasons, first, that it can not be done scientifically on account of the weather risk and other uncertain factors, and, second, because a mere guess at the price is too likely to hurt if it does not ruin the producer.

When the agitation was later commenced by Mr. Baruch and others in regard to the fixing a price on cotton, a series of meetings was held on the part of the southern Senators and Congressmen. Repeated protests were made and a committee appointed to wait on the President and to give emphatic expression to this protest. After the President's note of September 13, intimating that action might be taken, a final meeting was held and a more vigorous protest was made. This protest brought forth the assurance that nothing would be done for the present and that nothing at all would be done in the absence of extreme and violent fluctuations of price. It is our hope that this assurance will be adhered to and that the farmers may be allowed to receive that price which the law of supply and demand will award even under the present restricted operation of that law. The farmers could not if they would, and should not if they could, become profiteers. They are unorganized. The men that would fatten and batten upon the misfortune of his countrymen or the exigencies of war is a public enemy. Prosperity is not incompatible with patriotism. Our policy ought to be so fashioned as to bring all our producers out of this war prepared for the tremendous economic struggle which is to follow, and able to perform their full duty in the unprecedented task of rehabilitating the world.

With best wishes for an early and complete victory and a permanent peace, I remain,

Your friend, truly,

T. P. GORE.

[From the Forum for September, 1918.]

THE WHEAT FARMERS' DILEMMA—WE MUST HAVE WHEAT—AT \$2.20 A BUSHEL WILL IT GO ON THE TABLE OR IN THE TROUGH?

(By Hon. THOMAS P. GORE, United States Senator for Oklahoma.)

(The vital food question of wheat backs up to the farmer. Is he treated with justice, in view of a restricted market price, forced to buy in an unrestricted market? The able Senator from the wheat belt of the West takes up the question for the Forum.)

The price of the wheat should bear some just and reasonable relation to the price of those things which he must buy with the proceeds of his wheat. This is the farmer's point of view. The President has stated the farmer's side with characteristic clearness. In his annual message last December he declared that the farmers complain with justice that they are obliged to sell in a restricted and to buy in an unrestricted market. What is the way out of the dilemma described by the President?

First. To remove all restrictions whatever upon the price of wheat.

Second. To advance the fixed price of wheat to correspond with the general level of advanced prices.

Third. To reduce the prices of all other articles to correspond with the reduced price of wheat.

I shall merely mention a fourth, which would be a compromise between the second and the third, by advancing the price of wheat and reducing the prices of other articles until they meet upon a common level.

The application of the first remedy would require a reversal of our policy and a retracing of our steps. I am not certain that we have the power even if we had the disposition to do this. The wheat market has been dismantled by the Government and if it were a legislative possibility I am not sure that it would be a commercial possibility to restore it overnight. If this could be done, it would be the simplest and best solution.

There are those who insist that the general level of prices, particularly upon articles purchased by the farmers, should be so reduced as to correspond with the fixed price upon wheat. If this were a legal and economic possibility it might, indeed, restore the ratio between the price of wheat and the general range of prices. Should we disturb all prices and all economic relations merely in order to attempt with or without success to readjust them? Wheat was selling at \$3 a bushel in Minneapolis the day the Government broke the price. That was the ratio between supply and demand. The Government reduced the price to \$2.17 at Minneapolis.

It is obvious that a horizontal or a universal reduction of all prices to meet this reduction of wheat would be unavailing so far as domestic commerce is concerned. We would merely have our pains for our labor in operating this treadmill and would be fortunate, indeed, if we escaped with so light a retribution. We could make a general reduction in the prices of all domestic articles and could apply these prices to exports. We could not apply this general or horizontal reduction to the prices of imports. We could sell our own products to the allies and to neutrals at the reduced prices, but we would be obliged to continue purchases from them at market prices or rather at war prices.

We are now obliging our farmers to take less for their wheat than it is worth, and are supplying wheat to the allies and perhaps in limited quantities to neutrals at the reduced figure.

FOREIGN MARKETS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OUR REDUCTIONS.

I am informed that neutrals purchase wheat from us upon this lower level and sell it to their own people at famine figures. We are supplying millions' worth of wheat to foreign countries at an artificially low price and are purchasing millions' worth of goods from them at war prices. And to make it worse, some of the neutral countries are manipulating foreign exchanges so as to double their advantage and double our disadvantage. This is transgression with a vengeance.

The President made the point, however, in his veto message that if we advanced the price of wheat here it would oblige the allies to purchase wheat at the advanced price. This is undoubtedly true unless some other or better method could be found for obviating the loss. Let me say once for all that if it be necessary to the winning of the war for us to supply the allies with wheat at \$2.20 per bushel, then that should be done and will be done by the unanimous voice and vote of the American people. The Government of the United States, however, should assume and should absorb the loss. The people of the United States in their public capacity should assume that loss and should not visit it upon the wheat producers in their capacity as private citizens. The United States ought to levy taxes and sell bonds enough to defray the necessary expenses of this war. A good deal of vainglory has been indulged in in this country on the action of the Food Administration in reducing the price of flour to \$10.50 per barrel. Flour made in England from American wheat sells at the mill door for \$7.50 per barrel. It may be somewhat inferior to American flour, but that is not the point. The Government of Great Britain appropriated \$200,000,000 to compensate the millers against loss in selling flour at \$7.50 per barrel. The loss is, as it should be, assumed and absorbed by the people of Great Britain in their sovereign capacity. It is not visited upon the millers in their private capacity. The difference should be charged up against the Government as an item of war expense and should not be levied as a special tribute or forced contribution upon the wheat farmers. In order to supply the allies with a relatively small quantity of wheat at a reduced price it is neither necessary nor just to subject the farmers to a loss of from \$300,000,000 to \$600,000,000 on their entire crop.

That the farmer is taking a heavy loss on wheat is not open to controversy. There is a pretty definite historic ratio between wheat on the one hand and corn, rye, barley, and oats on the other. Based on this ratio an expert recently computed that the price of wheat should be approximately \$2.77 at Chicago. The measure recently passed by Congress and vetoed by the President proposed to make the price at Chicago \$2.60. Congress undertook to apply in a limited measure the remedy of advancing the price of wheat to correspond with the general level of other prices. We must adopt one of two remedies, either to advance the price of wheat or to reduce the general range of prices. Congress preferred the former method. Nothing has been done to apply the other method in the eight months that have come and gone since the President declared that the farmers complained with justice of the existing situation. When the President made that declaration in December last, he, of course, had in mind the price of wheat which the farmer was then obliged to take and the price of other articles which he was then obliged to buy.

WHEAT THE ONLY ARTICLE THAT HAS NOT ADVANCED.

Wheat is perhaps the only article in the United States the price of which has not advanced during this interval. The farmer pays a higher price for everything now than he paid in December. He receives the same price for wheat. The Government fixed the price upon wheat harvested during the season of 1917 at \$2.20 per bushel. The Government also fixed the price upon wheat harvested during the season of 1918 at \$2.20 per bushel.

If the price fixed by the Government upon wheat for 1917 was not too high, then the price fixed by the Government on wheat for 1918 is not high enough; or if the price of wheat fixed by the Government for 1918 is high enough, then the price fixed for 1917 was too high. I say this because the cost of producing wheat in 1918 was much greater than in 1917. Seed wheat advanced, farm labor advanced, farm implements advanced. Every item of cost save only soil depletion has advanced. Let us state a few comparative figures.

In 1915 denim overalls sold for \$9 a dozen wholesale; in 1918 the same overalls are quoted at \$29.50. In parts of the great wheat belt farm wages in 1917 were \$35 per month plus board; in 1918 they were \$65 a month plus board, and the demand could not be supplied even at this figure. Binding twine has gone up from 9 cents in 1914 to 20 cents in 1917 and 26 cents in 1918. A 14-inch gang plow was \$65 in 1914, \$85 in 1917, and \$200 in 1918. In 1914 a 7-foot self-binder

retailed for \$150; in 1917 the same binder retailed for \$185; and in 1918 for \$250. The ordinary farm wagon in 1914 cost \$75. In 1917 it cost \$95, and in 1918 it cost \$150. These are retail prices.

The farmer has been obliged to pay a higher price for the articles necessary in producing the crop of 1918, as compared with the crop of 1917, yet he is obliged to accept exactly the same price for wheat in 1918 that he received in 1917. If the farmer complained with justice in December last, he has much greater cause to complain to-day. Something has, indeed, been attempted, but nothing has been done to remedy this injustice.

WHY SINGLE OUT THE FARMER TO TAKE THE BURDEN OF LOSS?

The President once said, with equal truth and felicity, that equal justice is the heart of democracy. In 1917 the millers received a net return upon their investment 300 per cent in excess of their return in 1914.

The farmer has to pay the increasing prices of meat, transportation, labor, and utensils, clothing, etc., out of the diminished proceeds of his wheat, diminished from \$3 to \$2 per bushel by a proclamation of the President. The farmer can not see in these different attitudes of the Government toward different classes of industry that equal justice which constitutes the heart of democracy. The wheat farmer is not quite satisfied with the honeyed assurances that bread will win the war and that wheat is the one farm product which is indispensable to the triumph of American arms. Is the wheat farmer to be punished rather than rewarded in accordance with the indispensable character of his service?

The wheat farmer who insists that the injustice admitted by the President should be rectified does not thereby brand himself either as unpatriotic or as a profiteer. His patriotism should not be the occasion of his sacrifice or enslavement nor the excuse of denying him that equal justice which is at once the heart and the crowning glory of democracy.

In his veto message the President avowed that personally he did not believe that the farmers of the country depend upon the stimulation of prices to do their utmost to serve the Nation and the world. The President then with less implied praise averred that if the farmer should be given an advance of price, the laborer would require an advance in wages. If the advanced price had registered itself in the advance of flour—which it would not—it would have cost each wage earner in the country \$2 a year for himself and for each member of his family. The object of the existing law, under which the President fixes the price of wheat, was not to hammer down the price of wheat in the farmers' hands, nor to afford any other class the benefit of such enforced and arbitrary reduction. It was not intended that the Government should take from three to six hundred million dollars a year from the wheat producer and bestow that amount as a gratuity upon the consumers of this or any other country.

Fortunately the law itself leaves us in no doubt upon this point. Section 14 of the present act, the price-fixing section, empowers the President, whenever he finds "that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat," to fix a reasonable guaranteed price in order that the producers of wheat might have the benefit of such price and "in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit." The object of the law and the lawmakers was not to deprive the farmers of a reasonable profit and to oblige them and the Government to rely solely upon their spirit of patriotism. The lawmakers placed their reliance upon constant economic forces and proposed to guarantee the wheat producers a reasonable profit. The lawmakers did not believe that they could stimulate the production of wheat by reducing its price.

HOW THE LOW-FIXED PRICE OF WHEAT WORKS.

The wheat farmer is now asking nothing more than that the purpose and object of the legislature be realized and that the injustice be corrected, which is inseparable from a system which obliges him to sell in a restricted and to buy in an unrestricted market. This injustice should be corrected as a matter of practical wisdom and a matter of sound public policy. Whatever is unjust is unwise. But we are not obliged to rely upon this necessary implication. There is particular proof of it in this special instance not only in our own country but in other belligerent countries. During the summer of 1917 the Department of Agriculture carried on a nation-wide patriotic campaign to secure the planting of 47,000,000 acres of winter wheat. They failed. The acreage secured was only 42,000,000, the same acreage that the farmers voluntarily planted in 1914, when there was no other encouragement than the prospect of a reasonable return. Rye presents an interesting contrast and should teach a valuable lesson. The farmers increased the acreage of rye of 4,400,000 to more than 6,000,000, an increase of nearly 50 per cent. The price of wheat is fixed; the price of rye is not fixed. Wheat brings only \$2.20, 50 or 60 cents less than it is worth. Rye, which is worth less intrinsically, has sold as high as \$3. The farmer can produce more rye to the acre than wheat. The farmer can produce more pounds of corn to the acre than wheat, and can, under existing market conditions, receive more per bushel, notwithstanding wheat is worth more intrinsically both as feed and as food. This possibility tends to make the farmer plant corn, rye, barley, oats, and other products the price of which is unrestricted, rather than wheat the price of which is restricted. The farmers in my State—Oklahoma—have sold wheat at \$1.90, and with the proceeds have purchased corn as high as \$2.20. One farmer put it in an epigram, saying that price reduction has put wheat in the trough and corn on the table. Millions of bushels of wheat have been fed to live stock which ought to have been conserved as a precious resource for ourselves and for our allies. Thus price regulation, like vaulting ambition, sometimes overleaps itself.

A farmer who has fertile lands and favorable seasons and who can rely upon from 20 to 35 bushels per acre can realize a profit on wheat at \$2.20. The average yield per acre sown in the United States last year was 11 bushels. This means that millions of acres yielded only 4, 5, and 6 bushels. As a rule our available surplus for export is produced in the semiarid country, where the yield per acre is low. These men can not produce under existing high costs at \$2.20 per bushel. If they disappear from the equation our average production per acre would indeed increase, but there would be a dangerous diminution in the total output. In times of crisis it is the total output that counts.

We ought to profit by the experience, and especially by the blunders of all other warring nations. In 1916 the French Government fixed the price of wheat too low. The French peasant shook his head. The results were disappointing to the State. In the effect the keen, logical French mind read the cause. They did not repeat it; they profited by the blunder. The Government price of wheat in France to-day is \$3.95 per bushel. The average yield per acre in France exceeds by 5 or 6 bushels the average yield in this country. Switzerland is paying for wheat a guaranteed price of \$2.70 per bushel.

WHAT WILL BE THE PRICE OF THE 1919 CROP?

What is to be done with respect to the crop of 1919? At this time no guaranty whatever has been offered. Mr. Hoover has indicated a purpose to buy and hold several hundred million bushels of wheat grown this year against a possible shortage next year.

Can the farmers be expected to produce a normal crop against a carry-over of such proportions? It will be remembered that Mr. Hoover and Secretary Houston appointed an agricultural advisory committee of 24 members, and is of a quasi-public character. It meets from time to time in Washington. Its traveling expenses are paid by the Government. The members are paid \$10 per day for their expenses while in the Capital. During the early days of the present month it met and deliberated upon the price of wheat. Seventeen members were present and voting. They unanimously recommended that the price of wheat for the 1919 harvest be fixed at \$2.46 basis, Chicago. There was, indeed, one dissenting vote, but this member changed his vote to make the result unanimous. This is the official authoritative advice of the agricultural advisory committee selected by Mr. Hoover and Secretary Houston. Will this advice be heeded? It was given after Mr. Hoover had sent a cablegram from London to the committee advising them not to advise an advance. It was given after Mr. Hoover's assistant and after Mr. Hoover's attorney had both appeared in person and advised the advisory committee not to advise an advance.

In his veto message the President committed himself to the administrative method of agreeing upon a price rather than the establishment of a fixed price by legislation. I have no doubt that the American wheat farmer will be reasonably content if the President should act upon the advice of this advisory committee and fix the price for next year's crop at \$2.46 basis, Chicago. This will not, indeed, amend the injustice for the current year, but it will secure a larger measure of justice, a more near approach to equal justice for the season of 1919. May I be permitted to cite once again Mr. Lincoln's declaration that no question is ever settled until it is settled right. This wheat question has not been settled right. It has not been settled at all. It involves an injury which is admitted by the President, an injury which is felt and suffered by the farmers.

I do not know whether every act of injustice disturbs the harmony of the moral universe. I do not know whether every act of injustice calls for ultimate retribution. I do not know whether we could hope for greater success in suspending the great law of retribution that James II experienced in suspending the penal laws of England. I do know that a great nation embarked upon a war for liberty, humanity, and democracy can not afford to violate the great fundamental principles which underlie and which give vitality and value to these high and mighty objects. The United States can not afford to be unjust to the humblest citizen who has a right to invoke the protection of its flag.

WALLACES' FARMER,
Des Moines, Iowa, October 9, 1918.

Senator GORE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I inclose herewith an editorial which appears in Wallaces' Farmer of this week. It deals with a matter which seems to me to be of very great importance to the Nation, and I hope you may be able to find time to read it through.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly,

HENRY C. WALLACE.

[An editorial from Wallaces' Farmer of Oct. 11, 1918.]

THE FOOD ADMINISTRATION AND THE PRICE OF HOGS.

On November 3, 1917, Joseph P. Cotton, Chief of the Meat Division of the United States Food Administration, issued a statement relative to the price of hogs. This statement concluded with the following:

"As to the hogs farrowed next spring, we will try to stabilize the price so that the farmers can count on getting for each 100 pounds of hog ready for market thirteen times the average cost per bushel of the corn fed into the hogs. Let there be no misunderstanding of this statement. It is not a guaranty backed by money. It is not a promise of the packers. It is a statement of the intention and policy of the Food Administration, which means to do justice to the farmer."

This announcement of policy by the Food Administration followed a series of conferences between Food Administration officials and representatives of the live-stock interests. These conferences were instituted by Mr. Hoover. The stockmen were told that there was a pronounced shortage of hogs and a great necessity for increase in the amount of pork produced; and the announcement of the Food Administration which we have just quoted was made to assure the farmers that they could increase the number of hogs and be sure of getting a fair price for them.

The investigations made by Wallaces' Farmer during the preceding three years had shown conclusively that when the price of hogs dropped below the value of 11.67 bushels of No. 2 corn on the Chicago market production decreased, and that when the price was maintained for a reasonable length of time above this figure hog production increased. This law governing the production of hogs has maintained our hog supply in the United States for 60 years past. It was recognized by our Food Administration when adopting the policy indicated in the statement we have quoted.

The Food Administration wanted more than normal production. Therefore it stated its policy to be to see that hogs marketed this fall and winter should bring more than the 60-year average price, measured by the value of the corn fed to them. In other words, it agreed to try to see that hogs would sell for a premium amounting to the value of about one bushel of corn per hundred pounds of hog.

This announcement of the policy of the Food Administration was given the widest publicity. It was printed in bulletins. It was printed in the agricultural papers throughout the United States. It was used by speakers for the Food Administration and by professors of agricultural colleges and by county agents everywhere. It was used to convince the farmer that he would be fully justified in increasing the number of hogs grown this year. He was told that he could depend upon it that they would sell for a price above the cost of production, a price which would give him a profit.

The hog producers of the country were reassured by the implied guaranty of the Food Administration. They had been producing hogs at a loss; that is, they could have sold the corn and hogs separately and have received considerably more money than by feeding the corn to the hogs. But the policy announced by the Food Administration promised to put an end to this unprofitable business. If carried out in good faith the farmers could pay whatever price might be necessary for corn and feed it to the hogs with the assurance that they would not lose by the operation. Consequently the farmers increased the number of sows bred last fall, and this year they raised about 8 per cent more hogs than the

year before. It is interesting to note that this is the exact increase which Wallaces' Farmer predicted might be counted upon in case a price ration of 13 bushels of corn to 100 pounds of hog should be fixed.

The Food Administration proposed a business deal with the farmers: If the latter would increase the number of hogs the Food Administration proposed to see to it that the hogs should sell for a price which would give the farmers a slight profit. The farmers accepted this in good faith and made the increase asked for. Now the time has come for the Food Administration to carry out its part of the bargain. Last spring's crop of pigs is now beginning to go to market, and it is these pigs which the Food Administration said it would try to make sell per hundred pounds for the value of 13 bushels of the corn fed into them.

It would appear now, however, that the Food Administration does not want to carry out its share of this bargain. Recent announcements are made to the effect that the average packer's drove of hogs will sell in Chicago during the month of October for about \$18 per hundred-weight. This is about \$2.50 per hundred-weight less than the Food Administration promised to try to make them sell for. It is also announced that a minimum price of \$15.50 will be maintained on hogs. During the next five months hogs must sell at from \$19 to \$22 per hundred pounds to maintain the implied guaranty of the Food Administration; and the suggestion that the minimum be maintained at \$15.50 is a most astonishing one to come from anyone conversant with the principles of hog production.

Apparently the Food Administration is going to try to justify this cut of two or three dollars per hundred pounds on hogs. It is going to try to make people believe that it is an approach to its guaranty. When the plan was adopted the price of No. 2 corn at Chicago was taken and the price of hogs at Chicago. Now, it is proposed that instead of taking the price of corn at Chicago, the price will be taken on the farm. This is Jew bargaining with a vengeance. If the price of corn is to be taken on the farm, why should not the price of hogs be taken on the farm? Such juggling will make a difference of 50 cents to \$1 a hundred less on the price the farmer gets for his hogs. Also it is proposed to consider the price of corn only during the five months just preceding the date the hogs are marketed, instead of the price during the 12 months preceding, as was understood when the guaranty was made. In short, the Food Administration proposes to change the terms of the contract to suit its own notion after the farmer has carried out his engagement in good faith.

The Food Administration can not justify a repudiation of its agreement by saying that to carry it out would make the price of pork too high for our allies to pay. If it is necessary for us to furnish pork to our allies for less than the cost of production, then the loss should be taken out of the Public Treasury and not out of the pockets of the hog producers.

Last week the Food Administration held a conference with the packers. In the newspaper report of this conference it is stated that the new scale of prices was submitted to the packers, and that "all the packers opposed the plan vigorously, but finally agreed to support the administration by doing their best to maintain the minimum of \$15.50 per hundred for the average drove for the heavy packing season." This is as entertaining as a play. In the future, how can anyone accuse the packers of lack of public spirit when, after vigorous protest, they finally agree not to buy hogs for less than \$4.50 below what they are worth?

The Food Administration has not announced what it proposes to pay for November hogs. On the basis of \$18.50 for the average packer's drove, the farmer will get for the hogs marketed during the month of October from five to ten million dollars less than they would have received if the price had been fixed on the basis which the Food Administration on November 3, 1917, announced that it would try to follow. From the talk of a \$15.50 minimum, it would appear that an effort will be made to buy hogs still cheaper in November, especially as the corn price is being beaten down.

There are two angles from which to approach this whole question. First, is it necessary to maintain or increase our hog production in order to furnish food for our Army and Navy and for our allies? If it is necessary, then the policy which the Food Administration is following is suicidal. Production can not be maintained on any such policy, to say nothing of increasing it. The farmers are the most patriotic class of people in the Nation, but they can not continue to feed corn to hogs at a loss of from one to three dollars per hundred pounds. In addition, if the Food Administration does not make a sincere effort to make good on its promise of November 3, 1917, there is danger that the farmers of the country will refuse to take seriously any further suggestions of the Food Administration. How can they?

If, instead of trying to maintain production, it is the plan of the Food Administration to restrict consumption, and thus make the hogs we do produce go around, and especially meet the needs of the boys in the armies and navies of our allies, that is another matter. We don't know whether it can be done or not. Mr. Hoover has been very skillful in such matters, and by the institution of meatless weeks or wholly restricting home consumption of pork products it is quite possible that he may be able to get as much pork across the seas as is needed. The danger of this meatless program is that it tends to still further reduce production. The farmer sees the demand for his product being curtailed, and he tries to trim his sails accordingly, by producing less and less of it, just as is true in any other line of production. As we look at it, this whole policy which is being followed by the Food Administration is fraught with very great danger to the Nation and to our allies as well.

The second angle from which the matter may be approached is the question of doing justice to the farmer and hog producer. In his address delivered in July, 1917, President Wilson said:

"A just price must, of course, be paid for everything the Government buys. By a just price I mean a price which will sustain the industries concerned in a high state of efficiency, provide a living for those who conduct them, enable them to pay good wages, and make possible the extension of their enterprise, which will from time to time become necessary as the stupendous undertaking of this war develops. We could not wisely or reasonably do less than pay such prices. They are necessary for the maintaining and developing of industry, and the maintaining and developing of industry are necessary for the great task we have on hand."

President Wilson, in this definition of a just price, did not specifically mention agriculture, but it is fair to assume that he believes the Nation should be as just to the farmer as to the manufacturer, and that it should pay the farmer as well as the manufacturer a just price for his products.

On this basis the price of hogs is not just, nor has it been just for more than a year past. Ever since August of 1917 hogs have sold for from one to six dollars per hundredweight less than the average price

of the past 10 years, measured by cost of production. Until the United States entered the war the price of hogs was above the average of 10 years past. Shortly after the Food Administration began its work of "stabilization" the price of hogs dropped below the cost of production, and has remained there ever since. Not until last month did hogs sell for the average price of the past 10 years as measured in cost of production, and no sooner did they reach this point than this hammering process began, and now they are again below this cost.

Is there any good reason why the farmer should be denied that just price for his product which the President stated should be paid by the Government and which has been granted with such a lavish hand to all other classes of producers but the farmer? Is not the farmer doing his share to win the war? Has he not furnished more than 25 per cent of our fighting men? Is he not working longer hours than any other class in the entire Nation? Has he not responded unselfishly to every appeal which has been made to him? Who, then, can justify a policy which denies to the farmer President Wilson's just price for his products? And who can justify the repudiation of a fair and square business deal made with the farmer?

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, October 29, 1918.

Hon. JESSE DUNN,
Oakland, Cal.

MY DEAR DUNN: I am pleased to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of late date. Your letter was characteristic. It was of the heart of oak. It was a mirror in which was reflected the principles and feelings of a real Democrat. It proves that real democracy still has real champions on this side of the sea. It proves that the sacred rights of freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech still have defenders worthy of the undaunted heroes who wrested these rights from embattled tyranny and who sought to transmit the blessings of liberty to their children's children.

I appreciate the indignation which you express toward the action of certain Oklahoma City and Muscogee politicians on the occasion of the recent State convention. The action of those politicians proves that real democracy has real enemies on this side of the sea. It proves that freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech may still be assassinated by those who make lofty protestations of friendship. They kiss but to betray and crucify. These men are unworthy trustees of the great legacy of liberty handed down to us by the great revolutionary fathers. There will soon be in France some four and a half million brave American boys, who are fighting the battles of democracy. They are shedding their blood, they are sacrificing their lives to make freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech sacred and respected everywhere. There are those on the Muscogee and Oklahoma City delegations who would take advantage of the absence of these defenders to stab democracy in the back, and who would, if they could, murder in the house of their friends freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech. When these champions of human rights and human liberty return, victory crowned, they will, I doubt not, rebuke those who have in their absence profaned the sanctuary of freedom and desecrated the temple of democracy. When it becomes necessary, if it becomes necessary, for these returning soldiers to reestablish and reconsecrate the inalienable rights of American freemen, "what so poor a man as Hamlet can do, I shall do to assist them." I have stood by these rights—freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, and freedom of the press—without variableness or shadow of turning. Indeed, I voted against the censorship of the press, notwithstanding it was asked by the administration and notwithstanding the freedom of the press has sometimes been abused to abuse me.

I was impressed with your remark that the Oklahoma City incident, intended by the politicians to injure me, would probably in the long run inure to my advantage. Arbitrary power like ambition often overleaps itself. Tyranny does not always succeed in cutting the tongue out of its victims. The people are just and react against injustice. I received from different parts of the State numerous protests which tend to verify your prediction. They show that the great heart of the people still beats in consonance with liberty and justice. You will be interested to hear two or three of them. I received the following telegram from southwest Oklahoma the evening of the incident to which you refer:

"Your enemies are all there. The population absent are your friends. Their high-handed schemes will wreck them. Don't worry."

The following is from an attorney in Delaware County:

"I wish to state to you that, politically, I am for you regardless of what a half handful of politicians do, or fail to do, and I assure you that the 'boys up at the forks of the creek' who live close to nature and recognize rugged honesty, will again cover your opposition with a load of ballots they will never get from under."

The following is from a farmer in Payne County:

"I have been requested to write you because we recognize in you a friend of us farmers. We'll stand back of and vote for you, and condemn the actions of the bone-head delegates; they do not represent us in such sentiment. We are for you; they only represent the little two-bit bone-headed town-corner politicians; they have raised a storm among your friends which augurs," etc.

I will not name the Oklahoma City politicians who were the chieftains in this little episode. They are well known to you. They hold high counsel and direct the destinies of the State, the world, and the universe in the lobby of the Lee Huckins Hotel. No one knows better than you that these politicians have always been against me, and that I have always been against them. The issue has always been squarely joined. They seem determined to keep me under perpetual obligation to them. I am sometimes puzzled to determine whether my friends or my enemies render me the greater service. The best way for Democracy to win is to be Democratic. The Daily Oklahoman has given aid and comfort to these politicians. Indeed, the Oklahoman has charged me with three separate and distinct acts, any one of which, had I been guilty, ought to have subjected me to the unmeasured condemnation of all patriotic American citizens. The Oklahoman afterwards felt constrained to withdraw and correct these charges. Unfortunately an assassin can not heal a wound merely by drawing the dagger out of the wound. Truth sometimes pursues at the snail's pace error which flies on the eagle's pinnions.

These charges were so fantastic that they would be laughable if they were not so serious, and if good men were not sometimes misled for the moment by such misrepresentations. Since you were once chief justice you will be interested and amused at the character of these fanciful indictments returned by no other grand jury than malice or the imagination. No truth-loving man would make such charges without evidence. No justice-loving man would credit them without proof.

The first count. The Oklahoman charged in flaming headlines that Senator GORE was giving aid and encouragement to draft resisters. This charge was based on the following telegram, which I sent to an unknown constituent. I quote his telegram first.

[Western Union telegram.]

DAUGHERTY, OKLA., September 17, 1917.

Hon. T. P. GORE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Read your letter State chairman. I travel over Oklahoma. I am confident farmers are with you 20 to 1. Please wire if there is a law that exempts men from any Army service who belong to a religious organization whose tenets are against going to war. Please quote authorities. Answer.

(Signed) H. CAPIRS.

[Western Union Telegram.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 18, 1917.

H. CAPIRS, Dougherty, Okla.:

Your telegram received and greatly appreciated. Am quoting the following from section 4 of the draft act: "Nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing and whose existing creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organizations."

(Signed) T. P. GORE.

This is the only correspondence or communication which ever took place between us. At his request I quoted without comment the letter of the law. He asked a civil question and I returned a civil answer.

Count 2. The Oklahoman charged that I was circularizing the State with literature to the effect that the draft law was unconstitutional and that those held under it were being subjected to unlawful imprisonment, and that notwithstanding the Federal court had sustained its constitutionality citizens were not obliged to obey it. This was not only not the truth; it was the reverse of the truth. I not only did not circulate such literature; I did not think that the draft law was unconstitutional. On the contrary, I thought that it was constitutional. The power of Congress to raise armies is plenary.

Count 3. The Oklahoman charged that in an address which I delivered before the Southern Commercial Congress in New York on October 17 of last year, while the liberty loan drive was in progress, I opposed the liberty loan drive and discouraged its success. The contrary was the truth. In that address I urged the success of the liberty loan in the strongest possible terms. I declared that it was as much a public duty to buy bonds as to pay taxes, and that the failure of the drive would be almost as great a calamity as the loss of a battle. I am of course powerless to prevent the Oklahoman or any other publication from imputing acts and motives to me which are the reverse of the truth. Innocent men have sometimes been put to death under the belief that they were guilty. Their innocence has afterwards been discovered, but even that was not quite competent to raise the dead.

You wonder why these charges are repeatedly made by what ought to be a responsible publication. The motive I shall one day more fully discuss. The campaign furious on the part of the Oklahoman was launched against me during the latter part of August last year. It continued with increasing fury for eight or ten weeks. It is still revived intermittently. I was one of the three members of the Finance Committee who signed the minority report filed on August 13 of last year. We urged higher rates of taxation upon war profits than those recommended by the committee. The committee itself afterwards revised its rates and raised the revenue some half billion dollars or more. I expected the profiteers to resent my action in signing this report. I expected the publications which were under their influence and control to launch against me such a campaign. I was not disappointed. There has been method in their madness. This was the real motive back of a good deal that was said and done. Other excuses, of course, have been assigned. They could not afford to assign the real motive.

I need hardly say that the general charge was made that I was not backing the administration in the prosecution of the war. People had a right to differ before the war was declared. They had no right to differ after war was declared as to the vigorous prosecution of the war to a satisfactory conclusion. Our whole future and our whole destiny are embarked in this enterprise. We must succeed. We can not afford to fail. I have said before that no man can be a friend of mine who does not favor the winning of the war. No man can be a friend of mine who is not willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to the winning of the war. As to that supreme end there must be no difference. As to the best means of winning the war differences of opinion are not only inevitable, they are desirable. They are desirable in order to test out—in order to detect whatever flaws there might be in any proposed plan, a plan on which might depend the fate of civilization itself. Lloyd George once said that he wanted a variety of counsel. Let me quote a very impressive and appropriate passage from a speech which he delivered when a member of the Asquith cabinet, while speaking of Premier Asquith:

"But we have had our differences. Good heaven! What use would I have been if I had not differed? I should have been no use at all."

"Freedom of speech is essential everywhere. The councillor who professes to agree with everything that falls from his leader has betrayed him."

"You want a variety of opinions expressed, and the height of wisdom is in knowing not what counsel to give, but which counsel to take. What I want to know is this: Whether the Nation in a great war wants counselors or mere penny-in-the-slot machines?"

I voted for some 18 or 20 big war measures. I shall not tax you with details, but will merely say that I voted for every dollar which has been asked; I voted for every bond issue which has been requested; I voted for the loans to the allies; I have voted to lay a heavy tax on war profits; I have voted for every measure to make our boys efficient fighting men. But this essential fact is, of course, obscured by the circumstance that I happened to vote for or against three or four other particular measures or amendments. Let me instance one or two.

I voted for Senator OWEN's amendment to the food-control bill to create an auditing committee on expenditures. Taxes were so high, expenses were so heavy, that I felt in duty bound to provide every possible safeguard to prevent waste and to insure economy. Has not time vindicated Senator OWEN's foresight in offering this amendment and the prudence and patriotism of those who supported this amendment?

I paired against the food-control act, although I approved of certain of its provisions. In a letter to the people of Oklahoma under date of September 29, 1917, I used the following language: "Who can answer the farmers' argument that if he must sell in a controlled market he should be allowed to buy in a controlled market?" Just two months and five days later, in his annual message to Congress, President Wilson said: "The farmers, for example, complain with a great deal of justice that while the regulation of food prices restricts their incomes, no restraints are placed upon the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase." I thought in July, when the food-control bill was under consideration, that the very things would happen that President Wilson declared in December had happened and of which he said our farmers complained with justice. I did not wish to vote to place the farmers in that situation. No one knows better than yourself to what extent the farmers of Oklahoma assisted in sending me to the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I felt under a double obligation to protect the farmers against a threatened injury or injustice. The farmers desire only that "equal justice" which the President has called "the port of democracy." A sense of injustice is a terrific force. I feared a political reaction.

I also voted for an amendment to the food-control bill to stop the use of grain in the manufacture of beer. I realized that the people would have to go on short rations and have wheatless days. This was necessary, and the people complied cheerfully. I voted, however, that while women and children were denying themselves bread, others should be required to deny themselves beer. I was outvoted. The administration at that time held a contrary view. I am pleased to say, however, that my vote has been vindicated by the recent presidential order prohibiting the brewing of beer on and after the 1st of next December.

I voted for the so-called Borland eight-hour amendment. I voted to require the Government employees in Washington to do eight hours' work for eight hours' pay. At present they receive eight hours' pay for only seven hours' work. This makes every eighth employee a supernumerary. It requires one-eighth more employees than would otherwise be necessary. It increases this demand for labor by 14 per cent, notwithstanding the present scarcity of labor. These employees have comfortable quarters, and their pay is certain without regard to floods or droughts or the vicissitudes of the seasons. I felt that in time of war they might well be required to render eight hours' work for eight hours' pay, and that the taxpayers were entitled to a dollar's worth of service for every dollar's worth of salary. Many of our people work long hours and work in sunshine and in shower to pay the taxes out of which the Government pays eight hours' wages for seven hours' work. I do not pretend that my views were infallible on this subject; I only maintain that I had a right to my views and had reasons which I honestly considered sufficient.

I also voted for the "work-or-fight" amendment. The administration was not opposed to this policy. It was opposed, as I understand, to the embodiment of the policy in legislation. I had to meet the question, however, as a legislator; I had to bear my own responsibility. I therefore voted for the "work-or-fight" amendment. It seemed to me that while millions of our boys were risking their lives and many of them sacrificing their lives in France, we could not afford to do less than to require those that remained behind either to work or fight. I did not vote to take from labor the right to strike where there was an agreement to submit the dispute to arbitration and abide by the award. I was not willing to enslave labor; on the other hand, I was not willing even to seem to discriminate in favor of slackers in this country as against our boys who are fighting on the fields of France.

I voted to try out the volunteer system before resorting to the draft. No one can deny that there are many points in favor of the selective draft. The volunteer, however, had been one of the chief figures in American history. One of our most cherished traditions was bound up in this system. The volunteers had waged and won every war of the Republic. They had led us without fail to victory and to glory. The heroism of our volunteers, like that of our drafted men, is to-day crowning American arms with unsurpassed splendor. One's wisdom might possibly be questioned for voting to stand by so ancient and so sacred a tradition, but it would hardly seem to lay his patriotism open to impeachment. In respect to the last draft law, I thought that 18 years was too low an age for the draft until it was dictated by military necessity. Both France and England had done what I tried to do. Every Member of the House from Oklahoma but one voted to exempt youths of 18 years from being drafted until all eligible men above that age had been drafted. I had the Senate excuse me from voting upon this measure. My colleagues were of the opinion that a unanimous vote would have a salutary effect upon the people in Germany and Austria. I was anxious to do everything that I could to convince those people of our united purpose to wage this war vigorously to the end. I could not get my consent to vote for a measure which would draft your son and which by its express terms exempted me and other Senators and Congressmen merely because we were officeholders. I have done my duty as I saw it.

Since we are in this war I think we ought to make a good job of it. Some say, "To Hei—ena with the Hohenzollerns!" I am not so much concerned with their habitat as I am to see them stripped of their power to baptize mankind again with blood and with fire.

It had been my hope to get down in the State before the campaign closed. The "flu" is raging there, however, and the Senate Finance Committee is having continuous sessions on the war-revenue bill. I shall indulge the hope to visit you again one of these days in Oakland.

With best wishes, believe me, very truly.

THE FARMERS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON
PACKING PLANTS AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1918.

HON. THOMAS P. GORE,
Chairman Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GORE: For the sake of fair play and in order that all the interests affected by the packers and those interested in the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission regarding the meat-packing industry may have their side of the case presented, the Farmers' National Committee on Packing Plants and Allied Industries instructs me to request that you would have the inclosed statement regarding the hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We trust that you will have this done.

Yours, very truly,

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

STATEMENT BY THE FARMERS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON PACKING PLANTS
AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES.

The hearings held by the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry on Senate resolution 221 with regard to the packing houses brought out a most extraordinary condition of affairs and demonstrated the very close connection between the packers, the financial interests, and the chamber of commerce. The evidence brought out indicated the great influence of the financial interests and the packers in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and, even more important, the close comradeship existing between the large aggregations of business centering in the chamber of commerce.

Officials of the chamber of commerce claim that the membership represents the major portion of the business interests of the country. The secretary of the chamber of commerce submitted the most recent list of its associate and individual members, confined to firms, corporations, and individuals who are members of affiliated organizations and have no vote. Associate members pay \$100 or multiples thereof annually; individual members, \$25 annually. At present there are approximately 7,000 individual and 2,000 associate members. About 1,050 commercial organizations, with an underlying membership of over 500,000 corporations, firms, and individuals, constitute the voting membership of the chamber. The financial statement of the chamber of commerce shows that they expended last year about \$420,000. It was brought out that the chamber of commerce was started in 1912, and a budget of \$100,000 a year was underwritten shortly after by the organizers. Special interest attaches to the chamber of commerce in connection with the investigation being held by the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry because of the widespread publicity given to the report of the Federal Trade Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on the Federal Trade Commission, with direct reference to the report of the Trade Commission on the meat-packing industry.

Mr. Rush C. Butler, chairman of this Federal Trade committee, stated, "I have stated broadly that the business interests of the country, as represented in and by the chamber of commerce, took exception to the spirit in which the commands of Congress are administered by the Federal Trade Commission." Mr. Butler admitted that most questions of importance are submitted to the referendum of the membership of the chamber; that being the policy, that it take no action without a referendum, but that this report was not submitted to referendum, and that it is at present nothing more than a report of the Federal Trade committee to the board of directors of the chamber, though probably with the authority of the chamber, it has been widely circulated. The Federal Trade committee was organized in February, 1915, and Mr. Harry A. Wheeler, who had previously been president of the chamber, was appointed chairman of this committee, which office he held until his reelection to the presidency of the chamber. Another member of the original Federal Trade committee was Mr. Joseph P. Cotton, of New York, who now represents the Food Administration on the meat end of the packing industry. Mr. Cotton resigned in 1916. Mr. Butler admitted that he originated the idea of making a report of the Federal Trade Commission while Mr. Heney was conducting his investigation. Mr. Butler, who has been attorney for Cudahy & Co., severely criticized the Federal Trade Commission for an alleged change in their method of dealing with the business interests of the country, and particularly for their action in turning over facts which they had found by searching the correspondence of men engaged in the packing industry to the Department of Justice. He admitted that from what he had gathered from the newspapers he thought that the conduct of Mr. Heney in the investigation of the packing plants was not right, and took steps to secure a report on the Federal Trade Commission on this account, while the Federal Trade committee had conferences with the Federal Trade Commission to try to get them to change their methods of investigation and their attitude toward business. Mr. Allen Walker, of New York, local manager for the chamber of commerce, had charge in 1915 of raising a guarantee fund, and sent out a letter appealing for subscriptions to business men. Probably this letter was sent to many, including the big list of 100 who were asked to pay at least \$1,000 a year each for three years. In this letter he said: "The point I wish to make—and I did not mean to dwell on it at such length—is that some of our corporation interests do not seem to grasp that this is their game—it is their pie." On the list of large contributors were the following: Thomas F. Ryan, Harry A. Wheeler, Great Northern Railroad, Armour & Co., Swift & Co., International Harvester Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Southern Pacific Railroad, New Jersey Zinc Co., John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the International Paper Co. Mr. Walker explained that the policy of the chamber was to make known that the contribution of any corporation was to be considered in the light of "business patriotism," and that it could not in any sense serve any individual or group interests. Following Mr. Walker's testimony, Mr. Butler expressed his opinion that he "didn't know whether the packers wanted the investigation of themselves or not." Mr. Butler stated, "I have no interest in ascertaining the facts about the packers." He admitted that the packers had been doing a great deal of advertising recently, but claimed that if they spend \$25,000,000 a year in advertising they could not counteract the effect of the methods of investigation and the activities of the Federal Trade Commission. He said, "I think this kind of publicity given out by an administrative agency of the Government of the United States does such irreparable damage that the expenditure of \$25,000,000 by the packers in a single year in any manner that they see fit to spend it would not begin to repair the injury." Mr. Butler, when asked whether the widespread editorial policy of opposition to the Trade Commission's report on the meat-packing industry might not have been affected by the extensive advertising of the packers, replied, "Well, if so, that would indicate a degraded press. I do not believe it is quite as bad as that." Mr. Butler asserted that the chamber of commerce wishes the commission to stay right where it is, but stated that the President has the power of removal of commissioners and the power of appointment, and that there are two vacancies on the commission now, and if he appoints men of the right viewpoint that the commission will be one of the greatest instrumentalities for usefulness in the country.

Mr. Ed. C. Lasater, a large live-stock grower of Texas, submitted sworn affidavits to the committee showing many instances of the sale of putrid and unfit meat by the five big packers; the indictments found against them, and the fines levied upon them. An item having appeared in the Washington Star to the effect that the farmers were disturbed by the Federal Trade Commission's report, Mr. George P. Hampton, managing director of the Farmers' National Headquarters and legislative representative in Washington of several farm organizations, testified that his knowledge of the farmers and their attitude convinced him that the farmers of the country were overwhelmingly behind the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Hampton referred

to the organization of the Farmers' National Committee on Packing Plants and Allied Industries, including representatives of most of the leading farm organizations of the country, whose specific purpose is to secure the carrying out of the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission as to the packing plants.

Most extraordinary testimony was given by Mr. Harry A. Wheeler, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and vice president of the Union Trust Co., of Chicago. Mr. Wheeler was asked whether there was any basis for the mention in the report of the Federal Trade Commission of the Union Trust Co. as one of the banks in which close business associates of the packers were directors, and specifically whether the Union Trust Co. was in any way connected with the Armour interests. He denied categorically that it is so connected, and stated that the commission was not at all justified in including the Union Trust Co. in this list and referring to it as an Armour institution, saying: "It is an assumption such as they have made in many instances, not proven by fact." Chairman Colver, of the Federal Trade Commission, presented proof that the Union Trust Co., with which Mr. Wheeler has been connected for 10 years, was directly tied up with the Armour interests. Mr. George E. Marcy, president of the Armour Grain Co., and for many years the active man of the company, Chairman Colver showed, is a director of the Union Trust Co. J. Ogden Armour owns 64 per cent of the stock of the Armour Grain Co., and other members of the Armour family own 22.9 per cent.

Naturally Mr. Wheeler objected to having the Union Trust Co. brought into the discussion, perhaps anticipating that the facts would be brought out, though he admitted that he was acquainted with the board of directors and the principal stockholders on the Union Trust Co., and said, "None of the Armours are in any way connected with the bank." Before the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry Mr. Wheeler, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, criticized the procedure of the Federal Trade Commission on the ground that it was un-American and improper, though there was no question of veracity or accuracy involved in its report on the meat-packing industry. Mr. Wheeler, on the stand, as also the report of the Federal Trade Commission of the Chamber of Commerce, criticizing the Trade Commission, did not attempt to deny any of the facts or charges of the Federal Trade Commission, and the chamber's charge of ex parte proceedings by the commission was completely disproven by the testimony brought out before the committee, that the packers sought to secure immunity if they gave testimony and declined to waive immunity, under which conditions it would have been manifestly improper for the commission to have permitted them to give any testimony. Mr. Wheeler refused to answer the questions of Senators as to whether the Chamber of Commerce denies the specific charges against the packers made by the Federal Trade Commission. Chairman Colver submitted detailed figures on the loans made to the packers by the banks in which the packers have a controlling interest, even if not officially represented on the directorate. The total loans outstanding about June 30, 1917, was \$37,527,351.15 in one series of banks. Much of these loans were made without any security. The Union Trust Co. on June 30, 1917, had loans outstanding to packers of \$674,531.27.

The action of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in publishing a report criticizing the Federal Trade Commission, a governmental agency created by act of Congress, and the methods adopted by this powerful association of business men through a small committee to attempt to break down the effect of the commission's findings in investigations ordered by the Congress and by the President, is, so far as our knowledge goes, without a parallel in the history of the United States. The testimony adduced before the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry showed the charges of the Federal Trade Commission of the Chamber of Commerce that the Federal Trade Commission has exceeded its jurisdiction, has acted without judgment, has skipped from one investigation to another, has played politics, has been too fast and too slow to be utterly without foundation in fact.

The testimony shows the sinister, insidious effort on the part of the trade committee of the Chamber of Commerce to attribute to the Trade Commission the recommendation that the Government should take over and operate the packing plants, through a maliciously cunning reference to the trade committee's report on the findings and recommendation of a committee appointed to report on the policies to be pursued by the Government with regard to the meat and packing industries. The animus of the officials of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is clearly shown in the statement of Mr. Butler, chairman of the committee of the chamber of commerce which criticized the Federal Trade Commission: "I would conceal evidence from Mr. Heney, and if the commission should come along and say it was behind Mr. Heney I might take some other view of it," as also in his statement with reference to a charge made by the Trade Commission: "Well, I would not believe it if it was in the report if that report was prepared by Mr. Heney." Mr. Butler gave a very strange twist to the ordinary conception of justice when he said: "If a small part of what the commission says about the packers be true, the Department of Justice ought to be impeached, from the Attorney General down." This expressed opinion of the spokesman of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States about the Department of Justice is peculiarly repugnant to the patriotic citizens of our country engaged in this world struggle in view of the fact that none of the officers of the chamber of commerce appearing before the Senate committee questioned in any way the accuracy of the findings of the Federal Trade Commission, but bitterly criticized the commission for turning over evidence the commission found in its inquiries to the Department of Justice. Stripped of its verbiage, the report of the chamber of commerce constitutes a desperate effort to break down the effect of the careful, painstaking, and reliable investigations of the Federal Trade Commission, especially the investigation of the packers.

Among the striking facts brought out before the Subcommittee on Agriculture were the complicated methods by which all the common stock of Sulzberger & Co. was turned over to the following trustees: A. Barton Hepburn, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Chase National Bank; Charles F. Sabin, president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York; Harry Bronner, of Hallgarten & Co.; Max Sulzberger and Germon F. Sulzberger, representing the Sulzberger interests, through a system of modified coercion which establishes a record for shady financial transactions. The keen interest of the packers in the organization of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States was shown in a letter put in the hearing, written on June 28, 1915, by Mr. Louis F. Swift to Mr. L. A. Carton regarding a luncheon he attended at the request of Mr. De Frees, attended also by Mr. John Fahey, then president of the National Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Forgan, Mr. Thomas Wilson, and quite a few others. In this letter Mr. Swift said: "Was considerably impressed with the program which they have laid out, and if they make any request for financial assistance would like to know about it. They maintain a bureau in Washington and evidently get a good hearing on all legislation." The story was brought out at the hearing of the inter-

view which Mr. Wheeler had with Mr. Rockefeller with reference to enlarging the scope of the publication of the chamber of commerce called "The Nation's Business."

Mr. Ivy Lee, press agent, testified that the money for this was to come from Mr. Rockefeller's fund. A letter from Mr. Wheeler of the National Chamber of Commerce to Mr. Rockefeller was considered "privileged" and was not produced. The close connection, almost complete identity, between the financial interests and the packers was completely established at these hearings. It is true that the packers, as such, have contributed a relatively small amount of the total budget or to the guarantee fund of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. But it is true in finance as in geometry that things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. This identity of interests is determined to prevent, if possible, at least by all means within its power, to postpone the carrying into effect of the recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission with reference to the meat-packing industry, which would strip the five big packers of those privileges they now enjoy, which have enabled them to build up an overwhelming monopoly not only in the production and supply of meat but to reach out for control over the major part of the food supply of the country. Mr. Heney remarked, "Armour advises that there isn't any food supply that he does not handle," while Commissioner Murdock, after his investigation, came to the conclusion, "So now there is not practically any activity in the way of distribution of food and care of the public as represented in the average town by stores, that the packer is not invading." Not only that the packers intrenched and fortified by carefully built-up undoubted privilege in this country now seek world domination in food-stuffs, so that the Federal Trade Commission was constrained to say of this aspect of international activity: "This urgently argues for a solution which will increase and not diminish the high regard in which this people is held in international comity." Such a solution the Federal Trade Commission has found and recommended, and the plan of the big five packers and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to prevent the solution is a challenge to the American people. Production must be made free and unmonopolized.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 23d instant approved and signed the act (S. 3470) to amend section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I call up the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the Senate consider the committee amendments when reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the committee amendments be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the Senator from Virginia, who has charge of the Appropriation bill, to yield to me for a moment in order that I may ask unanimous consent for the passage of a very short bill, which came over from the House, having been unanimously reported there, and which has been unanimously reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will yield to the Senator, with the understanding that the matter is not debated and that the Appropriation bill will not be displaced.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12976) providing for the protection of the users of the telephone and telegraph service and the properties and funds belonging thereto during Government operation and control. I will state that it is very necessary that this bill shall pass. The Government can not properly operate the telegraph and telephone until it is passed.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever during the period of governmental operation of the telephone and telegraph systems of the United States by the Postmaster General, under the act of Congress approved July 16, 1918, and the proclamation of the President dated July 22, 1918, shall, without authority and without the knowledge and consent of the other users thereof, except as may be necessary for operation of the service, tap any telegraph or telephone line, or willfully interfere with the operation of such telephone and telegraph systems or with the transmission of any telephone or telegraph message, or with the delivery of any such message, or whoever being employed in any such telephone or telegraph service shall divulge the contents of any such telephone or telegraph message to any person not duly authorized or entitled to receive the same, shall be fined not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 2. That whoever shall steal, purloin, embezzle, or without authority destroy any money, property, record, voucher, or valuable thing whatever of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of any telephone or telegraph system operated by the Postmaster General under

the act of Congress approved July 16, 1918, and the proclamation of the President dated July 22, 1918, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Sec. 3. That whoever shall receive, conceal, or aid in concealing, or shall have or retain in his possession with intent to convert to his own use or gain any money, property, record, voucher, or valuable thing whatever of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of any telephone or telegraph system operated by the Postmaster General under the act of Congress approved July 16, 1918, and the proclamation of the President dated July 22, 1918, which has been embezzled, stolen, or purloined by any other person, knowing the same to be embezzled, stolen, or purloined, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, and such person may be tried either before or after the conviction of the principal defendant.

Sec. 4. That whoever shall forcibly break into, or attempt to break into, any telephone or telegraph office, or any building used in whole or in part as such telephone or telegraph office, of any telephone or telegraph system operated by the Postmaster General under the act of Congress approved July 16, 1918, and the proclamation of the President dated July 22, 1918, with intent to commit in such telephone or telegraph office or building, or part thereof so used, any larceny or other depredation, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Sec. 5. That whoever shall assault any person having lawful charge, control, or custody of any money or property of any telephone or telegraph system operated by the Postmaster General under the act of Congress approved July 16, 1918, and the proclamation of the President dated July 22, 1918, with intent to rob, steal, or purloin such money or property, or any part thereof, or shall rob any such person of such money or property, or any part thereof, shall be imprisoned not more than five years; and if in the effecting or attempting to effect such robbery he shall wound such person having custody of the money or property, or put his life in danger by the use of a dangerous weapon, shall be imprisoned not more than 10 years.

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

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, before proceeding with the reading of the bill, I desire to call attention to the fact, which every Senator realizes as well as I do, that the appropriations are reaching enormous proportions. The Committee on Appropriations has felt deeply the responsibility resting on them. They have made an earnest effort to prevent any useless appropriation, but at the same time they have felt in duty bound to report favorably every dollar necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

In carrying out this purpose the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate had its labors greatly lessened by the extraordinary labors of the House committee. I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to say that during my service in this body I have never seen abler, more energetic, more intelligent, more faithful work than has been performed on this bill by Mr. SHERLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. He has made our duties much lighter than they would have otherwise been, and he has given us information which it would have taken us a long time to acquire. As I said, our duties have been made much lighter by the burden which he has carried and carried with wonderful success.

Now, Mr. President, I have only this suggestion to make: We are all anxious to get the business of the Senate in such a shape that we can adjourn or recess Congress on the 29th to the 12th day of November. We hope to have a conference this evening on this bill. It has to go through conference and to final passage before the 29th of this month. I will not ask and will not suggest that any Senator forego any criticism or any investigation, but I am anxious that the bill should be facilitated and speeded up as much as possible, consistent with a proper guarding of the public welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN.

Subsection (c) of section 7 of the "trading with the enemy act," approved October 6, 1917, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If the President shall so require any money or other property including (but not thereby limiting the generality of the above) patents, copyrights, applications therefor, and rights to apply for the same, trade-marks, choses in action, and rights and claims of every character and description owing or belonging to or held for, by, on account of, or on behalf of, or for the benefit of, an enemy or ally of enemy not holding a license granted by the President hereunder, which the President after investigation shall determine is so owing or so belongs or is so held, shall be conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid over to the Alien Property Custodian, or the same may be seized by the Alien Property Custodian; and all property thus acquired shall be held, administered, and disposed of as elsewhere provided in this act.

"Any requirement made pursuant to this act, or a duly certified copy thereof, may be filed, registered, or recorded in any office for the filing, registering, or recording of conveyances, transfers, or assignments of any such property or rights as may be covered by such requirement

(including the proper office for filing, registering, or recording conveyances, transfers, or assignments of patents, copyrights, trade-marks, or any rights therein or any other rights); and if so filed, registered, or recorded shall impart the same notice and have the same force and effect as a duly executed conveyance, transfer, or assignment to the Alien Property Custodian so filed, registered, or recorded.

"Whenever any such property shall consist of shares of stock or other beneficial interest in any corporation, association, or company or trust, it shall be the duty of the corporation, association, or company or trustee or trustees issuing such shares or any certificates or other instruments representing the same or any other beneficial interest to cancel upon its, his, or their books all shares of stock or other beneficial interest standing upon its, his, or their books in the name of any person or persons, or held for, on account of, or on behalf of, or for the benefit of any person or persons who shall have been determined by the President, after investigation, to be an enemy or ally of enemy, and which shall have been required to be conveyed, transferred, assigned, or delivered to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him, and in lieu thereof to issue certificates or other instruments for such shares or other beneficial interest to the Alien Property Custodian or otherwise, as the Alien Property Custodian shall require.

"The sole relief and remedy of any person having any claim to any money or other property heretofore or hereafter conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid over to the Alien Property Custodian, or required so to be, or seized by him, shall be that provided by the terms of this act, and in the event of sale or other disposition of such property by the Alien Property Custodian shall be limited to and enforced against the net proceeds received therefrom and held by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this amendment will permit the Alien Property Custodian to take the assets of the German insurance companies which have been placed in his custody and reincorporate them into another corporation for the transaction of business by and through his authority?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator from Virginia will allow me to answer, this amendment does not touch that question. There are only two features embraced in the amendment. It does not broaden the power of the act, but makes the act workable on two questions that were not covered by the original legislation.

One is the question of shares of stock. The present law is amply sufficient to allow the Alien Property Custodian to sell the shares of stock owned by an alien enemy in his actual possession. Of course, they can be obtained from the alien enemy in this country who owns the stock, and it has been done, but where the alien enemy lives in Germany and has stock which would be kept in Germany, the original law was not broad enough to allow him to sell the stock certificate without having actual possession of it. This allows him to sell the stock certificate, notwithstanding the fact that they have not the actual possession. That is as far as it goes on that feature.

The other proposition of the amendment relates to patents. An act has already been passed authorizing the leasing and control of these patents by the President, and he has assigned it to another department of the Government; but the Alien Property Custodian has found that there are a large number of plants that he has taken over and has a right to sell unquestionably under the act, but their ability to carry on the business is dependent on the German patents. He finds he can not sell the property for what it is worth unless he sells the patent right along with it and disposes of the patent at the same time, for after the war is over there would be no value to this particular property. That is largely true in cases of chemicals and in cases of radio plants. The radio plant at Sayville, Long Island, is involved in this question. I understand it is to be sold, and in all probability the Navy Department itself will buy the plant at the sale, to be taken over by the Government. That plant is controlled by a certain patent right on aerial service, and if they proceed to sell the plant without conveying title to the patent right to the instruments they might involve the Government in many lawsuits after the war is over. They seek to avoid that now and to sell along with the plant the patent right in this country. The sale has not been made, but it is supposed that the Government itself will buy it. Secretary Daniels has written Senator MARTIN this letter in reference to that matter:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 22, 1918.

Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN, U. S. S.

Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The department indorses the proposed amendment to the trading with the enemy act now pending with your committee. The department is engaged in the operation of a large number of wireless stations, both ship and shore, and the purpose of the department contemplates a large increase in the number of stations operated by it. It is essential that the department be allowed to operate these stations without interference by any patent litigation, and particularly without such interference at the hands of aliens. The proposed amendment to the act will effectively dispose of patent litigation after the war by German patent owners, at least to a large extent.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

In order to accomplish the real purpose of the original trading-with-the-enemy act it is essential, in order that these plants may be sold and a clear title not only to the machinery but to

the patent rights be obtained, that the President be given this additional power. That is all there is in the amendment. There are only two things involved: One is the right to sell the shares of stock that happen to be in the possession of an alien enemy in Germany where the Government does not get actual possession of them, and to sell them on the books; and the other is to give to the Alien Property Custodian, or whomsoever the President may designate, the right to sell the patent rights along with the machinery. It has been represented to the committee that, as a war necessity, this is of very vital importance, especially at this immediate time. I think one of the most severe blows that this Government has delivered against the German Empire is that we have taken over alien-enemy property; that we are proceeding to dispose of it, and that we do not propose to allow aliens to continue to do business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Alabama, so far as the control of the alien-enemy property by the Alien Property Custodian is concerned, but what I am interested in is this: It has been stated—and I understand that in the other House an amendment was introduced containing such a provision—that the Alien Property Custodian could take insurance corporations and trust corporations and operate them as Government corporations; in other words, as Government trust or Government insurance companies. Under this amendment providing for the transfer of the shares of these companies where the majority of the stock has been owned by German citizens if a majority of stock can be transferred to the Alien Property Custodian or otherwise, does not that mean that the International Trust Co. and several insurance companies can be taken over by the Alien Property Custodian and run by him, and would not they be Government companies?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No. I think the Senator from New Jersey is entirely mistaken about that. I think he is correct, however, about a bill pending in the other House. There was a bill pending in the House before the Interstate Commerce Committee that contained vastly larger powers than anything involved in this amendment. That bill may have gone—I am not sure about it—to the point which the Senator indicates. This amendment, however, does not go to that point. What this amendment does is to authorize the President—he is acting through the Alien Property Custodian—to sell the shares of stock. It does not authorize the Alien Property Custodian to take these companies over or to run them, but it merely authorizes him to sell the stock; in fact, he has that authority now as to any stock that he can get hold of in this country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If he can make a delivery.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If he can make a delivery; but of course a large amount of that stock is owned by alien enemies in Germany, and the certificates are there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no reason in the world why we should pass a bill that affects the rights of alien enemies living in the United States and not be just as drastic in our methods as to alien enemies living in Germany. That is all there is in this proposition. We have already passed a law that affects the alien enemy who lives here, whom we can put our hands on, but the man who has got a gun in his hands on the other side is getting off.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But you can provide that the stock shall be sold to American citizens.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is only an amendment to that act. All of these provisions are already in the other act. It does not change the terms. The Senator remembers the amendment that he was largely responsible for having placed in the original act. That applies to this amendment just as well as it does to that act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The only thing that I am trying to ascertain is whether the Alien Property Custodian anticipates, or has anticipated at some future time, taking the assets of these German insurance companies and starting a Government insurance company. All I want to be assured of is that there is no hidden language in this amendment which will permit him to do that, for I am opposed to Government insurance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can say to the Senator that I do not know what the purposes of the Alien Property Custodian may be; I know nothing about that; but I can assure the Senator that there is no language in this amendment that will authorize that to be carried out. That is as far as I can go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 5, after line 21, to insert:

MILITIA.

The unexpended balances of appropriations made in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918 for the Militia of the District of Columbia are made available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1919.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Shipping Board," subhead "Emergency shipping fund," on page 7, line 11, after the word "appropriated," to strike out:

Provided, That obligations incurred hereunder may be met from appropriations made or to be made for the construction of ships.

So as to make the clause read:

2. For the acquisition or establishment of plants suitable for ship-building or ship maintenance or repair, or of materials essential thereto, and for the enlargement or extension of such plants as are now or may be hereafter acquired or established, authority is granted to enter into contracts or otherwise to incur obligations for not to exceed \$34,662,500 in addition to the amounts heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," subhead "Salaries," on page 8, line 11, after the words "Department of State," to strike out "\$136,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For employees in the Department of State, \$200,000: *Provided*, That not more than six persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign intercourse," on page 9, line 1, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Clerks at embassies and legations: For the employment of necessary clerks at the embassies and legations, who, whenever hereafter appointed, shall be citizens of the United States, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Bureau of War-Risk Insurance," on page 12, after line 4, to insert:

For the purpose of the payment of allotments made by the enlisted men or the payment of family allowances under Article II of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended, an enlisted man reported as missing in action shall be considered as occupying a pay status until his actual status has been determined by proper official authority of the department in which the man served or is serving: *Provided*, That payments authorized hereunder shall not continue for more than one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Interstate quarantine service: For cooperation with State and municipal health authorities in the prevention of the spread of contagious and infectious diseases in interstate traffic, including the sanitation of areas adjoining military and naval reservations and Government industrial plants, in order properly to safeguard the health of the military forces and Government employees, including necessary clerical help in the District of Columbia and other personal services, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quarantine stations," on page 14, line 14, after the words "direction of the," to strike out "Construction Division of the War Department" and insert "Supervising Architect of the Treasury," so as to make the clause read:

The foregoing construction work under "Quarantine stations" shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 15, to insert:

CREDIT IN ACCOUNTS.

Relief of Maj. (now Lieut. Col.) Charles J. Nelson: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. (now Lieut. Col.) Charles J. Nelson, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$327.04, being a shortage in his accounts caused by embezzlement of Quartermaster funds by Mack A. Steel, civilian clerk (temporary), who was acting as chief clerk in the finance office at Fort Logan H. Roots.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 15, after line 1, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES.

For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," at the top of page 16, to insert:

Claims occasioned by explosions and fire at plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., Morgan, N. J.: The Secretary of War is authorized to consider, ascertain, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property occasioned by the recent explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Co., at Morgan, N. J., and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress within six months from the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Military Establishment," subhead "Contingencies of the Army," on page 17, line 12, after the date "1919," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919; \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Quartermaster Corps," subhead "Pay of the Army," on page 24, after line 5, to strike out:

The President is authorized, through the Secretary of War, during the existing emergency, from time to time, to requisition or otherwise take over for the United States any lands, including the buildings thereon and their equipment, or any temporary use thereof, required for hospital facilities. He shall ascertain and pay, from the proper appropriation, a just compensation therefor. If the compensation so ascertained be not satisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined, and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the United States district court for the judicial district where the property is situated to recover such further sum as, added to the 75 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation: *Provided*, That hospital facilities shall be so situated as to provide for the care of patients as near the place from which they entered the Army or Navy as practicable, and that the facilities shall be in every case in keeping with the number of men in the service from the different States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 16, to strike out:

Shooting galleries and ranges: For shooting galleries and ranges, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$183,186.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

For the acquisition of land at Fayetteville, N. C., for an artillery range, \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 22, to strike out:

For the acquisition of land at West Point, Ky., for an artillery range, \$1,600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on page 29, at line 22, I desire to offer an amendment, and I ask permission of the Senator from Virginia that I may offer it at this time, because I am obliged to attend a meeting of the Finance Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am very glad to agree that that course shall be followed in this instance, because I know that the Senator is needed in the Finance Committee. I therefore ask that the rule be varied so that he may offer his amendment now.

Mr. LODGE. In offering the amendment I merely wish to say that it arises from the great destruction caused to State roads by Army traffic in the neighborhood of Army posts. At several places in my State where there are Army or military posts roads, which were fine roads, they have been destroyed by motor trucks, and this amendment is to give authority to the Government to pay a portion of the expense of repair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 29, line 22, after the word "purpose," it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with the duly authorized officials of any State or any political subdivision thereof, for the payments of such proportion as may be mutually determined to be equitable, not to exceed 50 per cent, of the cost of the reconstruction or repair of any public highway, where said reconstruction or repair is made necessary principally by reason of the increased use thereof resulting from the location, construction, or extension of any Government armory, arsenal, fortification, proving ground, or other governmental facility under the supervision of the Chief of Ordnance, in the immediate locality adjacent to or served by said public highway.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I make the point of order that that item is not estimated for, and that it is clearly out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, while my attention was diverted, two items included in lines 21 to 24, inclusive, on page 25, were stricken out in accordance with the amendment proposed by the committee. I wish to say that when this question was before the committee, of which I am a member, I protested against striking out those lines. I was told in the committee that the purpose of striking them out was to get more information, and that the items would go to conference. I think probably that when the bill goes to conference information will be furnished demonstrating that these appropriations are necessary; and with the understanding that the items will be considered in conference and, if necessary, will be put back in the

bill I shall make no further protest. I should like, however, to have inserted in the Record a letter from Gen. Jervy, Assistant Chief of Staff, who had this matter in hand, and I ask permission to incorporate that letter in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to incorporate in his remarks the letter to which he has referred. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
August 8, 1918.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of War.

Subject: Land for Field Artillery training center, Fayetteville, N. C.
1. The attached papers relate to the acquisition of approximately 120,000 acres of land at Fayetteville, N. C., for use in connection with the Field Artillery training center which is to be established at that place. The real estate branch has ascertained that the land can be acquired as soon as this season's crops are out of the way for approximately \$1,500,000—either by purchase or condemnation—or the land can be rented at a cost of approximately \$120,000 per year. In the latter case, however, there would have to be an additional amount allowed for damage to buildings and cultivated lands. Only 7 per cent of the land is now under cultivation. From options secured last year by the local chamber of commerce, the purchase price fixed by the owners aggregates about \$2,000,000. If the land is leased, it is estimated that damages in addition to the rental for the first year would be \$500,000. Therefore the total cost for the first year would be approximately \$620,000 if the land is leased. Consequently it would seem more advisable to acquire title to this tract of land, which embraces about 120,000 acres, by purchase, or in those instances where the owners will not sell it at a reasonable price, title should be acquired by condemnation proceedings with view to purchase.

2. The estimated cost of this project is \$1,500,000. Funds are available from the Army appropriation bill, fiscal year 1919. It is recommended that \$1,500,000 be authorized to acquire title to this tract of approximately 120,000 acres of land and that for those portions of the land which cannot be purchased at a reasonable price it is recommended that condemnation proceedings be instituted to acquire title by purchase.

3. Approval is recommended.

HENRY JERVY,
Brigadier General, National Army,
Assistant Chief of Staff, Director of Operations.

Approved:

B. CROWELL,
The Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that the committee was not satisfied with the items to which he has referred; but when the bill goes to conference we will give them further investigation and hear all that can be said in respect to them.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 31, after line 12, to insert:

MILITARY ACADEMY.

The United States Military Academy Cadets of the classes of 1920 and 1921 who have been ordered by military authority to graduate November 1, 1918, and to provide themselves with the full personal equipment required for immediate active service overseas, shall be credited with so much of their respective full course personal equipment allowances as may remain unpaid at the said date of their graduation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," on page 37, after line 22, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For the following employees from November 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation, as follows: Six clerks of class 4, at \$1,800 each; 20 clerks of class 3, at \$1,600 each; 21 clerks of class 2, at \$1,400 each; 24 clerks of class 1, at \$1,200 each; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; and 1 messenger, \$840; in all, \$74,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 5, to insert:

For personal services in connection with extraordinary work of the Post Office Department in the District of Columbia, to be expended under the direction of the Postmaster General, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 16, to insert:

POSTAL SERVICE.

OUT OF THE POSTAL REVENUE—OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For compensation to postmasters, fiscal year 1917, \$4,912.31.

For special-delivery fees for the fiscal years that follow:

Nineteen hundred and seventeen, \$22.72;

Nineteen hundred and eighteen, \$196,022.32.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 42, after line 21, to strike out:

The appropriation of \$50,000 "for one new vessel, including equipment, to cost not exceeding \$354,000," contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, shall be covered into the surplus fund, and the authorization for the said vessel is repealed.

And insert:

The appropriation "for one new vessel, including equipment, to cost not exceeding \$354,000, \$50,000," contained in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, is hereby amended to read as follows: For one new vessel, including equipment, to cost not exceeding \$354,000, under contract which is hereby authorized, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 13, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.
NATURALIZATION SERVICE.

The temporary appointments of members of the Naturalization Bureau and Service are hereby made permanent and the appointees given a full classified status.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not adopt this amendment; or, if it does adopt the amendment, that it will do away with the Civil Service Commission entirely. This is only a beginning. The Naturalization Bureau, I presume, now has more employees than it ever has had, and many of them have been employed, I am sure, without any civil-service examination whatever. I am not finding fault with the bureau for employing men and women without examination under the conditions existing to-day, but I do find fault that as soon as they are in the service without examination, and at a time when it is impossible for the bureau to secure a greater number of employees than needed, such employees are covered into the civil service without examination of any sort whatever. I can not see any reason or justification for this piece of legislation, unless it is going to be followed by other legislation covering all of the hundreds of thousands of temporary clerks into the civil service. The President now has authority to take this action if he sees fit; it has been done in the past, and there is no necessity for the legislation whatever. I can not for the life of me see why it is proposed. There has never been a time, Mr. President, I presume, in the history of our country when it has been so hard to secure the number of employees the various bureaus, divisions, and departments want.

Mr. THOMAS. They get all they need, but not all they want.

Mr. SMOOT. I was very careful to use the word "want." The head of a bureau told me only last week that if he were allowed to pick out 40 per cent of the employees in his bureau he could secure as great an amount and better work than he can now with the whole number employed. They are in each others' way.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I ask the Senator for information. Why does not the head of the bureau referred to proceed to discharge the 60 per cent of incompetents?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say, Mr. President, that if he should attempt to make the discharges, he would immediately meet with objections higher up.

Mr. REED. Oh, well, I think not. I think there are supernumeraries, but I do not see how a man can be head of a department and not have the authority to regulate his employees.

Mr. SMOOT. What I referred to was not a department, but a bureau.

Mr. REED. Well, the head of a bureau.

Mr. FLETCHER. The head of the bureau must have asked for the employees.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Florida suggests that the head of the bureau must have asked for the employees. I do not wish to go into personalities and remind the Senator why many have been employed. The Senator from Florida knows the reason. Senators and Representatives have asked that many be employed and have asked the head of the bureau to employ them. I know it is very hard sometimes for heads of bureaus to refuse to make appointments under such circumstances.

Mr. FLETCHER. The point I was making was that the bureau chief, whoever he is, who makes a statement like that is, in my judgment, in the first instance, responsible, because he must have asked for the employees; and he should not have asked for them if he was going to get an organization that he did not need.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no use of going into a discussion of this question. I think every Senator knows that so far as the number of employees is concerned in the departments in Washington, they are out of all reason. I know that they have employees who can not do the required work, and I am quite sure that if they had such employees as they could secure in ordinary times there would not be half of the employees in the District of Columbia who are now here, and yet they would perform all of the work that is being done at the present time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. I have not the slightest doubt of the fact that there are a large number of employees in the city of Washington who could be dispensed with if the bureaus and places in which they are employed were thoroughly organized and had

time to develop a trained corps of assistants. The trouble to-day is that somebody is called upon suddenly to create a department to perform important work. He has to do it out of raw material, to use an expression that I think will cover it. He calls in a lot of men who are ignorant to a large extent of the work, and they get a lot of young ladies who are ignorant of the work, and they proceed to organize the best way they can. The result is that they have a great number of incompetents and for a while the machinery does not work. After a while they begin to get some system out of it, and some work; and yet, making allowance for all that, I have not a bit of doubt there are a great number of supernumeraries employed in the departments who ought to be gotten rid of. There has been a great deal of waste, but I still do not understand how the head of a department can go around grumbling that he could get rid of 60 per cent of his employees if he were permitted to, because I think he could get rid of them if he tried.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what I wanted to bring particularly to the attention of the Senate was this: Cases such as that just spoken of by the Senator and the one to which I referred, and intended to proceed to refer to a little more extensively, no doubt exist; but this amendment covers the people into the civil service when we know that they are not qualified or fitted for the positions that they occupy to-day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator right there?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. As a matter of fact, when this bureau was organized as it is now they could not get civil-service employees. The Civil Service Commission could not furnish them, and could not furnish them to-day. Now, the question is in regard to these people who have been in the employ of the bureau there for six months, some of them for a year, can they not do better service after having been trained in the work, as the Senator from Missouri says, than new ones who might be covered in from the civil-service register?

Mr. SMOOT. In some cases perhaps they might; in other cases they might not. I want to say now that it is my opinion that half of them can not, or even more; and why bother now to provide that all of the employees of that department should be covered in under the civil service, when I have no doubt but that every Senator will agree that there are many of them that could not pass the required examination? That is the objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but, Mr. President, would you not get very many on the civil-service register that would not be competent to fill the places, and yet you would have to take them?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, they are supposed to be competent if they have passed the examination prescribed by the commission. If the commission has broken down, and if they allow employees to pass the examinations who are not capable of doing the work for which they took the examination, that is against the system.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him further, I know of one or two employees there who failed to pass the civil-service examination, possibly on mathematics, or possibly on using a typewriter, or something else that they are not called upon to use in the service. Now, why should not people like that, who are not required to perform that particular service, be competent to do something else?

Mr. SMOOT. That same argument applies to every bureau and every department of the Government. If we are going to have a civil service, we ought to have it. If we do not want it, we ought to abolish it. We should not allow the Naturalization Bureau and Service to employ people who have not taken the civil-service examination, and then at a time when there are more employees than were ever known before cover them all into the civil service. That is the wrong of this amendment, and that is the reason why I ask that the Senate disagree to the amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, this affects only a very few men—no great number of men. All of the employees in this District are taken under the civil service, except a few men. An act passed at the last Congress providing for the naturalization of certain soldiers in the camps required the employment of lawyers to look after that naturalization. They had to be good lawyers, and the civil-service register could not furnish them. Therefore they authorized the bureau temporarily to appoint these men to do this work that has to be done by a good lawyer. So they appointed those men and are now using them, and the Civil Service Commission now insists on their standing an examination. One man stood the examination when he does not have to typewrite at all and failed on typewriting, and they knocked him out.

This amendment takes care of and puts in the civil service about 30 or 40 men who already have the experience, who are

already learned in the law. It is not necessary for them to stand an examination. Why should we require these men now to stand a civil-service examination? They are few in number—not a great number, like there are in some bureaus here. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] was right when he said that the chief of the bureau he referred to could get rid of them, and he ought to get rid of them. What is he going around here for, talking under cover to the Senator from Utah, and saying that 50 per cent of his men ought to go out? Why does he not put them out if he ought to put them out? He is not the right sort of man himself, or he would put them out if he were looking after the interests of the Government.

This amendment, however, affects only a few men, as I say, called in under those circumstances, because they had to have lawyers and had to have them quickly, and there were not any on the register. Now, the Civil Service Commission wants to turn out all of these men, who are doing splendid work, and make them stand a civil-service examination. That is all there is in this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of turning them all out. There is no necessity for turning them out. The Senator knows that under the civil-service rules they can be temporarily employed. He knows that at the end of three months they can be employed again, and so on, as many times as the head of the bureau wants to employ them. That is not the object of this amendment. The President of the United States has a perfect right and power to cover every one of them under the civil service if he wants to, or he can take any one man and issue an order waiving the examination for his employment in this bureau or in the other bureau of the Government. This amendment is to place every man in this bureau under the civil service without examination.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I think he states the matter a little more broadly than the facts warrant. It is not intended to place every man in the bureau under civil service. There are many of them in the bureau who are already under the civil service.

Mr. SMOOT. Then they are under the civil service. I think the statement that I made is absolutely correct. The amendment reads:

The temporary appointments of members of the Naturalization Bureau and Service are hereby made permanent, and the appointees given a full classified status.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will let me interrupt him further, I think I can give him a succinct statement of conditions. I went over the matter with a man in the bureau who knows the conditions from the ground up. The statement I now make is based upon information he gave me, and was put in writing by me in order to bring the matter before the Senate as it actually is:

The fact is that a third of the office force in the bureau in Washington have left for the military service. Temporary appointees were secured to take their places. They have been in the continuous employ of the bureau since July, 1918, in large numbers. Others have come at later periods, and all are now trained clerks who are serving under temporary appointments awaiting the furnishing of eligibles by the Civil Service Commission upon examination. The Civil Service Commission has for over a year endeavored to furnish eligibles and has had three separate examinations for this purpose. A fourth examination has now been called.

Now, why turn out these people who have been in there for six or eight months, or possibly a year in some cases, and wait for the Civil Service Commission to furnish unqualified people?

Mr. SMOOT. You do not have to turn them out. They have not been turned out up to this time. If they have been in the service a year, they can be in the service another year.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But under the civil-service rules, as the Senator knows, here is A. B., for instance, who is a competent clerk, working in this department, and who has been working there for a year. That clerk, as soon as an eligible is furnished by the Civil Service Commission, must step aside, because he has not passed the civil-service examination.

Mr. SMOOT. Not necessarily.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I know what the practice is. I know what the rule is. I know what the law provides.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Continuing this statement, if the Senator will permit me a moment, I want to get the facts in the RECORD as they are:

During this period under the act of Congress approved May 9, 1918, the soldier-naturalization work was authorized, among other responsibilities, which has doubled the duties of the bureau. At the time that these duties were added there were no eligibles on the civil-service register having the qualifications requisite to the proper performance of the duties of naturalization examiner. It was necessary to secure immediately an adequate personnel both in numbers and qualifications. A large number, approximately 100 examiners and clerks, were appointed temporarily. All of these who are now serving are performing excellent service. They have been in continuous service, some of them

for nearly six months. The examiners are lawyers with qualifications as practical typewriters. Some of them have failed to pass the typewriter examination before the Civil Service Commission.

If the Senator will pardon me for just one moment, I will finish this statement which I desire to make.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (reading)—

Because of the heavy demand on the man power of the country it has been found impossible to secure through the usual means provided by the Civil Service Commission a sufficient number of eligibles to enable the bureau to transact its business. It is not known when there will be eligibles obtainable. These men have abandoned their practices and devoted the past four or five months to their duties in the Naturalization Service, and if they are not continued permanently in the service will suffer unnecessary hardship. The Naturalization Service needs their services, or others equally as good. They have all passed through the preliminary course of training necessary to be given to all who enter the service. If these temporary appointees in the bureau and field service, approximating 130, are obliged to be discontinued and other appointees secured, it will result in the constitution of the Naturalization Service of approximately 30 per cent experienced and 70 per cent inexperienced members.

In view of that it seems to me no reason can be given why the appointment of these people should not be made permanent and why they should not be given an opportunity to serve there, rather than to have new men and women come in to take their places.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that every bureau, every division, every board, every commission, every department in the Government could make the same kind of appeal.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I believe it would be a wise one.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if it is a wise one, let us repeal the civil-service law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to see that done in some respects.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, that is an opinion that the Senator has a perfect right to express, and there are others who believe as he does, but the civil-service law is in force to-day.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. There is one instance where there is a lawyer doing this work who is very efficient. When the Civil Service Commission can get a man on the register to fill the place, they send him up, and the bureau has to turn out this lawyer and put in this other fellow?

Mr. SMOOT. Not necessarily.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, yes; that is what they are doing. I am putting a concrete case now, where they have taken out a lawyer who did not pass the civil-service examination because he could not typewrite, and they sent some fellow up there who was a typewriter, who was not as good a man as the one they turned out. Now, that is a concrete case.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that these temporary appointments are held over for three months, and then for another period of three months, and sometimes for years. All they have to do is to make a request to the commission that they are wanted there for the positions they are filling, and there is no question but that the request is granted. Now, I very much prefer to vote at this time to abolish the civil-service law entirely, rather than to undertake now to pick out certain bureaus and divisions and departments of the Government to which the civil-service law shall not apply, and have it apply to all others.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not particularly concerned about the Civil Service Commission. I share the view expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], in that I think in some respects it ought to be abolished; but I fear that this amendment is the beginning of what I am told is a concerted purpose upon the part of the new employees of the Government to make their tenures here permanent after the war.

We have here at least 40 per cent of employees who, I repeat, are not needed at all. They are supernumeraries, even in this time of great activity; and if one may judge from the work which some of them seem to be doing, I have understated rather than overstated the percentage. I have been informed from credible sources that a movement began some time ago—an organized movement, having, of course, political power behind it—by which the employees everywhere now in Government service, and who have been brought in owing to the exigencies of the war, are beginning—they are not only beginning, but they began some time ago, and they are continuing—their activities for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. They are writing letters now.

Mr. THOMAS. I therefore expect, if I live to see the war ended, to be confronted with a concerted movement to keep the civil service in its present state of numbers and inefficiency, and consequently I do not want to vote for this amendment. To be perfectly frank about it, I have not much regard for the

legal abilities of any lawyer who has left a practice to serve the Government in its emergency who cares to remain at the present rate of compensation as a permanent employee of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think that is a very unjust criticism to make of these people who have left lucrative practices, whether as lawyers or in any other profession, and have come here to serve the Government at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. I think if a man has left a lucrative practice his lucrative practice will come back to him just as soon as the emergency is over which required him to leave it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That may be true, too; but the general charge is made that they would not leave lucrative practices to come here and serve the Government at these salaries. Some of them come here and serve for nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I did not say that. The Senator misunderstood me. What I said was that I can not conceive why, having left a large practice, they want to stay here permanently. Of course I cast no imputation whatever upon them. On the contrary, it is a matter to the credit of any man who leaves his business, where he was prosperous, and comes here and serves the Government. That is creditable; but to want to stay and spend the rest of his life here, at the meager salary which is paid by the Government, does not give me a very high opinion of the extent of the lucrative practice which he claims to have had. But, in my judgment, it is the beginning of a policy certain to develop as time goes on, with the political power which goes with organization behind it, to continue this vast horde of employees here in Washington even after the war is over and when the need for them shall have ceased.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator, if he will pardon me, if it is wise to offer this amendment, why would it not be wise to extend it to other departments?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's colleague [Mr. Smoot] asked that question before the Senator came in.

Mr. KING. I apologize for repeating it, then.

Mr. THOMAS. It will serve as a precedent when it is enacted, and naturally and properly will encourage the employees of other departments to do likewise.

Mr. KING. Then it is apparent, if this is wise and just, there are employees in other departments who have the same right to ask for legislation of this character.

Mr. OVERMAN. And for the same reason exactly.

Mr. KING. It seems to me this is very unfair and very unwise legislation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, this Naturalization Bureau has had its business increased very largely by the act of May 9, 1918. It is possible that there are other departments situated as is this particular department, and I will say very frankly that if there are other departments—and I know of none that are so situated—they ought to be granted the same relief. I have been unable to see why a man who has been serving the Government for six months or a year by appointment without having passed a civil-service examination should be turned out after having gained experience in his place and that place filled by some man or woman less capable simply because they passed such examination. That does not count for anything. It is simply in compliance with the law that the heads of departments go to the Civil Service Commission to get employees, but that does not mean in any sense of the word that persons so obtained are capable and competent. As a matter of fact, I think I would resign my seat in the Senate if I had to depend for my clerical assistance upon clerks certified to me by the Civil Service Commission whether such clerks suited me or not.

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

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Allow me to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. Why does the Senator state that these men are about to be turned out from their present employment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know of any other reason for it except that they are simply holding by appointment without having passed the civil-service examination. Whenever eligibles are certified up by the Civil Service Commission to the Naturalization Bureau they have to discharge employees who have not had the examination and take those certified, whether they have had practical experience or not.

Mr. THOMAS. Their places are being taken so fast that some of the departments have been obliged to call a halt here in the city. The movement is inward.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They have stopped people coming here because of the influenza.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish they would make it permanent.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator does not wish that—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In just a moment. The Senator does not wish that any more than I do, but the departments are being crippled in their work because they have not sufficient employees.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me say it is not because they have not sufficient employees. There may be other reasons.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill the Senator from Virginia has in charge, with the understanding that as soon as that bill is disposed of it will be taken up for consideration.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. We need these employees in the department, and why turn men out who are competent and experienced and go to the civil service and have them certify somebody who is not. Here is a case that is sui generis. It does not set a precedent at all. I do not like to go over the reasons again. I have shown that there are a few lawyers from the country here willing to help the Government, and they are now doing it. One of them took an examination as a typewriter and they turned him down. The Civil Service Commission have not got him on the register, and the man has to get out. This takes care of 40 or 50 experienced, able men, men willing and capable to do this work, and they have done it. The Civil Service Commission say those men must stand a civil-service examination, and they can not keep them any longer. They were appointed for three months, temporarily.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina how many employees there are in this bureau?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no idea. We put only a few in the bill we passed last year.

Mr. SMOOT. There are 130 employees involved.

Mr. OVERMAN. I said there were not very many.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is not any question but that every man who is at work in that bureau to-day, whether he be upon the temporary roll or whether he be sent by the Civil Service Commission, is not going to lose his job because of the passage or the nonpassage of this act. If he has been on the temporary roll for six months or nine months, he is continued on the temporary roll for one year longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 43, after line 19, to insert:

SENATE.

To pay Katharine C. Norton and Alice Gallinger Espe, daughter and granddaughter, respectively, of Hon. Jacob H. Gallinger, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 44, to insert:

To pay Salie Tillman, widow of Hon. Benjamin R. Tillman, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 3, to insert:

To pay Ruth James, widow of Hon. Ollie M. James, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 5, to insert:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 8, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

For the payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, reported to Congress during the present session in House Document No. 1332, namely:

Under the War Department, \$68,003.50;

Under the Navy Department, \$72,619.45;

Under the Interior Department, \$343,440.34;

Under the Department of Justice, \$4,544.80;

Under the Post Office Department, \$12,954.47;

In all, \$501,562.56.

None of the judgments contained in this act shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 23, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS.

Sec. 3. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1916 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in House Document No. 1333, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For collecting the revenue from customs, \$2.07.
For paper-money laundering machines, 1917, \$109.96.
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, \$284.52.
For miscellaneous expenses, Internal Revenue Service, \$12.
For refunding internal-revenue collections, \$20.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, \$451,496.72.
For redemption of stamps, \$5,997.97.
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, \$80,803.30.
For allowance or drawback, \$516.50.
For Coast Guard, \$429.77.
For pay of crews, miscellaneous expenses, etc., Life-Saving Service, \$375.50.
For operating supplies for public buildings, \$9.37.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, \$436.40.
For general expenses of public buildings, \$22.05.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, \$1,984.72.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks at Army division and department headquarters, \$860.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, \$1,607.67.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, \$5,022.23.
For incidental expenses, Quartermaster's Department, \$26.60.
For barracks and quarters, \$4,108.69.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, \$1,079.32.
For roads, walks, wharves, and drainage, \$39.58.
For Medical and Hospital Department, \$11.65.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, \$7.79.
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Pacific Branch, \$336.73.
For National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, clothing, \$828.62.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Observatory, \$13.75.
For pay, miscellaneous, \$159.68.
For pay, Marine Corps, \$313.97.
For transportation, Bureau of Navigation, \$57.88.
For outfits on first enlistment, Bureau of Navigation, \$26.87.
For contingent, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, \$7.
For pay of the Navy, \$882.01.
For engineering, Bureau of Steam Engineering, \$40.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$2,261.30.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, \$6.35.
For Capitol Building and repairs, 1917, \$1.
For surveying the public lands, \$375.
For inspecting mines in Alaska, \$6.40.
For investigating mine accidents, \$4.90.
For testing fuel, Bureau of Mines, 36 cents.
For suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, 1917, \$72.75.
For suppressing liquor traffic among Indians, 20 cents.
For relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, \$10.
For Indian schools, support, \$195.95.
For Indian school and agency buildings, \$220.38.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1917, \$1,466.59.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, \$153.67.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 55 cents.
For pay of Indian police, 67 cents.
For Ganado irrigation project, Navajo Reservation, Ariz. (reimbursable), 95 cents.
For support of Indians in California, \$30.
For Indian school, Greenville, Cal., 1917, \$4.19.
For oil and gas inspectors, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, 1917, \$116.57.
For Indian school, Tomah, Wis., \$1.84.
For Army pensions, \$18.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For relief, protection, and transportation of American citizens in Europe, \$52,537.32.
For salaries of secretaries, Diplomatic Service, \$166.67.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, 1917, \$430.85.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, \$137.75.
For salaries, Consular Service, \$636.86.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1918, \$37,480.23.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, \$676.
For representation of interests of foreign governments growing out of hostilities in Europe, \$34.28.
For preservation of collections, National Museum, \$24.
For books, National Museum, \$8.44.
For Interstate Commerce Commission, \$2.07.
For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$754.20.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, \$372.60.
For general expenses, Forest Service, \$31.59.
For marketing and distributing farm products, 54 cents.
For general expenses, Bureau of Standards, \$1.21.
For investigation of optical glass, Bureau of Standards, 1918, \$121.
For testing railroad scales, etc., Bureau of Standards, \$6.
For military research, Bureau of Standards, 1917 and 1918, \$1,916.70.
For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, \$2,549.25.
For contingent expenses, Department of Labor, \$11.61.
For contingent expenses, Department of Commerce and Labor, \$1.80.
For expenses of regulating immigration, \$41.25.
For general expenses, Children's Bureau, \$101.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, transportation, 1918, \$58.30.

For detection and prosecution of crimes, 1918, \$1,486.01.
For inspection of prisons and prisoners, 1918, \$534.45.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, \$154.98.
For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, \$1.25.
For pay of special assistant attorneys, United States courts, \$542.55.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, 1918, \$17,183.85.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, 1917, \$68.50.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, \$1,605.05.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1917, \$119.60.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, 1918, \$44.95.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, 1917, \$16.20.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, \$140.50.
For pay of bailiffs, United States courts, \$15.
For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, \$114.50.
For supplies for United States courts, 1918, \$895.31.
For supplies for United States courts, 1917, \$79.02.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, \$1.50.
For United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., 1918, \$4.19.
For United States penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash., 1918, 35 cents.
For United States penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., 1918, \$20.91.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For indemnities, international registered mail, \$256.63.
For indemnities, lost insured mail, \$10.
For shipment of supplies, \$28.72.
For star route service, special mail carriers, \$40.47.
For railroad transportation, \$502.32.
For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, \$3.15.
For Railway Mail Service, injured, \$2,000.
For foreign mail transportation, \$352.89.
For compensation of postmasters, \$103.99.
For rent, light, and fuel, \$43.33.
For City Delivery Service, horse hire, \$161.99.
For Rural Delivery Service, \$116.27.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The bill is now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I propose the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. Add the following to the bill:

The appropriation of \$100,000 provided by section 7, Chapter XV, of the act approved July 9, 1918, "Making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, is hereby made available for the purpose of paying the salaries of officers, investigators, and all other necessary employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as well as rentals, office equipment, supplies, and expenses, travel expenses of officers and employees; printing, binding, books and periodicals, law books and books of reference, and miscellaneous expenditures which the board may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this amendment is plainly in violation of the rule against legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I make a statement in reference to the matter before the Senator insists on his point of order?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly; I withhold the point of order until the Senator can be heard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, this is a matter of such great importance that I do not think the Senator from Virginia ought to make a point of order against it. Yet I am frank to say I think a point of order, if insisted upon, would lie against the amendment.

I say again that the amendment and the bill to which it refers greatly affects our people, and not only affects the present generation but generations yet unborn. While the Army appropriation bill of this year was under consideration the Military Affairs Committee took up the subject of venereal diseases as affecting those who were coming into the Army from civil life, and not only was the committee astounded at the conditions which developed in the hearings before the committee, but the country at large was amazed at the showing which was made by those who understood the situation and had made a particular examination into and study of the subject.

At my request, and at the request of other members of the committee, some of the newspapers and magazines took up the subject which had never before been publicly discussed nor very generally discussed in the home circle for reasons of false modesty. The public prints did not discuss it because it seemed to shock the moral sense, although the subject was one which came very near to and affected the homes of hundreds of the people of the country. After that hearing and after experts had testified before the committee and the reports affecting the Army had been examined by the committee, they adopted what is known as chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act. The title of the chapter is "Interdepartmental Social Hygienic Board."

It provided for the creation of a board to take up the subject for intelligent investigation and discussion, and appropriated large sums of money for that purpose, because the necessity for curative and preventive measures was so great, much of it to be spent in cooperation with the States and the several universities

and places of learning in the United States in an effort, if possible, to check and finally to eradicate these destructive diseases.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator place in the Record before he concludes the amount appropriated?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will do so by inserting the law sought to be amended. On account of the relation that this proposed amendment to the pending bill bears to the act itself I am going to ask to have printed in the Record chapter 15 of the Army appropriation act.

Chapter 15 of that act, approved July 9, 1918, is as follows:

CHAPTER XV.

Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To recommend rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) To select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under said section 5; (3) To recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purposes of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) To direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 referred to in the last paragraph of section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for the purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, or commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces of the United States against venereal diseases.

Sec. 3. That there is hereby established in the Bureau of the Public Health Service a Division of Venereal Diseases, to be under the charge of a commissioned medical officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, which officer while thus serving shall be an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, subject to the provisions of law applicable to assistant surgeons general in charge of administrative divisions in the District of Columbia of the Bureau of the Public Health Service. There shall be in such division such assistants, clerks, investigators, and other employees as may be necessary for the performance of its duties and as may be provided for by law.

Sec. 4. That the duties of the division of venereal diseases shall be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury (1) to study and investigate the cause, treatment, and prevention of venereal diseases; (2) to cooperate with State boards of departments of health for the prevention and control of such diseases within the State; and (3) to control and prevent the spread of these diseases in interstate traffic: *Provided*, That nothing in this chapter shall be construed as limiting the functions and activities of other departments or bureaus in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases and in the expenditure of moneys therefor.

Sec. 5. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, to be expended under the joint direction of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this chapter: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein made shall not be deemed exclusive, but shall be in addition to other appropriations of a more general character which are applicable to the same or similar purposes.

Sec. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,400,000 annually for two fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1918, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of \$1,000,000, which shall be paid to the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases; this sum to be allotted to each State, in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the proportion which its population bears to the population of the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska and the Canal Zone, according to the last preceding United States census, and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for which the allotment of money is not conditioned upon the appropriation or setting aside of money by the State, provided that any State may obtain any part of its allotment for any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1919, by specifically appropriating or otherwise setting aside an amount equal to such part of its allotment for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases; the sum of \$100,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions, as in the judgment of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, more effective medical measures in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases; the sum of \$300,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions or organizations, as in the judgment of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering and developing more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases, and for the purpose of sociological and psychological research related thereto.

Sec. 7. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of \$200,000 to defray the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the division of venereal diseases in the Bureau of the Public Health Service; and the sum of \$100,000 to be used under the direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board for any purpose for which any of the appropriations made by this chapter are available.

Sec. 8. That the terms "State" and "States," as used in this chapter, shall be held to include the District of Columbia.

That the act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of lands for military purposes," approved July 2, 1917, as amended by an act approved April 11, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, amended, and its provisions in all respects, together with all its privileges and benefits, are hereby extended to the right of condemnation of standing or fallen timber, sawmills, camps, machinery, logging roads, rights of way, equipment, materials, supplies, and any works, property, or appliances suitable for the effectual production of such lumber and timber products for the Army, Navy, United States Shipping Board, or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. That the right to institute such condemnation proceedings is hereby conferred upon the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the United States Shipping Board and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, individually or collectively. Such right of condemnation shall be exercised by such officials only for the purpose of obtaining such property when needed for the production, manufacture, or building aircraft, dry docks, or vessels, their apparel or furniture, for housing of Government employees in connection with the Army, Navy, or the United States Shipping Board and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and for the procurement of materials and equipment for aircraft, dry docks, and vessels. The jurisdiction of such condemnation proceedings is hereby vested in the district courts of the United States where the property which is sought to be condemned or any part thereof is located or situated, regardless of the value of the same.

And the President is hereby authorized, through any department or the United States Shipping Board or said Fleet Corporation, to sell and dispose of any lands or interests in real estate acquired for the production of lumber and timber products, and to sell any logs, manufactured or partly manufactured or otherwise procured for the Army, Navy, or United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, or resulting from such manufacture or procurement, either to individuals, corporations, or foreign states or governments, at such price as he shall determine, acting through his above representatives selling or disposing of the same, and the proceeds of such sale shall be returned to the appropriations which bore the expense of such procurement.

I want Senators who oppose this amendment to the pending bill to stand responsible before the country for their course, because I think that German bullets have done less damage to our boys over there than these destructive diseases have been doing in our country at large and to generations yet unborn.

In order to show that I want to call the attention of Senators to the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, held on June 10, 15, 17, and 18, 1918. I am not going to discuss the subject at any length. I am merely calling attention to it, and I know it will touch the consciences of Senators here if they have not read this testimony.

Maj. Snow, of the Surgeon General's staff, who is an expert on this subject, was asked to give his reasons for favoring such legislation as the committee was considering, and he answered, in part, as follows:

Maj. Snow. I might say this, that I was first interested in this problem some years ago as a State health officer. We have been rather backward in applying the scientific information that we have about these dangerous communicable diseases. I think the reason has been that until perhaps 10 years ago we did not have certain important information about ready and accurate scientific diagnosis, particularly of syphilis. Another difficulty has been that it is so closely interwoven with questions of moral standards. Because these diseases are spread especially through sexual promiscuity, health officers have hesitated to take up the problem until the public was ready to take up that phase of the question simultaneously. The public has known nothing about the dangers of these diseases. The advent of war has changed all this. An active public interest has been aroused and health and medical organizations are taking hold. The Surgeon General has assigned me to the problem of control of venereal diseases as they relate to the Army. That has brought me particularly into touch with the seriousness of venereal diseases not only as they affect the military forces, but the civilians who are of value in prosecuting the war successfully.

I would like to present the picture as I see it, because I think that such a picture is perhaps more effective in convincing me that something needs to be done than any statistical argument.

We draw our men, by the decisions of Congress, from every State in the Union, according to a proportionate quota distribution. It was decided that it was wise, so far as venereal diseases are concerned, to accept as a part of the quota from each State all those persons infected with venereal disease who reasonably can be treated in the Army and made useful for military service. That changed the policy as compared with past practices of the Army, and it is a vitally important change. I think, in relation to our combating these diseases, approximately five-sixths of the cases the Army has had to treat since mobilization were thus brought in from civil life.

He later gave way to Sergt. Harkness, who was his aid, and who prepared maps and charts which were based upon the records which came to the department from the several cantonments.

On page 62 of this testimony Sergt. Harkness commenced to testify from the chart which was before the committee. He said:

Sergt. HARKNESS. This chart has been made up from the weekly reports received from five camps, all National Army camps or cantonments, and they spread over a period of nine weeks, from March 29 to May 24, 1918—

Practically two months—

Not every cantonment reported regularly. We are now getting these reports in regularly, and we will shortly be able to give something that will be a little more representative and from more than five cantonments. But from these 37 reports, after separating them, we found these things. This represents the annual rate per thousand [indicating on chart].

I interrupted him by stating that he should give the figures, because the chart would not go into the record. Mr. Harkness replied:

All these figures are based on an annual rate per thousand, to make them comparable with other statistics, and taking the cases that were brought into the Army the rate was 231.3 per 1,000.

Senators, I want you to note that the cases were coming into the Army from civil life from every community in America.

Mr. POMERENE. What was the rate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Two hundred and thirty-one and three-tenths per thousand.

Now, note. Maj. Snow said, "For gonorrhea."

Sergt. HARKNESS. That is for gonorrhea as compared with 11 per 1,000 contracted after enlistment.

In other words, in this one disease there were 231.3 per thousand coming in from civil life as compared with 11 per thousand contracted after enlistment. The civil life of this Republic, which ought to be the purest, was the most defiled, and with the men who were serving in the Army it was reduced to the minimum.

Mr. POMERENE. Do those figures relate to the entire service or only to certain cantonments?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. He is making an estimate from a certain number of cantonments which had reported, and these were fairly representative of the whole number of cantonments. Mind you, that refers to only one disease.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the great majority of cases of gonorrhea during the period covered in those five cantonments came in already infected from civil life?

Sergt. HARKNESS. Yes, sir. The percentage of syphilis—

I am glad there are no occupants of the gallery to hear this, because it will not sound so bad in cold type; and yet this subject ought to be discussed as one would discuss tuberculosis or any other disease which is so destructive to the human race.

The percentage of syphilis was 53.5 per 1,000 men of those men brought in as compared to about 2 per 1,000.

Remember that these infected young men came in from civil life and go to make up the armed forces of the United States! I may say here, incidentally, that under the old military regulations, if a man presented himself for enlistment and had any of these diseases, he would probably have been turned down, but the policy of the Government under the selective-service law and the new regulations is to take them and undertake to restore them to healthful lives, which has been done very largely. There are very few of these young men affected by these terrible diseases who are not cured, or cured as far as it is possible to do so, and restored in the open camps to healthy and vigorous life.

The CHAIRMAN. Contracted after they came in?

Sergt. HARKNESS. Yes; after they came in. And of chancroids we had 30 per 1,000 brought in as compared with 4 per 1,000 contracted after they came in.

In other words, 30 per thousand cases came from civil life, while those which were contracted after the young men got into the Army and were subjected to discipline were only 4 per 1,000.

For all venereal diseases we have 320 per 1,000 as brought into the Army, contracted before entrance, compared to 16.8 per 1,000 contracted after enlistment.

Further in his testimony, Maj. Snow was asked:

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not find that there is a very great lack of information among the general public as to the amount of infection and as to the effect of these diseases upon the civil community?

Maj. SNOW. Yes, sir; that is one of the greatest difficulties, or has been in the past, in making any real progress against these diseases. I started to say, before I digressed, in connection with these statistics that for the five-sixths of the 80,000 men Sergt. Harkness has mentioned being called in the draft is the best thing that could have happened to them. Many of them never had been near a physician. They had received the misinformation which medical charlatans give, and the kind of information that all of us, as we have grown up, have had about the harmlessness, relatively, of gonorrhea, and about the ease with which it can be cured by a druggist or by ourselves, when we go and buy some patent medicine which is supposed to be a sure cure, and similar misinformation about syphilis and how it can be cured. In the Army these men are brought to understand, from the education they receive and the treatment, the importance to themselves and to the community later of their being under treatment. Again, the taking of these men into the Army has removed immediately from the community a very considerable number of persons who were carriers of venereal disease. But perhaps the most valuable influence of all has been the awakening of health authorities, and simultaneously of business men and influential men and women generally, to the fact that this is a communicable-disease problem; that it can be met if we apply the same scientific methods that we have applied to the control of yellow fever and other diseases.

The Medical Department of the Army has done everything it could to aid in stimulating this interest of the public in this problem, because you can see, from an administrative point of view, the Surgeon General can do very little about the control of venereal diseases, other than treating those cases that develop, unless he has the cooperation of the public. The infections in the Army after the men are drafted do not occur inside of the cantonments, because the infections primarily come from sexual promiscuity, and there is no ready opportunity for sexual relations to occur between the infected civilian women and susceptible noninfected soldiers in the camp itself; but when the men go out on liberty and furlough we have the danger.

The CHAIRMAN. Those cases you can measurably control?

Maj. SNOW. We can measurably control them to the extent that Congress has provided authorization in sections 12 and 13 of the draft law, and facilities through the Commission on Training Camp Activities for applying those sections. Recreation which keeps a man so busy that he does not expose himself; enforcement of the law which makes infected women inaccessible; education which encourages self-control are all vitally important control measures. Many times just a man's better judgment leads him to realize that he owes it to the Government, if not to his personal career, to keep sober and to avoid prostitution and possible infection.

The CHAIRMAN. I had the pleasure of attending a meeting over in the Committee on Banking and Currency room one evening when you exhibited charts and a motion-picture film and displayed the methods that were being adopted by the commanders of the troops for instructing the young men.

Maj. SNOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Medical Corps is proceeding with that instruction, and is delivering lectures on that subject?

Maj. SNOW. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find that is being attended with benefit?

Maj. SNOW. It is very hard to find out just how successful such measures are, but I think it is significant that the commanding generals and our division surgeons and other officers who are immediately in touch with the men are increasingly expressing their favorable opinion of those methods. They feel that it does have a very distinct deterrent effect on reducing the amount of drunkenness and sexual promiscuity, which they ordinarily would otherwise have expected from the men.

There is another thing that is important, I think. That is, that in the past the Army has felt that it could not do anything outside of its own Army reservations; that when a man went out he was to all intents and purposes for the time of his liberty a citizen. At the same time the citizens of the community generally were not very much interested in the soldier; they did not know him personally; he had enlisted from some distant place; they did not know what kind of a man he was; he came into the community, and if he got into the hands of the underworld nobody bothered very much about it; and the Army could not do anything except reprimand him and treat him when he returned. At the present time practically every family has some direct interest in somebody in the Army, and there is added stimulus of being at war.

The attitude of the public in favor of clean living; the feeling that we must make for national efficiency; the order against civilian dress for the soldier, resulting, as it does, in every military officer and man being conspicuously identified to the public; all these things are to have their deterrent influence on immorality and consequently on the amount of exposure to venereal disease. Then as the community takes an active interest in this, it becomes harder for the commercialized vice interests to get hold of the men without the better element in the community effectively protesting.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not find that the dissemination of information such as you are giving now and which was withheld from the public in times past, has had the effect of stimulating local interest in the States and in the larger communities?

Maj. SNOW. Oh, undoubtedly. Inquiries are constantly arising. Doubtless they come to each of you here every day, and they come also in very large numbers to the Surgeon General and to every officer, I suppose, of the Army. These come from communities, saying, "We have just learned something about the work of the Government against venereal diseases and prostitution, and we want to know what we can do in our communities to help." Generally there is the vaguest kind of information about what this problem is, and how the diseases are spread and how they can be controlled, and why we need dispensaries. If we ask the question in return, "What have you done with tuberculosis," for instance, they answer promptly with a program because they are familiar with that disease because of the campaign of education which has been carried on for the past 10 years. Such a campaign should be promoted now by Congress. Dr. McLaughlin here, of the Public Health Service, will doubtless tell you about the excellent work that is being done by his service in establishing dispensaries for the treatment of civilians; some 24 of them, I think you have, doctor, or 25?

Dr. McLAUGHLIN. Twenty-four.

Maj. SNOW. These stations are open, and the public understand that they are open for advice and treatment. Some of them already have had 500 patients a week, women and men. That shows that the public wants advice and assistance from a reliable source. A definite educational campaign is being carried on in connection with these clinics, and as more and more people find out that they can get treatment more are coming. We are interested for the Army in this civilian work, because anything that operates to reduce the total amount of venereal diseases in the community operates to lessen the chances of a soldier on liberty being exposed, and therefore it lessens the number of infections that are brought back to us for treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. Why has there been such a woeful ignorance on the part of the public as to these particular diseases?

Maj. SNOW. I think, Senator, that it is because we have never quite sensed the fact that it is a communicable disease problem. And physicians have been, perhaps, more backward than any other group in analyzing the possibilities of talking to the public about these diseases just as frankly as they have talked about malaria and yellow fever and tuberculosis. There has been a feeling that sexual relations which society calls immoral are the source of spreading these diseases, and that we can not do anything until we can control people's morals. Now we have found that with the stimulus of the war and the leadership of Congress and the Federal officers, through the declaration that these diseases were going to be fought, and that measures would be provided to control prostitution and alcohol in relation to them, as well as measures for diagnosis and treatment, everyone has taken courage. The efforts which have already been made by State boards of health or local health departments and by cooperating agencies that are dealing more directly with the moral phases of the problem, have convinced one person after another that there is a practical program that can be put through. This education of the men and women in each community must go on.

I invite the attention of Senators to the whole of this testimony. I simply refer to enough of it to show the necessity for undertaking to enforce properly chapter 15 of the appropriation act of 1918. The reading of the act will show that the administration of it is placed in responsible hands. The Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Secretary of War, the

Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are on the board and attached to and under them are distinguished members of the Medical Corps.

Mr. President, when the board undertake to administer this law they find that obstacles to its proper execution, as in the case of nearly all such laws, are placed in the way by decisions of an acting controller. If we should undertake to walk through the labyrinth of decisions of the various auditors and controllers of these several departments one absolutely gets lost, and the acts Congress intended to put into effect have been delayed, postponed, and nullified by the action of these men.

I do not wish to criticize this particular controller, but in any event he practically held that the appropriations which Congress made in the Army appropriation act could not be used as Congress, I am sure, intended it should be.

It is the purpose of this amendment simply to enable the board to so organize that the purpose of the act may be put into practical effect. I know what the criticism of the distinguished chairman of this committee will be. His criticism will be that they are going to spend a large part of this appropriation in organization.

Mr. President, I do not care if every cent of it is expended in the organization of this work so long as it relieves a serious situation in the life of the American people.

If it is once organized, as it should be and as Congress intended, the money will be judiciously spent by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, and these States will have a voice in the administration and enforcement of the law. When once established, I venture to say there will be no one who will ever rise on the floor of Congress and suggest the repeal of a law that has for its purpose the purification of the morals of the people of this country and the curing of the diseases that affect not only those of the present but of future generations.

I do hope, in order to assist in carrying out the great work which has been begun, the Senator from Virginia will not insist upon his point of order, because I think if he will examine the record he will find that these diseases are destroying more men annually in one way and another than the influenza and German bullets combined.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I am so anxious to get the bill through that I shall not spend any time in going into the merits of this question. The service is going on. I want to say that this is simply a question of a greater margin and paying more salaries. I insist on the point of order. The amendment is plainly out of order. I ask the Chair to rule upon it.

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

Mr. MYERS. I offer an amendment, which I desire to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Amend by adding a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. For furnishing seed for spring planting in food crops in the year of 1919 by farmers in the drought-stricken regions of the United States who, owing to crop failure in the year of 1918, are unable to purchase seed therefor, and for furnishing to such farmers feed for their live stock during the next ensuing winter and spring, the sum of \$5,000,000, to be disbursed and paid out, upon application therefor, by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon such showing and proof as he may require and under such rules and regulations as he may promulgate and upon such terms as to security and repayment as he may require.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Before the Senator proceeds, I will say, so that I may not be misunderstood, that of course I shall not make a point of order if the Senator wishes to address the Senate, but when he gets through I shall make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it may be this amendment is subject to a point of order, but the necessity for the appropriation is so great, it is so vital to the interests of the country to have the proposed appropriation made, that I do not think the point of order should be made, and wish it might not be sustained.

A few weeks ago my colleague [Mr. WALSH] offered a similar amendment to another appropriation bill, then pending before the Senate, about the only difference being that the sum then sought to be appropriated was \$20,000,000. There was no point of order made against that amendment. It came to a vote in the Senate and was defeated. I think it was defeated largely because the Senate thought the sum sought to be appropriated was larger than should be appropriated and larger than the Senate was willing to vote. Therefore I have offered an amendment, aimed at the same purposes, to appropriate only \$5,000,000, a much less sum.

I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture favors this amendment. I have had extended conversation and much consultation with him on this subject, and I know he thinks the sum here sought to be appropriated would do a great amount of good and that it is needed and would be highly beneficial to the country.

There was a very severe drought in some of the Western States this year, and a total failure of crops in some sections of the country. It was a failure to such an extent that it was a great calamity to whole sections of the country; so much so that thousands of farmers were not able to raise enough to furnish themselves with seed for next year, to say nothing about not realizing enough to live on during the fall and winter. In consequence, the President was interested and he agreed to set aside, out of an emergency fund at his disposal, and did set aside the sum of \$5,000,000 for the benefit of such farmers, for the fall sowing of wheat and other food crops this fall. I am told, however, by the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials, who have investigated the subject, that all of that sum of \$5,000,000 will be required for fall sowing by impoverished farmers, and that none of it can be spared for farmers who sow their wheat in the spring.

A great many farmers in the Western States sow all their wheat in the spring, grow spring wheat exclusively, owing to soil and climatic conditions, and I understand that the \$5,000,000 generously set aside by the President will be entirely exhausted by the fall sowing of wheat and that none of it will be left for those impoverished farmers who of necessity must sow their wheat in the spring. There are thousands of farmers in Montana who, owing to soil and climatic conditions, can grow only spring wheat. They are dependent upon that crop alone for a living. There are thousands like situated in other Western States.

I have been told by the Secretary of Agriculture that if anything is to be done for such farmers, if any aid is to be extended to such of them as are not able to buy their seed wheat, of whom there are thousands, it must come from an act of Congress; that the money must be appropriated by legislation. Therefore I have offered this amendment for that purpose, as well as to enable such impoverished farmers to live and feed their live stock through the coming winter. It is of very vital importance. There is a great, crying, actual need for it, and I should like very much for my amendment to be adopted. The farmers who can only grow spring wheat and who were absolutely bankrupted and reduced to dire poverty and distress by the terrible drought and crop failure of this year, of whom there are thousands in Montana and thousands more in other Western States, are patriotic and highly desirous of raising big wheat crops next year and helping to win the war by helping to feed our workers, our civilians and soldiers, and those of our allies, but they can not do it unless they may have help. This amendment does not propose a gift to them, but only a loan. The sum of \$5,000,000 is not more than is needed. I am assured by the Secretary of Agriculture it is not. Let us adopt my amendment and give this needed aid.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I make a point of order against the amendment. There has been no estimate and nothing whatever before the Congress of the United States except the speech of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MYERS. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the Chair is sustained.

Mr. POMERENE. I move the following amendment: On page 40, line 9, strike out "November 1"; page 41, line 2, strike out "November 1"; page 41, line 4, strike out "November 1"; and on page 41, line 18, strike out "November 1," and in lieu of the words stricken out insert "July 1" in all these cases.

The reason for the amendment in brief is this: Some time in the earlier part of the summer a bill passed Congress providing for an increase in the salary of those who were engaged in the Steamboat-Inspection Service. That is the law now; but as the pending bill is framed it only allows this increased salary which has heretofore been authorized as from November 1, 1918. If Congress was right in providing for the increase, as of July 1, 1918, it seems to me we ought to provide the fund to comply with the act of Congress as from the date it went into effect and not from November 1, 1918.

It is for that reason that I move the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to offer an amendment. The cause for offering the amendment is a change in the time of graduation of certain of the cadets at West Point. There is a large number of them who will graduate on the 1st of next month who will require equipment. That equipment comes from the commercial store of the academy. They have not up to the present time sufficient funds to provide for it. It costs no more money in the long run by appropriating this amount now than it would to appropriate it later. It merely makes available on the 1st of November that which becomes necessary, under the law, to equip these cadets.

I send the amendment to the Secretary's desk and ask that it be read, in order that Senators may understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 31, after line 21, under the subhead "Military Academy," it is proposed to insert the following:

That \$150,000 are hereby appropriated for use of the treasurer, United States Military Academy, as a working fund to enable him to keep stock in cadet store, cadet mess, and cadet laundry during the continuance of the present system of cadet instruction at the United States Military Academy: *Provided further*, That in case a four-year course is reestablished that this amount shall remain available for use of treasurer of the United States Military Academy until such time as the equipment fund of cadets shall have reached the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, before the matter passes from the consideration of the Senate, I desire to say that the amendment has not been presented to the committee, and I have not even heard it read. I am willing for it to go to conference; but I do not want the Senator from Wyoming or anybody else to feel that I am committed to it in conference, except to give it fair consideration. I desire, in justice to myself, to make that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia desire the vote to be again taken?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No. I am willing for it to stand, although, as I have said, I do not know what is in the amendment. However, it may go to conference, and I will see that it is given fair consideration.

Mr. WARREN. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I want to give the amendment more consideration myself, but I feel that it is important to let it remain in the bill and go to conference.

Mr. President, in order that the amendment may be understood by the Senate and also by the members of the committee of conference, I submit the following reasons for its adoption which have been furnished by the treasurer of the Military Academy:

1. Fourteen dollars is taken from the pay of each cadet per month and held until graduation, when it is delivered to him for purpose of equipping himself as an officer. This equipment fund is the capital which enables the treasurer to keep stock on hand in the cadet store, cadet mess, and cadet laundry to meet the wants of cadets. When four classes are at the academy, this equipment fund is in the neighborhood of \$200,000. The graduation of the top class leaves the equipment fund of the three lower classes to carry on the business.

The recent order to graduate all but the plebe class means that all equipment must be paid out November 1—that of the plebe class amounting to very little, as they have been here but four months, and is far exceeded by their indebtedness. The order being unexpected, the treasurer finds all funds invested in stock, and further orders coming along to take care of stock, and further orders coming along to take care of what would have been probable future wants of cadets.

The present stock in store is \$117,330.64; in mess, \$17,148.76; and in laundry, \$2,695.31; total, \$137,174.71. A loan of about \$100,000 will be necessary to meet the emergency of graduation.

2. Under the proposed system of training here, a class consisting of all cadets will be graduated once per year. This will mean that once per year all equipment fund will have to be paid out and the treasurer will be left without funds to keep stock in his three departments to meet wants of cadets prior and subsequent to graduation. A permanent working fund is necessary. In case of reversion to old system of four-year instruction, this working fund should remain available until the equipment fund has grown to be equal in amount.

3. It should be noted that this proposed scheme calls only for a loan, as the amount will ultimately revert to the Government.

B. A. DIXON,
Captain, U. S. A., Treasurer, U. S. M. A.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, when we were considering committee amendments I thought the Senate stopped on page 45. Were all of the other amendments beginning "Judgments, Court of Claims," agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). All of the other amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. On page 40, line 9, there is a provision in the bill under the head "Steamboat-Inspection Service," which reads:

For amount necessary to increase the compensation of officers and employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service from November 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive.

The law therein referred to, which was passed, provided for a readjustment of the service and for some increases, not very large, and it was approved on July 2, 1918.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suppose the Senator from Florida was not on the floor, and I desire to inform him that an amendment at that point by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has just been voted on and rejected.

Mr. FLETCHER. I beg pardon. I was called out of the Chamber for a time, and I had a memorandum in reference to the matter.

Mr. POMERENE. I can assure the Senator from Florida that, judging from the vote, there was no chance for the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume the amendment was offered to strike out "November 1" and insert "July 2"?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the date when the act was approved.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when the matter was considered, but I was necessarily called out.

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. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is a matter of some regret to me, and doubtless my view is shared by a great many others in the country, that in a period like this it has become necessary to hold a general election. In some countries, particularly in Great Britain, it is constitutionally possible to postpone general elections until emergencies making the postponement necessary shall have disappeared. Under a written Constitution like ours the requirements of general elections are inflexible, and consequently they must be held regardless of their effect upon general conditions.

It is difficult to carry on a campaign and to evoke any public interest in a campaign so conducted in the absence of questions and issues upon which the two great parties of the country are arrayed against each other. The differences between the Republican and the Democratic Parties, however, are much more apparent than real, and the contest therefore must necessarily resolve itself into one for securing the control of the American Congress in an off year. Each party, very properly and very naturally, in appealing to the electorate, utilizes every advantage which occurs to it as available or desirable, and each may be pardoned, therefore, from my viewpoint, for taking positions which are not entirely logical and not entirely fair. That is one of the imperfections of human nature, which is quite as apparent in political parties as in individuals.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat interested in determining for my own satisfaction what differences exist between the two great political organizations of the country at this time, and I have been unable to satisfy myself that there are any of any substantial character or importance. My own view of the political situation is that the country is divided into those who are for the Government and for the prosecution of the war, and those who are not. That is a division which cleaves party lines, instead of running parallel to them. There is no lack of loyalty in the Republican Party, but there are many Republicans whose loyalty is the legitimate subject of criticism and challenge. There is no question of loyalty in the Democratic Party, but a large number of those who call themselves Democrats are equally subject to criticism as to their views and positions in the great contest now waging between the allies and Germany. I wish it were possible that the coming election could have been gauged upon such a standard and so conducted as to divide the loyal on the one side and the disloyal on the other. That, of course, is humanly impossible, since parties can not be organized to meet temporary conditions, nor can they avoid, if they are true to themselves, assertions of superiority to their opponents, which include as well the question of patriotism.

I trust, Mr. President, in what I shall have to say that I shall not say anything that can be construed as a reflection in the slightest degree upon the loyalty and patriotism of any man. The criticisms that I wish to offer are based entirely upon different considerations.

The President said in his message last May that "politics is adjourned." It was one of the statements of that illustrious statesman which I was unable to accept. Politics is never adjourned in a republic, and never ought to be. Politics is as essential to the life and the vigor and the purity of a republic conducted as politics is conducted in a country like this, or a country like Great Britain, as is oxygen to animal existence.

The opposition party in England is called the King's opposition. It is recognized as quite as useful to the Government as is the party in power. The same may be said, Mr. President, of political divisions in the United States. Inasmuch, however, as we are to have an election, and inasmuch as the electorate is being instructed, or the attempt is being made to instruct it, I think I may be pardoned for directing attention to the manner in which the so-called issue of loyalty and patriotism seems to be handled.

A Member of the other House on the 19th instant, upon the floor, complained of the Democratic plan to send posters and to post them on billboards all over the United States with statements of this sort: "Germany will say you repudiated Wilson if you elect a Congress not in sympathy with his policies," or "Washington and Lincoln were hampered by critics. Do not hamper Wilson or elect men who will not aid him win the war," and other placards of similar import. The objection of this Representative was that these placards contained an imputation of disloyalty toward Republicans, and, assuming that his criticism was true, it was eminently just, because any announcement that would arraign, as I have said, either of the great political parties as untrue and unfaithful to this great country would be cruelly and criminally untrue.

But I have noticed, Mr. President, and especially from expressions said to have fallen from the lips of the chairman of the Republican national committee, as well as from gentlemen who stand high in the councils of the party, statements of similar import and carrying a similar imputation, if there be imputation in such statements at all. Hence the evil, if it be an evil, seems to be shared in common, and doubtless will continue to be shared in common, possibly upon the theory that the man who talks the loudest will be the last man heard. Competitions in loyalty are delightful. Nothing of the sort could be or should be discouraged, except in so far as they may carry with them the sting of an inference which is unjust toward others.

Mr. President, one thing is absolutely certain, and I think I may refer to it in this connection. It is that one of the great political parties, as a party, sustains the President of the United States and the administration, and that another of the great political parties does not sustain the administration, except in so far as a common interest is concerned.

With regard to domestic affairs, the conflict is constant, and I may say perpetual. It is inevitable and could not and ought not to be avoided if it were possible to do so. It must follow, therefore, from an outside standpoint that an election that does not seem to support but on the contrary seems to be a disavowal of an existing administration must be regarded as in conflict with it, if not in enmity to it. We may know better at home, but, viewed from abroad, one may easily conclude what that view would be by imagining in a country like Germany an election which operated in times of war to change the complexion of the legislative body from one in general accord with the administration to one out of touch with it. Hence, Mr. President, that is an issue, disguise it as we may, or, if you please, a conclusion necessarily resulting from this election and one which of course is the objective sought by the contending parties.

I have, Mr. President, three bulletins released, respectively, on the 21st, 22d, and 23d of October from the Republican national congressional committee, and I suppose, therefore, they may be considered, must be considered, as official and authentic. The first reads:

The Democratic Party is committed to a free-trade policy.

That is the old, old statement which appears in every campaign, just as does the corresponding statement from Democrats that the Republican Party is committed to a high-protection policy. Hence, it is not new; but the bulletin contains a quotation from the President's peace program and includes one of the 14 terms laid down by him in his message to Congress on the 8th of January last. I read it:

The removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

That is the end of the quotation. The bulletin then proceeds:

This is a positive declaration that the treaty of peace must guarantee to Germany free trade with the United States without any tariff safeguards whatever to protect the American laborer, manufacturer, farmer, and business man from foreign competition in his home markets.

I ask to have inserted in the Record, without reading, the remainder of the bulletin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENET in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Under such a policy Germany will buy raw materials in the United States, manufacture these materials in Germany, and sell the manufactured products in American markets in competition with similar prod-

ucts "made in America," by American manufacturers, without the slightest tariff restrictions for the protection of American labor, business, and farming.

No one doubts that in an open and unrestricted American field Germany, with her cheaper labor, will be able to dominate markets for many manufactured products in the United States and will drive similar American products out of those markets, with the ruin of American manufacturers and harm to American labor swiftly following.

American labor will never agree, and quite properly, to wage scales on a par with the comparative pifflances paid to German labor before the war, which undoubtedly will be paid after the war.

The American manufacturer, with the higher wages that he must pay, can not compete with the German manufacturer in many lines if the United States is on a free-trade basis.

The greatest periods of prosperity that the United States has ever known have been Republican administrations, with a protective tariff as the chief corner stone.

The Republican Party has never been defeated on a protective-tariff issue when it presented such an issue to the electorate.

Free trade, absolute and complete, with all its tremendous ills, looms in the near future, under a continuation of Democratic rule.

A Republican House and Senate, elected in November, would be a guaranty to the people that a free tariff disaster would be prevented.

A Republican Senate would never agree to a treaty of peace giving free-trade privileges to Germany.

Reconstruction problems after the war will tax the experience and the genius of the ablest men in the United States. It is well known that most of these men are Republicans.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the conclusion drawn in this bulletin may or may not be a correct one. I do not think it is; but I have not taken the floor for the purpose of arguing for or against it. What I want to emphasize is that it is a repudiation of one of the 14 bases for peace upon which the recent diplomatic correspondence has taken place between the German Government and our own, and that it must, therefore, be a dissent from the inclusion of such a trade-relation provision in any ultimate peace establishment which may be agreed upon between the allies and the central Empires.

To that extent it is therefore an attitude which is not in accord with the administration, and I think I may say not in accord with the allies of the administration, all of whom have approved more than once, on many occasions and in different ways, the sum total of the President's announced policy, which must therefore be considered as an international understanding.

I am free to confess, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, inasmuch as all wars have been trade wars, since and including the Napoleonic wars at least, we will not have permanent peace on earth if, after the war shall have been closed, we engage in a war of commerce based upon discriminative high tariff and other discriminations, which necessarily beget that friction and disagreement that culminate in very serious differences and afterwards in war.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. THOMAS. No; although I do not want to take very much time.

Mr. REED. The Senator has said that many wars, if not all wars, have occurred because of trade differences; but does the Senator know of any war that has been occasioned by mere differences in tariffs?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I think the present war is largely due to discrimination, which Germany sought to wipe out by the sword.

Mr. REED. Discriminations in tariffs?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Of course, I do not mean to be understood that that is the sole cause of the war, but that it is and was substantially involved in the war. The freedom of the seas—

Mr. REED. I do not desire to take the Senator's time. I quite agree that many wars have occurred over a desire to secure trade dominance or trade monopoly or trade advantage; but I am not aware of any war that has occurred between highly civilized countries over the mere matter of a tariff.

Mr. THOMAS. No such war has occurred, Mr. President, over a mere difference in tariff rates or a conflict over tariff duties. When I say that most wars have been trade wars, I include a much larger range of causes, nearly all of them commercial and industrial, than those which are involved in the mere matter of discriminating duties.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a public statement by Von Bernstorff, former German ambassador to the United States, of the terms of peace that Germany would have imposed on France a year and a half ago.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I am familiar with it. It was placed in the Record the other day by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I had not noticed that; but the statement of Von Bernstorff that Germany would exact free and

unrestricted trade privileges of France and would impose her duties upon French products entering Germany gives the only color that I have ever seen to indicate that the Senator from Colorado is justified in the statement he has made.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, that is precisely one of the things for which Germany waged this war. The Senator is also doubtless familiar with the tentative announcement of the terms of peace made by the German Government very shortly after their big drive seemed to be so successful last spring. But, as I have said, that is one of the things which has been laid down by the President, which itself is far broader than any question of tariff or of free trade, and which has reference to the general commercial and industrial intercourse between the countries.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Will it interrupt the Senator if I ask him a question?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he construes the third basis of peace as laid down by the President to mean universal world-wide free trade?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not as a matter of course. I stated a few moments ago that I was not to be drawn, if I could help it, into a discussion of the old tariff and free-trade controversy.

Mr. WATSON. No, Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon; I was not seeking to engage in any controversy with the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I am satisfied of that, of course.

Mr. WATSON. I merely wanted the Senator's view as to what that does mean.

Mr. THOMAS. My view of what it means is exactly what it says—"the removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

Mr. WATSON. Is one of the economic barriers a protective tariff, in the view of the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. It may or may not be. All the countries of the world have them.

Mr. WATSON. Except one.

Mr. THOMAS. Which one?

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the policy of Great Britain could be called a protective policy. She has a very high revenue tariff, but not a protective tariff. Of course a protective tariff is an economic barrier; but I wanted to get the Senator's view, if I do not interrupt him—and the Senator is always very kind in yielding—as to whether a protective tariff is an economic barrier that the President proposes to remove by inserting in the forthcoming peace treaty a clause to that effect.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's question deserves an answer, although entirely outside of what I intended to say. I think that the President designs a tariff that shall not be protective in the sense that it is prohibitive and irritating—at least, I hope he does—and I am satisfied that that sort of an arrangement will be perfectly satisfactory to the nations "consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance," which will be the nations now enforcing peace upon the world.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask the Senator if he feels quite certain that the President referred, or intended to refer, to tariffs at all in that address?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know whether he did or not. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] asked me my view of it. I am unable to state what was in the President's mind, except in so far as I may be able to define the language which he used.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, will the Senator allow another interruption?

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

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The President has always regarded the question of tariff duties as somewhat irritating, has he not?

Mr. THOMAS. He certainly has, and I would not have voted for him if he had not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the statement that is contained in the third article of his peace suggestions had been penned by Cobden or any other free trader in the interest of a world-wide free trade, it could not have been stated stronger.

Mr. THOMAS. And if it had been penned by William McKinley it could not have been made any stronger; there is no question about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But, Mr. President, the Senator, of course, is unfortunate in his parallel. Such a statement never could have emanated from any protectionist who believed that trade barriers were absolutely vital to our civilization, to our employments, to our citizenship, and to the preservation of the American market place.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I recollect very distinctly what the sentiment was which was expressed by President McKinley in the last public utterance that he ever made; and I am satisfied that it had a tendency in the right direction; but my purpose in referring to this is simply to emphasize the fact that in one particular, at least, the Republican Party is at present officially opposed to one of the conditions of a universal peace, announced by the President of the United States some time ago, and which must be considered as one of the bases of whatever result may flow from existing conditions.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I understand the Senator from Colorado to say that he does not know whether that means free trade or not.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. WATSON. If he does not know, how can the Republicans know?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the Senator intends to put in my mouth words that I never uttered.

Mr. WATSON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. THOMAS. I said I did not think it meant free trade.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely. Now, if the Senator does not know what it means, how can he impute to us a knowledge that he himself does not have, and hence charge us with hostility to a proposition when we do not know ourselves what it means?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, again I say—and I give my view of what it means—that I am satisfied that it does not mean high protection. But, answering the Senator's complaint, I may say, having read the entire bulletin from which I make this quotation, that there is no question but that the Republican Party has put upon it a definition satisfactory to it, at least, and which is the basis of its opposition, necessarily, to the administration.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think the opposition of the Republican Party to that particular clause is much broader than the Senator states, because I believe it to be the position of the Republican Party to object to incorporating in any treaty that may be made growing out of this war a provision by which the economic policy of the United States shall be fixed by a foreign nation. Personally I should just as strenuously object to placing in a treaty a clause providing for a protective tariff as I should object to placing in a treaty a clause providing for free trade, because it is my contention—and I think it is the position of the Republican Party, although I have no authority to speak for it—that we of ourselves should be permitted to determine our own economic policy, free from the domination or even the dictation of any or all the other nations on earth combined.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course it is impossible even to allude indirectly to the tariff or free trade without getting up a discussion. Perhaps that is one of the beauties of the issue, because it always is an issue, and when we have not anything else to talk about we can always fall back upon that. But I will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt my friend from Colorado, but he is very generous about it.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to get through with what I have to say.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want to see whether the Senator from Colorado seriously thinks he is doing the memory of the late President McKinley full credit when he challenges his life-long devotion to the principles of a protective tariff by citing a speech delivered in the last year of his life providing for amicable trade arrangements so effectively reciprocal as to open new and certain markets for our labor and enable us to buy the necessities we can not produce. This is protection, not free trade. Protection protects our labor, stimulates new enterprises at home, and yields revenue to run our Government.

I enjoyed the personal acquaintance of President McKinley for many years. I heard him upon a hundred different occasions, probably more, enunciate this great cardinal principle of his political faith; and he never wavered even in defeat in his belief that these barriers were vital to the security of the wage earner, and to the development of our domestic industries in such way as would give to us the largest possible supply of the necessities of life from our own soil. I never heard challenged—and I do not think the Senator from Colorado intention-

ally challenges—the constancy and fidelity of McKinley to the principle of protection to American industry and labor. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] says he hopes he does. I know that the Senator from Mississippi has been a free trader all of his life, and believes in free trade now, and he has the courage to say it, although his party is far from united on that question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I never have been a free trader, for the simple reason that I never had an opportunity to be.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have heard the Senator say that over and over again.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never lived under a government where sufficient revenue could be furnished with free trade. If I had lived under one, I would have been a free trader long, long, long ago. I do think that one of the real mean things in the world is the commercial warfare that one nation carries on against another through tariffs and protectionism, and other things of that description; and I hope that my friend from Michigan understands me well enough to know that I hereby apologize for not being a free trader, because I never had the opportunity to be.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator does not have to apologize for not being a free trader. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for nearly 25 years is full of his utterances in favor of free trade. I have served with him in both Houses of Congress. I have admired his career; I respect his judgment; but on this subject we are irrevocably divided. I am a protectionist, and that principle will be a living necessity here after this war shall have been won.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat, Mr. President, that the only reason why I have not been a free trader is because I have never had the opportunity nor a fair and square chance to be. I have always been a citizen of a government which needed a whole lot of revenue, some of which had to be arrived at by indirect taxation. I wish to God that I were a citizen of a country that could invite the whole world's commercial peace, as well as every other sort of peace.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think anything I said in my reference to President McKinley could be the slightest possible reflection upon his memory or upon his record. If so, I hasten to correct it. My own view is that his last speech was the greatest speech that he ever uttered, and I am satisfied that from it and from the doctrine there enunciated has come much of the remedial legislation of a tariff character that has blessed this country since that time.

I can readily understand that the President may have meant—though I am not his spokesman with regard to this particular feature of his recent proposal—that tariff duties of a nondiscriminatory character by each of the allied nations—that is to say, common and equal as to all the other nations—may have been, and probably were, in his mind at the time. I am satisfied that the interpretation given by the national Republican congressional committee is not the correct interpretation of that proposed article of peace, but, of course, it must be given that interpretation either to create an issue in the campaign or to justify dissent from the President's program.

On the 22d of October there was another political release, which I will not read in its entirety. It pays a tribute to John Sherman, the great Ohio Republican statesman, and to William McKinley, another great Republican statesman, and to William Howard Taft, still another Republican statesman, as a few illustrations of constructive Republican statesmanship. The selections were well made.

The bulletin declares, also, that—

The Republicans consider winning the war the first great duty.

There is no issue in that. Any American with red blood in his veins, unless he has become terribly un-American in his surroundings and in his views, also considers winning the war as the first great duty.

They worked all along toward that end, and have given greater support to war measures in Congress than the Democrats. They have supported every war activity. Before the war they asked for preparedness, which was denied them by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, from whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. THOMAS. I am quoting from the Republican congressional committee's bulletin of day before yesterday.

They are now pointing out the necessity of preparedness for peace, apparently with a will, but their patriotism, wisdom, and business ability have been called upon to help win the war. The Democrats boast—as a fake display of nonpartisanship—that they have utilized the brains and directing force of the Republicans in this war. They head the list with Taft, Hughes, and Schwab, and a long list of financiers, diplomats, soldiers, statesmen, business men, and professional men. The Republicans of the constructive type are doing big things at personal sacrifice, not

merely holding jobs or commissions but building great fleets of ships, raising billions in taxes and liberty bonds, raising and equipping great armies, and speeding the war program.

And so they are. So also, Mr. President, are Democrats. Hence, there can be no issue there, except a vain or a forced one.

When peace comes—and reconstruction—these constructive Republicans will be called on to solve the problems growing out of the war, and at the same time protect interests of the laborer, the manufacturer, the farmer, and the business man. This can not be done by the Democratic Party, a Democratic Party now absolutely controlled by the South.

Northern, mid-western, and western Democrats have no voice in their party's policies. These policies are controlled by the Democratic Congressmen from nine Southern States. Democratic Congressmen representing northern, mid-western, and western citizens are bound hand and foot by the party caucus, which is controlled absolutely by the South.

Democrats as well as Republicans outside of the South can not hope to have their great and varied interests looked after properly by Democratic representatives controlled by a southern caucus.

They should vote to send Republicans to Congress who could constructively represent their districts, State, and the Nation without the bossism of the South, whose interests are vastly different from those of the North.

Peace and reconstruction will bring tremendous duties—Republican statesmen would be able to properly handle the great problems.

Mr. President, I can understand how a dispute might be made by the contention that the Democratic Party is unfit to handle these great problems which are bound to arise after the war, and that only Republican statesmanship and ability will be able to deal with them. I can understand that; but to contend as an issue that one party has been more loyal and more active in its support of the administration than the other is simply to get up a childish contention, to appeal to views and to prejudices which I do not believe to be worthy of the Republican Party on a great occasion like this.

On the 23d of October we have another bulletin that was issued, beginning—

“With the conclusion of the liberty-loan drive political activity again occupies us, and then, as now, every single act of the Republican Party in State and Nation shall be determined solely by how we can contribute most to the sum total of war good,” declared Will H. Hays, chairman of the Republican national committee, in a statement to-day.

Then there is a reference to New Hampshire and Wisconsin and Maine and the elections that were held there, which are said to mean that this—

Is the people's war, and that the war must be kept out of partisan politics, and partisanship must be kept out of the war.

That is to say, the State Republican victories which have occurred since we entered this war served notice upon all that the war must be kept out of partisan politics, and partisanship must be kept out of the war, notwithstanding the bulletin of the previous day declared that the Republican Party had done more than the Democratic Party toward the prosecution of the war and the support of the administration, and therefore its candidates should be elected. If that does not intrude partisanship into the struggle, I am at a loss to know what does. I am not complaining, because I am here to say that you can not keep partisanship out of an election. You can not do it until you change human nature; and therefore I am merely stating the facts, not making any complaint.

Notwithstanding these defeats, the Democratic high command further pursues this policy.

They are circularizing the country with a pamphlet entitled “Why you should give earnest attention right now to electing a Democratic Congress.” It is signed by an officer of that committee. One I have before me was sent out in a letter dated September 18, 1918, which letter is signed by an officer of the organization. In this pamphlet they say the election of a Republican Congress would be “a source of comfort and elation to the Kaiser and his cohorts.”

Here is some more partisanship on the other side.

Against this reprehensible conduct by a responsible political organization I protest, not as a Republican but as an American.

Again, I say, such statements do no harm politically to the party against which they are directed. But for national reasons most important I deplore them.

And then the reasons are given why they should be deplored.

So we have this situation: With the tariff as a sort of a side issue, partially submerged, partly submarine and partly upon the surface, the Republican contention that they have done more for the prosecution of the war, and therefore the support of the administration, than the Democrats, and the Democratic contention that a Republican victory would rejoice the heart of the Kaiser. Now, we may be mistaken in our view of the manner in which a Republican triumph this fall would be received abroad. It ought not to make any difference in so far as the war is concerned. I am satisfied that a Republican Congress would see the war out, just as a Democratic Congress would see the war out. The statement that has been made here that the Republicans of this Congress have done their duty is absolutely true, with two or three exceptions, perhaps, as there are two or three exceptions on the other side.

God forbid that I should say anything that could be even indirectly construed as a criticism of the good work that has been done here conjointly by American citizens on both sides of this Chamber and on both sides of the House. The claiming of too much credit on the one hand and the effect of the election upon the other is, therefore, about the only thing between them.

The action of this responsible Democratic organization, Mr. Hays says, is reprehensible. Mr. MADDEN in the House made the same remark the other day, and made it in a very heated manner. Both regard it as a reflection upon the Americanism of the Republican Party. If we have made that mistake, however, it is because we have followed what may turn out to be a bad example, although we thought it was a good one. There are some great statesmen in the Republican Party. They arrogate to themselves superiority of wisdom and of experience, as perhaps they have a right to do; and sometimes we may be pardoned if we accept the views which they expressed on other occasions and the attitude which they occupied at other times, especially when the people have taken them at their word and acted accordingly.

Now I want to refer to the campaign of 1898. It had a great many points in common with the present campaign. The country was engaged in a war—not so great a war as the war now waging but in a very important war—with a foreign country. The country was behind the administration, without regard to politics.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before the Senator reaches the part of his remarks under that heading, I want to ask him candidly if he believes that the last senatorial election in Wisconsin had the slightest influence on earth, one way or the other, with the German people or the German Kaiser?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not believe they ever heard of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. And does not the Senator really think that no other election, no matter whether the successful candidate were a Republican or a Democrat, would have any influence upon the Kaiser?

Mr. THOMAS. I have not yet come to what I think about it, but I will do so. I will say here that there is a vast difference between a solitary election of a solitary Senator and a general election affecting the whole country and the political complexion of the entire Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, what senatorial election is the Senator talking about?

Mr. THOMAS. The election of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh!

Mr. THOMAS. In 1898, during the Spanish-American War, Col. Roosevelt was a candidate for governor of New York; and this is what the colonel had to say upon that subject:

Remember that, whether you will it or not, your votes this year will be viewed by the nations of Europe from one standpoint only. They will draw no fine distinctions. A refusal to sustain the President this year will, in their eyes, be read as a refusal to sustain the war and to sustain the efforts of our peace commission to secure the fruits of war. Such a refusal may not inconceivably bring about a rupture of the peace negotiations. It will give heart to our defeated antagonists; it will make possible the interference of those doubtful neutral nations who in this struggle have wished us ill.

Again Col. Roosevelt said:

You could get the benefits of the victories of Grant and Sherman only by reelecting Lincoln, and we will gain less than we ought from the war if the administration is not sustained at these elections.

Col. Roosevelt at that time had excellent company. Former President Harrison, pleading for the election of a Republican Congress on that occasion, was quoted by the Philadelphia North American of November 1, 1898, as saying:

If the word goes forth that the people of the United States are standing solidly behind the President, the task of the peace commissioners will be easy, but if there is a break in the ranks—if the Democrats score a telling victory, if Democratic Senators, Congressmen, and governors are elected—Spain will see in it a gleam of hope; she will take fresh hope, and a renewal of hostilities, more war, may be necessary to secure to us what we have already won.

He also said:

Our election results should not give or even seem to give encouragement to those who would find in our discords and divided counsels their advantages.

I now wish to quote from the distinguished leader of the minority in this Chamber, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The Senator delivered a speech on the 6th day of October, 1898, before the Republican State convention; and he is thus reported in the Springfield Daily Republican of the next morning:

But there is one question on which I do desire to say a few words, and that seems to me to override all others. It is whether we shall stand by the administration and the President at this juncture. If we give a victory to his political opponents, we say not only to the United States but we say to the world, we say to the Spanish commissioners in Paris, that the people of the United States repudiated its result and repudiated the man who has led victoriously the war and is now leading us back to peace—William McKinley.

If that was true in 1898, it is true in 1918. It is more eminently true now because the war here is not over and because the comparison between the two wars makes the other too insignificant for ordinary human vision.

He said further:

That is the great and overshadowing question to my mind. Hostilities have ceased, but this war is not over. But there are only two parties in the country when there is a great question like this to settle: one is the party that sustains the American President, who will do his work well, and those who do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon my ignorance? Who said all that?

Mr. THOMAS. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Who is now in this body?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; and I hope he will remain here for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Still a Member of this body?

Mr. THOMAS. Still a Member of this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. THOMAS. And, as I say, I hope he will long continue to be a Member of this body.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator, the historical aspect of the Spanish-American War has two definite and distinct angles in my mind. One was the persistent endeavor of the House of Representatives to get President Cleveland to act upon the serious questions at issue, about which he refused to interest himself, notwithstanding all the crimes that were committed against the people of Cuba by their offenders. Resolution after resolution was silently passed and quietly tabled; and if it got to the President, Mr. Cleveland, at all, nothing more was heard of it.

Now, the administration which succeeded Mr. Cleveland succeeded to the responsibilities of the Cuban situation, and met them fearlessly and courageously. I do not say that our party met them without the cordial cooperation of many Democrats, because there were many Democrats who sustained us; but Mr. McKinley's predecessor in the White House would do nothing in that situation. I speak of him not to criticize him but in the interest of historical accuracy, because I was one of the men here at that time who greatly admired Mr. Cleveland, and I think in history he will stand out for all time as a sterling American. I have nothing but words of the highest praise for him, much as I differed with him politically; but that was the situation at that time. President McKinley's predecessor had failed to act when our island neighbor was being crucified; and to go back to the people who tabled and pigeonholed relief resolutions sought to accomplish relief for Cuba in the preliminaries of the Spanish-American War would have been inexcusable.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, I have noticed that Cleveland is always popular with Republicans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a Democratic disorganizer he was a success.

Mr. THOMAS. He was a very good man, perhaps; but to my mind he will go down to history as the arch destroyer of the Democratic Party.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, that was no crime. I liked him for that, too.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly. That is what made him popular with Republicans; certainly.

Now, whatever Mr. Cleveland's fault may have been upon this question, it was rectified by McKinley. He went to war with Spain, and had, of course, occasion to do so. He was justified, and the whole country stood behind him, with here and there an exception, as is now the case. The situation is parallel to the present, although not so imposing.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I do. I hope, however, this will not provoke a controversy. I want to get through.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that at the time of the Spanish-American War the Senator will remember, because he was then in the House, that when the Republicans came into power Mr. McKinley refused, as did the Republicans in the House, to take any steps against Spain or to at-

tempt to correct the evils existing in Cuba, and the Senator will remember that 87 Republicans in the House organized—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was one of them.

Mr. KING. The Senator was one of them—organized under the name of "Republican Reconcentrados"—and they served notice upon Mr. McKinley that unless a declaration of war was made against Spain—and that was after the *Maine* had been blown up—they would join with the Democrats, who were insisting upon a declaration of war, and would force some action upon the part of the Republican administration.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I must yield to the Senator now, though I am very anxious to conclude.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Utah is partly right and partly wrong. I spoke of the attitude of the Republican House of Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and the attitude of the President of the United States at that time. We had the House of Representatives—I think the Senator from Utah was a Member of it, and I am very sure the Senator from Mississippi was.

Mr. KING. The Fifty-fifth Congress and the Fifty-sixth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say that upon that particular subject you did not have the House of Representatives. The Democrats, plus a lot of Republicans, had it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi was the leader of the Democrats in the House and never knew what their attitude would be. But be that as it may, the Senator from Utah is partly right and partly wrong. There was never any question about going to war from the day the *Maine* was blown up. I was the first caller on President McKinley the morning the news came over the wire, and Mr. McKinley said to me, as he said to other callers, "It is impossible to put this off longer, much as I dread war. I have been a soldier and know the horrors of war; and although we are not as fully prepared as we ought to be, this means war." From that time there was no question about his attitude. We did urge him, as we prodded Cleveland in the early days. President Cleveland may have been wiser than we thought, but President McKinley was wiser always than we were, and when he finally went to war he did it in a manner to command the united support of his countrymen, and he did it in a way to reflect credit upon future generations of his countrymen. There was no attempt to make it a party war. He appointed Democrats and Republicans alike to responsible commands in the Army, and even old Confederate soldiers and prominent Democrats were appointed to every branch of the public service.

Mr. THOMAS. Again, Mr. President, I want to protest that I care nothing about the policy which led to the war with Spain. I am concerned only with the attitude of the Republican Party because of that war toward the election of 1898.

Senator LODGE again, at a dinner given by the Massachusetts Republican Club on October 26, 1898, is reported in the Springfield Daily Republican the next morning as having said:

The policy of the United States, like the policy of all great nations, has been an advancing and an extending policy, and the question that confronts us to-day is not whether we shall enter upon a new policy, but how far we shall go under the circumstances and conditions created by the war. There is nothing new in the question. It is a question of degree. How far do we want to go? There is one man who has got to deal with that question who can not meet it with empty negatives, and that is the President of the United States. I have faith in him. I believe in his Americanism, and as the Constitution has charged him with this great duty, I, as one American citizen, am prepared to stand back and allow the constitutional representative to deal with it in the face of Europe and of the world, and to settle it, and it is my desire, and I think it should be the duty of every patriot, to stand behind him and to hold up his hands and not to cross him.

Mr. WATSON. What was the date of that?

Mr. THOMAS. The 26th of October.

Mr. WATSON. Eighteen ninety-eight?

Mr. THOMAS. Eighteen ninety-eight.

Mr. WATSON. The War with Spain was then over.

Mr. THOMAS. The War with Spain was over, so far as hostilities were concerned, but the Senator has forgotten that the Senator from Massachusetts on the 6th of October said it was not over. He said "hostilities have ceased, but this war is not over."

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; and did not the question then turn upon the ratification of a treaty of peace?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; it did.

Mr. WATSON. And was not Col. Bryan then on his way from Jacksonville, Fla., where he had resigned as colonel to come—

Mr. THOMAS. That was later.

Mr. WATSON. Was it not about that time?

Mr. THOMAS. No; it was in December.

Mr. WATSON. And at the time Senator LODGE made his speech was not the question of the ratification of a treaty of peace as to what should be done with the Philippines?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator said—

Mr. WATSON. Was not Col. Bryan opposed to dealing with the Philippines as President McKinley proposed to deal with them, and was not my friend—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And the payment of money.

Mr. WATSON. And the payment of the money that we agreed to pay Spain for the Philippines. My friend from Mississippi, at that time leader of the House, made the most ringing speech he ever made against the adoption of that peace treaty and the paying of that money. The Senate, of course, had to deal with the ratification of the treaty. The Senator from Mississippi, then the gentleman from Mississippi, used the words "world powering." He coined a new word and used it over and over again. He described the attitude of the Republican Party. The whole question at that time to which Senator LODGE's speech referred was the question of a peace treaty and as to what should be done with the Philippines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Colorado will pardon me just this far. If I am charged with the guilt or offense, whichever it may be, of having opposed paying \$20,000,000 to buy the Filipinos, as Tom Reed said, at \$5 a head per Filipino, I voted against it; I have always opposed it; and in this age of self-determination if I had my way at the end of this war I would let the Filipinos determine for themselves whether they would be independent or not. But this has nothing to do with the question which the Senator from Colorado is discussing. He is merely showing, from George Washington's day down to now, including George Washington's day, that it always was argued by every party that when a given party was in control during a war, to use the language of President Lincoln, it was very inadvisable to "swap horses while crossing the stream."

Now, you took every advantage during the Spanish-American War—and the Senator from Michigan knows it—of the situation and the fact that William McKinley was President of the United States and was a Republican. You made every point you could out of that fact, and you argued all the time that the American people owed it to themselves to elect Republicans to the Senate and House because a Republican was President during the war. Now you come up here with a hypocrisy that is absolutely superb and argue that if any Democrat dares say that at this time a Democrat is the President of the United States he is guilty of partisanship.

I remember the Senator, then Representative SMITH of Michigan, in the House. I remember how every day he came up with that old slogan, "McKinley President, Americanism, Republicanism. Let us see the President through. Let us stand behind him all the time, and if we do not, we are not quite loyal." Do you not remember that? Of course you do. You know it as well as I. You are not going to stand here and tell me that you deny it.

Mr. WATSON. I will tell the Senator when he gives me the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will give the Senator the time now, if the Senator from Colorado will permit it.

Mr. THOMAS. I want a little time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Colorado. If he will permit me—

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Colorado insists on making his own speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know. I am not making his speech, I am making mine, and I am challenging you to make yours.

Mr. WATSON. This is the situation—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado would never forgive either one of us for making his speech. He is so much abler than either of us.

Mr. THOMAS. I am quite willing to yield, but I assured the Senator having charge of the bill that I would only detain the Senate for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to hear from the Senator from Indiana on that particular question, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. WATSON. I shall be very glad to state in a few words what I have to say about it.

As far as the Spanish-American War is concerned, there was no party division. The South and North alike, Republicans and Democrats alike, were exceedingly loyal and behind the administration. That war was soon over. Then the question came

as to a treaty of peace. The question came as to what disposition should be made of the Philippines. The question came as to whether or not \$20,000,000 should be paid, and on that question there was a strict party division. On that question Col. Bryan left his regiment and came here to influence the Senate. On that question the gentleman from Mississippi, now the Senator who stands here in our front, opposed the retention of the Philippines and the payment of \$20,000,000, so he says now, and all the leaders of the Democratic Party stood squarely against the proposition. The whole of the campaign to stand by the President turned on the question of the ratification of the treaty and as to what should be done with the Philippines. That is the history of the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, the Senator from Indiana is mistaken. The Senator from Mississippi, at that time a Member of the House and at that time the floor leader of the Democratic Party, took the position, and the Senator will find it in the RECORD, that the United States Government, having made the pledge to pay the \$20,000,000, we ought to pay it, and that although the House had the constitutional right to object to the treaty upon that ground the moral situation was such that I would not oppose it. I made a very short and a very vehement speech in favor of the payment of the money. Now, the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. WATSON. Just a moment right there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did oppose the retention of the Philippine Islands, and I oppose it now. I say now that the United States never had any moral right under God's sun to deal with \$20,000,000 in the liberties of the Philippine people any more than Prussia had to deal in the liberties of Belgium to-day. I have no apology to make for that, but I did stand on the floor of the House as the Democratic floor leader and speak in behalf of the payment of the money, because we had promised it. I believe I said—I am not certain now whether I did or not, at any rate it is an old conviction of mine, and maybe I quoted it and maybe I did not—that gentlemen never quarrel about money.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very sorry that we are getting away from the subject matter of my remarks. I am not at all concerned at present with the causes of the Spanish-American War nor with the status of that war at the time of the election of 1898. I want to say, however, in reply to the Senator from Indiana that if it were true, politically true, morally true, in 1898 that the President should receive the support of his party for its reelection to power where only a treaty was involved, then a fortiori must that argument apply in a crisis like this, where not only treaties are involved, but the fate of nations. This war is not over; it perhaps has not yet reached its supreme crisis, and upon the assumption that the arguments which I have read are correct the reason for their application now is a hundredfold greater than it was at that time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood by the Senator from Colorado. If Woodrow Wilson was a candidate for reelection as President of the United States on the 5th day of November in the present international situation I would want him to win. I would not lift my finger or say one word to influence the electorate against him. I think in this world crisis he has earned the gratitude and the confidence of the American people. But it is not for him to enter my State and say who shall represent that Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States. That is our business, and may safely be left to the people of Michigan.

Mr. THOMAS. That is an entirely different question. I have not touched upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Upon that question, while I differ with some of my associates and some on the other side, I feel that wherever a State, through its representation, has been loyal to the Government in this crisis the State should be permitted to pick its representatives in its own way, without Executive interference, and I hope it will do so.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, I am not going to yield any more, not because I want to be discourteous to my fellow Senator, but because I must get through.

The statement made by the Senator regarding his attitude if this were a presidential election does credit to his heart and to his head. I shall not enter into the local politics of any State, neither shall I excuse or defend anything that may have been done by the Executive with regard to subjects of that sort. I am concerned with the main proposition.

I now, Mr. President, call attention to an extract from the speech of another very distinguished Member of this body, himself a great Republican leader and statesman, and entitled, and has been entitled for many years, to speak for his party. I refer to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE.]

The Philadelphia Inquirer of October 8, 1898, has the following headings:

Sloan continues triumphal tour.

Reed's earnest appeal.

Meaning the Speaker. I presume.

He urges every man who loves his country to strengthen McKinley's hands.

Senator PENROSE said on the 21st of October, 1898, as reported in the Philadelphia Inquirer, October 22, 1898:

In a few hours President McKinley will be your guest to witness the greatest pageant the country has ever known. In his recent speeches the President has appealed not to a partisan but to a national spirit. He asks the aid of the Nation. He seeks the support of every man who believes in the result of his administration. I appeal not to the martial spirit of the Nation, great as have been our victories on sea and land. I appeal to the quiet, sober thought of the American people, who do not go to war unless for honor and humanity. I make this appeal to you that you give loyal support to President McKinley and the Republican party in the spirit he has asked for it.

He wants Pennsylvania to remain the Keystone State for the Republican party. I do not hesitate to say that no one would mourn more than he disaster to the Republican party in this State, and I say advisedly that the loyal Republicans of Pennsylvania will be found on the 8th day of November holding up the hands and assisting in guiding this Nation, through the leadership of the Republican party, to our manifest and glorious destiny.

The Senator also said:

The conditions surrounding the present congressional election are unprecedented. Before the war with Spain Republicans were willing to concede that the next House of Representatives would probably be Democratic. * * * The successful prosecution of the war raised the hope that the Republican Party might carry Congress even in an "off" year; but the war speedily ended and the reaction even against that exists in many forms. Criticism of the conduct of any war is inevitable, and criticism of the conduct of the late war is no exception. * * * It is difficult to overestimate the supreme importance—

That is pretty strong language—

of sustaining the President of the United States and the Republican Party at the present critical crisis in our foreign relations. While it can not be said that there have yet been formed any issues as to the details of our policies, yet there seems to be one thing upon which we are united, and that is upon the question of our national aggrandizement.

Mr. President, the Republican Members during that campaign were practically unanimous in urging the same duty upon the voter and for the same reason.

Let me quote from the New York Tribune of the 10th of October, 1898:

Everyone knows that there are wide differences between Spain and the United States respecting terms of peace, and that Spain will be immeasurably less likely to yield if led to believe that the American people have no longer the disposition to uphold their Government; nor can any doubt that the election of a Democratic Congress or even the defeat of the President's supporters in this State would go far to create that impression in Spanish minds. Hence it is that a renewal of the war with indefinite possibilities of interference by some European powers may be among the consequences dependent upon the action of the people at the ballot box.

The New York Sun said:

We are at war with Spain, peace commissions and peace jubilees to the contrary notwithstanding. Upon President McKinley and his administration are yet the burdens and responsibilities of a state of war not yet terminated. And upon all patriotic citizens of every political party rests the duty of supporting the administration and sustain the Nation's cause against all foreign enemies, both by voice and by vote.

The Philadelphia North American, November 8, 1898:

The voters will decide to-day whether the administration of President McKinley is to be condemned and the conduct of the war vetoed.

After the election and victory had been scored the same paper said:

It is a great triumph and must be a source of deep satisfaction and profound relief to our much-tried, much-enduring President. His policies and the policies of the party which he represents have been approved. He can now proceed, encouraged and unhindered, with their execution.

The Topeka Daily Capital, a paper which I think is now published and owned by the Republican nominee for the United States Senate and to whom I shall refer before I take my seat, in an editorial on November 3, 1898, took this view:

The Republican Party puts it to the good sense of the country whether or not the election of a Congress in sympathy with a President who has shown himself equal to every test would be for the best interests of the country at this time. In such a campaign no American worthy of the franchise should neglect his privilege to vote, and every man who believes in stalwart, aggressive Americanism should hold up the hands of the stalwart American in the White House and see that his friends and neighbors do the same.

This sounds very much like the announcement which was so severely criticized by the Republican congressional committee.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sunday, Nov. 6, 1898.]

No less important is it to the future prosperity of the country that the results of the War shall be faithfully preserved. Justice to ourselves as a Nation and justice to the memories of those whose lives have been sacrificed in maintaining American honor and American rights demand it. The attitude of President McKinley on this subject has been unanimously approved by the thinking and patriotic men of the Nation and he is entitled to the election of a Congress on

Tuesday next that will sustain his policy. Any other result will give encouragement to the enemies of the American Republic, not only in Spain, but in every country in Europe, and will delay infinitely the settlement of the question now under consideration by the Peace Commission in Paris. The effect would be the same that the election of a copperhead Congress would have had upon the rebel cause during the Civil War.

What intelligent, patriotic, sagacious voter—whatever his party, name, or creed—is willing to assume the responsibility of offering encouragement to the enemies of his country. Let all such—not only in every one of the 22 districts of Illinois but in every congressional district in the country—make it their duty to support candidates in harmony with the administration.

The Kansas City Star's editorial of November 3, 1898, said:

The people have stood together, regardless of politics, in supporting the Government in prosecuting the war, and there is sound logic in the contention of the Republicans that there should be no change in the control of Congress until the issues arising out of the war are settled.

We now cross the continent and take a paper on the Pacific coast, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

The people believe in and trust the President; they are proud of the achievements of the Army and Navy; they have confidence in the wisdom of the administration's policy and expressed their confidence by electing Members of Congress who will work in harmony with and aid the President in his plans.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat observed:

A Congress hostile to the Executive would multiply the difficulties needlessly and dangerously.

Mr. President, I have read enough and quoted from a sufficient number of sources, I think, to justify the conclusion that if it was orthodox in 1898 to preach politically the Republican doctrine of standing by the President, it is not heterodoxy in 1918 for the Democratic Party to do the same thing.

It may be, Mr. President, that the arguments used in 1898 were specious and unsound. They proved conclusive. It may be that they are now specious and unsound, but I hope they will also prove conclusive, for every reason exists to-day in multiplied form which existed then for the recognition above everything else of the administration engaged in the supreme task of waging war against a public enemy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say simply this, and I want to say it as an American, not as a Democrat. I think that the arguments made by the Republican politicians during the Spanish-American War were unfair, were morally and politically wrong, and that the arguments made by us now in imitation of them are also unfair and politically wrong. When the American people go to war with a foreign nation it is the American people who are at war and not one party or the other.

I always resented the efforts of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], and they were both guilty during the Spanish-American War of trying to make it appear to the American people that it was a Republican war. It was not. It was an American war, and they knew it as well as I did, although you made the opposite impression to the best of your ability.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That may be true, but—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I am not going to imitate you. I am not going to imitate your bad example. This war is the war of the American people, and you Republicans over there have been loyal by as large a majority as the Democrats over here. When you attempt to read the riot act and say that the President interferes here and there because he demanded loyalty to America and to the Republic and to the administration, unless you tell the whole truth you are guilty of partial falsehood. The President has demanded it in Georgia and in Mississippi, and other Democratic States, and he has seen that the Democrats went by the board when they were not loyal to the American Republic. He has not confined his efforts to Republican politicians or officeholders in the Republican States, and you know that as well as I do. Now, let us be fair to one another.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us be fair to the President. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought the Senator had concluded his interruption.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon, I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, as soon as the Senator does conclude, I will ask for recognition. I thought the Senator had concluded. I have a few more words to say.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Senate for only a very few moments longer. I have seen it charged in this campaign that Democrats were supporting men of questionable loyalty, and that as a consequence they should not receive the sanction of public approval. That may be true; that is to say, there may be some men here and there against

whom that charge may be made; I do not know; and for the purposes of my reference to the subject, I do not care.

But surely, Mr. President, he who complains of the beam in his neighbor's eye should not overlook the mote in his own. There are three candidates for the United States Senate running on a Republican ticket in their respective States, and the charge can be made as fully and as amply against each and every one of them as it can be made against any Democratic candidate of whom I have any knowledge, and there can be no question about the loyalty, the patriotism, and the Americanism of their opponents.

In Nebraska the Republican nominee is our colleague, Senator NORMAN, a most excellent man, a most useful Senator, an honest, upright public servant; but the Senator's record for pacifism is notorious. If I remember correctly, he placed a dollar mark upon the American flag in a speech which he made in this Chamber about the time of our declaration of war. I am satisfied that he regrets having said so. He did say so, however, and the man who is running against him has no such blemish upon his record at this time. Yet for the purpose of preventing an inconclusive peace, for the purpose of upholding the hands of the Democratic President, Nebraska Republicans are asked to support the sitting Member in this body against such a man.

The Republican nominee for Senator in the State of Kansas is the present governor, a most excellent man, a man against whom no man can say a word with respect to his integrity, his honesty, or his purity of purpose. But he is, or has been at least, notorious in his pacifism. It may be that his great majority in 1916 over his opponent had something to do with the fact that he was opposed to the war. I have never heard of any charge on our part of Gov. Capper. There can be no question about the loyalty of his opponent, the sitting Member, Senator THOMPSON, but Senator THOMPSON is to be defeated according to this program in order that his opponent, Gov. Capper, may come here and uphold the arms of the administration and see to it that a victorious peace, a peace with honor, that a satisfactory solution of all the great problems involved now and after the war shall be realized.

Take the candidate in Nevada, Mr. ROBERTS, the sitting Member in the House. He voted against the declaration of war. His record is of similar import to those of the gentlemen to whom I have referred. His opponent is Senator HENDERSON, upright, loyal, patriotic, a typical western American. In God's name, if because of an implication upon some candidate supported by the Democratic Party there should be a change of conditions, our opponents surely should be free from such conditions afterwards.

In my own State a campaign is being made against my colleague to the effect that he could probably not be trusted to make a conclusive and satisfactory peace, and hence his opponent should be elected. There is a man, Mr. President, who has been as faithful, as consistent, and as continued a supporter of this administration from the time of its commencement down to its present hour as can be found; a man of whose three sons—all the children he has—two are in France and one in command of a torpedo boat aiding in the convoy of our boys across the sea. There can be no question about his loyalty, no question whatever about his attitude with regard to every problem of the war, but it is seriously—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan rose.

Mr. THOMAS. Just one moment. But it is seriously declared in the political circles of my State that perhaps such a man would weaken, that he would not be true to the interests of his own country and of the administration should he come back here with credentials entitling him to be his own successor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am glad to hear what the Senator from Colorado says about his colleague, who is an upright and honorable man, but, if pacifism is not the test of presidential favor, why undertake to interfere with a senatorial election in the State of Michigan?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not interfering, and I expressly declare that if, because of such a charge, the party to which I belong is unworthy to remain in control of Congress, then certainly the party which is supporting three such men in different parts of the country at least is open to the same suspicion.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all that I care to say. I desired to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the extracts which I have read and to make some remarks in connection with them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I may refer, of course, to the situation in my own State without any selfish

ness, because it is a well-known fact that I was not a candidate for reelection and that I have sustained the President at every turn since war was declared, and shall continue to do so until it is over; at least, so long as I stay here; but, nevertheless, I want to reassert that the tendencies of the Democratic Party seem to be pacific in one part of the country and full of virility and fight in another—rather a geographical test, made necessary by political expediency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I had already begun what I thought would be a few uninterrupted remarks; I thought that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] was through, and I owe him an apology for not having better sized up the situation. I have already said that I would not imitate at this time the conduct of the Republican Members of the House and of the Senate during the Spanish-American War, when they made capital out of the war in behalf of themselves and McKinley at every step, as all of you know they did.

Mr. President, I remember the most disgraceful scene that ever occurred upon this floor. I remember a scene when a United States Senator stood in his place on this floor and announced that, in his opinion, "the American flag was marked all over with the dollar mark," and yet the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Indiana are supporting that Senator right now.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, what is the party of the Senator from Mississippi doing in Michigan? They are supporting a pacifist, trying to defeat them in some and trying to elect them in others.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Henry Ford, at least, never said the American flag was marked all over with the dollar mark.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; of course not. He is a patriot and a most useful and honorable citizen, whose industrial achievements have astonished the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no vote in Michigan. The only fault that Henry Ford ever committed was that he did hope for peace a long time after those of us who had better sense had despaired of it. That is all.

But he never announced, as a Senator did here on the floor, that the American flag in that controversy was covered all over with the dollar mark. He never announced, as did another Senator upon this floor, that the United States was stabbing Germany in the back while France and Great Britain were holding her down. There are a great many things that Henry Ford never did, amongst them those two things.

Mr. President, the other day I read a little Republican pronouncement to the effect that the State of Pennsylvania was paying more income tax than all the "11 former rebel States." That is a part of the Republican propaganda to-day which has been sent abroad through the country—that Pennsylvania is paying more income tax than all the former 11 rebel States, putting in the word "rebel," you know, so as to catch the popular intonation at the North. I do not know whether it is true or not; I have never examined the statistics to see; but suppose it is true, it really proves that Pennsylvania has enjoyed a degree of prosperity, happiness, and financial enrichment that the 11 former "rebel States" have not enjoyed. If anybody from Pennsylvania thinks there is not a Mississippian who would not agree to pay his Pennsylvania taxes provided he could swap incomes, the Pennsylvanian is very much mistaken. We are perfectly willing to swap taxes and incomes, both, right now.

Now, what is all this baby act? Nonsense. It reminds me of a Kentuckian who once told me in the other House that Kentucky paid an undue share of the revenue on whisky and tobacco. Finally, when I got through with him on the floor of the House, he felt ashamed of it himself, and came to me and told me so. I said, "You may distill most of the liquor and you may raise most of the tobacco, but the people who really pay the taxes after all are the fellows who drink the whisky and who use the tobacco, and I want you to give Mississippi a little bit of the credit or discredit for a part of all that." [Laughter.] Finally he confessed that he believed he would.

Mr. President, the Senator has talked about Michigan. While I do not want to quarrel with the Senator about his colleague—and I am not going to say anything against his colleague, either, because I rather like him personally—but surely, if the Senator goes back to McKinley's time and the time of the Spanish-American War, and will count himself as a Republican at that time and his colleague as a Democrat, I think WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, the Senator from Michigan, would have a perfect contempt for me if I did not say something about his colleague; but I am not going to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator can not say anything except good about my colleague, whose public record is creditable alike to himself and his country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I may say that Mr. LENROOT cast a great many votes in the other body that were not in accord with yours or mine.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator is aiming at the Senator from Wisconsin, not my colleague, Senator TOWNSEND.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Votes that were not in accord with this war, and which were not in keeping with the spirit of this war; and the Senator from Michigan knows it as well as I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President, I do not know it. I deny that statement; it is not true. In the first place, he did not come to the House until the War with Spain was practically over. The Senator from Mississippi is mistaken and does my colleague an injustice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not talking about the Spanish-American War; I am talking about this war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, Mr. President, he was in the Senate then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He was not. He was in the other House during the first part of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator's memory is badly at fault.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can I be that much mistaken?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I will tell you what is the matter with the Senator. Time has outrun him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I remember that your colleague voted against conscription and against the selective draft and against the ship-purchase bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the House of Representatives?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Am I mistaken? If I am, I want to apologize.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator is mistaken; he is dreaming.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I really did not know it. I thought I was right about it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator is mistaken, and I know he will be glad to make the correction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very glad to make any correction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The European war has been going on about four years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean our part of the war. I am not talking about the war from its commencement.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Our own part of the war has been going on about a year and a half, and my colleague has been here for seven years, so that the Senator is greatly mistaken about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know the Senator's colleague had been here for six years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes, Mr. President, and his record in this war is as straight as a gun barrel and as clear as a bell. The Senator from Mississippi is greatly in error.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have myself been here ever since. The Senator is simply mistaken about it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will pardon me for one word about Michigan, I am not going to say anything in criticism of the candidates for Senator in Michigan—neither Mr. Ford nor Mr. Newberry. They are both honorable men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not referred to them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would not say anything against either of them, but the Democratic Party were guilty of a form of political kleptomania when they took their candidate for Senator out of the neutral zone of national affairs and made him the unwilling and exclusive candidate of the Democratic Party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the opening remarks of the Senator from Michigan led to a very "lame and impotent conclusion." He first said he did not want to say anything, and then he said a good deal about Mr. Ford. I shall not reply to it, for I do not care anything about the fight in Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi is scheduled for that fray. I hope he will talk free trade there as he does here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Never mind about that, I am talking for myself now, not for somebody in Michigan. I do not know who they are and do not know what they said.

If I had to say anything about it, if I were to open my front door with an innocuous observation, as the Senator did, and then close the front door with a slam in the face of everybody, I would say that the Republican candidate in Michigan had spent a whole lot of money; but I do not want to say that; I want to keep it in reserve.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, do not say it, because the Senator is again wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not take it back, because it is true.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; the Senator is wrong again.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Republican candidate for Senator in Michigan says he has not spent a dollar, and says so in his affidavit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the other fellows have spent it for him, then.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. A candidate can not always control his friends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One word more; I am going to say this, that Mr. Newberry is an honorable, upright, high-minded man, served his country in the War with Spain, and was Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt. He is now a prominent officer in the Navy and has two sons in the Army.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know a thing about him; I never even heard of him until he became a candidate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, the Senator from Mississippi is facetious.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I never heard of him, although that may have been my fault. There are a whole lot of people down here in the departments that I never heard of. I met one this morning when I went to the War Department who I did not know was in existence, but he was Assistant Secretary of War. Now, however, the Senator tells me that Mr. Newberry did not spend all this money; that his friends spent it for him.

Mr. President, I want to say that when a fellow spends his own money for office I have some respect for him, because it is his; it is his slave; it is his pocketbook; and he has a right to do what he pleases with it, provided he does not do anything unlawful; but when he becomes a cozenor upon his friends and sponges upon them to the tune of a couple of hundred thousand dollars, or something mighty near like it, then I want to know who is going to be elected to the office when he is nominally elected—he or the men who contributed the money?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How much did Col. House contribute to the campaigns in 1912 and 1916?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How much was contributed by Jones, of Illinois, who was put on the Federal Trade Commission and rejected by the Senate? But why should I pursue a theme so inexhaustible and a custom so well recognized by all parties? I deplore the use of money in politics, but the habit is quite general, as we all know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The voice is the voice of the Senator from Michigan, but the feel is the feel of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. President, I do not know anything about that; I do not care anything about it; I am making no attack upon this man Ambsberry, whom the Senator has mentioned. I know nothing about him and never heard of him until about two weeks ago when his name was mentioned in connection with a couple of hundred thousand dollars of campaign expenditures. I do not even know whether the charge is true, but the Senator tells me now that the man did not put up his own money, but that other people put it up for him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; Mr. President, I did not even say that the Senator was drawing on his imagination.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator said his friends had done it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know nothing about money in politics personally and have never used it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not talking about your using money in politics; you never had it to use.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator is at last right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not at any rate. I thought you were in the same class that I was—each equally "poor and honest."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Possibly, although the Senator from Mississippi takes a great deal of pride in parading his poverty, and I find some difficulty in concealing mine. That is the difference between us. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President, I am not attacking this man Fullberry at all; I do not know anything about him. I am just saying that if a man spends his own money to get elected to office, it is at least his own money, and when he is elected to office he himself is elected, but that when a man spends the money of some one else to be elected to office I should like to know who is elected, he or the fellow who contributes the money? Nominally, of course, he is elected; but really, behind everything, the fellow who contributes the cash holds the office.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator can find innumerable instances in this administration where contributors have been rewarded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not doubt it. I am not contending for one moment that Democrats are saints or Sunday-school teach-

ers. They are about as wicked as you are, and mighty nearly as wicked as I am, and a whole lot of them are mighty near as wicked as this man Comeberry; but all the time, at least, they step out into the front and stand the punishment for their sins. A gentleman Democrat, you know, has this much about him, that whatever else he may be, he is not a hypocrite; he just stands out and takes his punishment.

Now, what I was calling attention to was that this man Mossberry had not even spent his own money, but he had spent the money of a lot of other people who had contributed, and just about the time that the Senator from New Jersey stepped up to give you those few pieces of information about people from other States who had also spent money.

I was thinking about that, and I also want to apologize to you personally now. I really thought that you and I were both "poor, but honest," but now you tell me that you are not poor at all. Did you not? Very well, then.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Poor, but proud.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At any rate, I thought that we were both in that old, honored class. You know I never read an old novel without noticing two sweet things; one of them begins with the hero telling that he is poor but honest, and I thought that that applied to both of us.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The hero was right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not only the honest part, but the poor part; and then, at the end of the novel it is always said that they remained "happily married forever afterwards," which is also a very large invention of the artist's imagination. I thought we were both in that class.

Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are not ready for that yet.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We have got to pass the appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been reported to the Senate as amended. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were 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.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WARREN the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to say concerning the retirement bill that, as Senators know, it has been before the Senate for a number of days and has come to the point of a vote. I believe there is one amendment still pending, but none others have been offered, and I wish to appeal to the Senate for the early passage of the measure. I desire very much to go home; I made my arrangements a number of days ago to go home, and feel that I should do so; yet I can not do so as long as this vote is not taken. I ask the Senate, therefore, to let this bill come to a vote this afternoon.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I very much regret that I can not consent to have a vote upon this bill at this time and, very briefly, for this reason: There will be another amendment offered. My present intention, at least, is to offer as a substitute for the pending bill the bill reported out by the same committee two years ago or thereabouts. I am having prepared now a comparative statement bearing upon the cost of these two bills to the Government. This statement, in part, was promised me to-day, but I know that the actuary who has the matter in charge has been very busy and has not been able to complete it.

I am just as much in favor of a retirement bill as is the Senator from Tennessee, but I prefer the plan which was reported by the committee two years ago. This is a very serious move on the part of the Congress; it ought not to be passed until there has been a full consideration of it; and I trust that

the Senator from Tennessee will not unduly insist on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator desires to secure some figures and to discuss the matter after he receives those figures. May I ask if the Senator feels that he will have those figures on Monday, and can we have a vote at that time?

Mr. POMERENE. I can not say as to that. There has been rather an understanding that the Senate would adjourn or recess. I have a number of engagements which will take me all of next week. I do not know whether or not I can be here on Monday, but I do not think that this legislation is going to suffer if there shall be a few days' delay. This matter can be taken up after the recess and can be disposed of in a very short time. I shall not ask for any undue delay; but I do think it is a serious proposition, and it ought to be very seriously considered by the Senate before we go to the extent of adopting a system one-half the cost of which is to be paid by the Government. It would be a most serious drain upon the finances of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say that the bill has been before the Senate now for about 10 days or 2 weeks and has been the unfinished business for some time. It has been read; it has been gone over; and the report on it has been available for quite a while. The question has been discussed for the last 20 years, as a matter of fact, and I presume every Senator has determined it for himself and has fixed views as to how he is going to vote. The bill is up to the very point of voting now. The only amendment of which I have heard is the pending amendment, to which I shall not make any serious objection; and there is no reason why the bill should not be voted upon in five minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Except for the fact, if the Senator will allow me, that there are a number of Senators who are not ready to vote; and if the effort were made to vote now they would wish to debate it long enough to give time to enable others to come in. There are a number of us who have no idea of voting on this bill now, and will not vote for it as it stands. We have been busy with other matters. I know three members of the Finance Committee who have been so occupied with the revenue bill that they have not had a chance to study the bill which the Senator from Tennessee has in charge.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no desire whatever to cut off any Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We want to know what it is going to cost; we want to study it. I do not mean the Senator has not presented the bill, but we have been so absorbed in other work that we have had no chance to digest it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator, then, thinks it is of enough importance, it is a matter for him to examine into, I think, and not ask the Senate to wait day after day and week after week.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are some of us who do not think the Senate is really in any hurry about passing the bill; certainly not until they have had an opportunity to examine and study it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure of that. I think there has been a filibuster for the past several days, and perhaps for the last week or two.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not think the Senator means that exactly; there has not been any filibuster about it at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, there seems to be an understanding not to vote, if it can be avoided.

Mr. POMERENE. This report was not presented while I was present in the Senate, and, in fact, I knew nothing about it until after I had gone to Ohio in connection with the liberty loan campaign. I came back here and found that it was the unfinished business. There has been a very limited discussion of this bill, and I am satisfied that it has not been given by many Senators the attention that it ought to have and that they will give it if they have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from Georgia that I am perfectly willing to give any reasonable time if they will fix a time when we can vote. I do not think, however, that the bill ought to be kept before the Senate day after day, week after week, and perhaps month after month, as the unfinished business without action.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not ready myself to give consent as to a time to vote. I do not know enough about the matter, and other Senators do not. How much is it going to cost?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have explained that very fully. It is going to cost about \$18,000,000 a year, of which the employees are going to put up half and the Government is going to put up the other half. I will say to the Senator, however, that the \$9,000,000 that the Government pays will come back in increased efficiency in this way, and I can show it to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him? It is important that we should have an

executive session, and it is impossible to reach an agreement to-night upon this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, and I am going to yield for that purpose; but, if possible, I think we ought to come to some agreement. I want to ask for a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is impossible to-night. We can not do anything along that line to-night.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I want to do is to fix some future date when we can vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We can not do it to-night without a roll call.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are half a dozen of us who would object to fixing a time to vote. We just have not had a chance to study the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the only thing I can say is that I hope to keep the bill before the Senate until we do get a vote on it, and I shall do everything in my power to keep it before the Senate until we get a vote on it. I think we are entitled to a vote, and I do not think Senators ought to ask for continual postponements simply because they have not examined into it. I think they ought to examine into it. It is an important matter, and I hope they will examine into it. I want them to examine into it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We have been doing something more important.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

RECIPROCAL MILITARY SERVICE WITH ITALY.

During executive session the following convention was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. HITCHCOCK, the injunction of secrecy was removed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Italy, signed on August 24, 1918, stipulating for the reciprocal military service of citizens of the United States in Italy and Italian subjects in the United States.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, October 14, 1918.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approved thereof, to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Italy, signed at Washington on August 24, 1918, stipulating for the reciprocal military service of citizens of the United States in Italy and Italian subjects in the United States.

This convention has been negotiated in conjunction with the War Department and has its approval.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT LANSING.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, August 28, 1918.

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Italy being convinced that for the better prosecution of the present war it is desirable that citizens of the United States in Italy and Italian citizens in the United States shall either return to their own country to perform military service in its army or shall serve in the army of the country in which they remain, have resolved to enter into a convention to that end, and have accordingly appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States, and His Majesty the King of Italy, Count Vincenzo Macchi de Cellere, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the United States, who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

All male citizens of the United States in Italy and all male citizens of Italy in the United States shall, unless before the time limited by this convention they enlist or enroll in the forces of their own country or return to the United States or Italy, respectively, for the purpose of military service, be subject to military service and entitled to exemption to discharge therefrom

under the laws and regulations from time to time in force of the country in which they are: *Provided*, That in respect to citizens of the United States in Italy the ages for military service shall be the ages specified in the laws of the United States prescribing compulsory military service, and in respect to Italian citizens in the United States the ages for military service shall be for the time being 20 to 44 years, both inclusive.

ARTICLE II.

Citizens of the United States and Italian citizens within the age limits aforesaid, who desire to enter the military service of their own country, must enlist or enroll, or must leave Italy or the United States, as the case may be, for the purpose of military service in their own country, before the expiration of 60 days after the date of the exchange of ratifications of this convention, if liable to military service in the country in which they are at said date; or if not so liable, then, before the expiration of 30 days after the time when liability shall accrue; or, as to those holding certificates of exemption under Article III of this convention, before the expiration of 30 days after the date on which any such certificate becomes inoperative unless sooner renewed; or, as to those who apply for certificates of exemption under Article III, and whose applications are refused, then before the expiration of 30 days after the date of such refusal, unless the application be sooner granted.

ARTICLE III.

The Government of the United States and the Government of Italy may, through their respective diplomatic representatives or by other authorities appointed for that purpose by the respective Governments, issue certificates of exemption from military service to citizens of the United States in Italy and Italian citizens in the United States, respectively, upon application or otherwise, within 60 days from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this convention or within 30 days from the date when such citizens become liable to military service in accordance with Article I, provided that the applications be made or the certificates be granted prior to their entry into the military service of either country. Such certificates may be special or general, temporary or conditional and may be modified, renewed, or revoked, in the discretion of the Government granting them. Persons holding such certificates shall, so long as the certificates are in force, not be liable to military service in the country in which they are.

ARTICLE IV.

The Government of the United States and the Italian Government will, respectively, so far as possible, facilitate the return of citizens of Italy and of the United States who may desire to return to their own country for military service, but shall not be responsible for providing transport or the cost of transport for such persons.

ARTICLE V.

No citizen of either country who under the provisions of this convention enters the military service of the other shall by reason of such service be considered, after this convention shall have expired or after his discharge, to have lost his nationality or to be under any allegiance to the United States or to His Majesty the King of Italy, as the case may be.

ARTICLE VI.

This agreement while in force holds in abeyance any provisions inconsistent therewith in the treaty of February 26, 1871, or in any other treaty between the United States and Italy.

ARTICLE VII.

The present convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States and by His Majesty the King of Italy, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at Rome as soon as possible. It shall come into operation on the date on which the ratifications are exchanged and shall remain in force until the expiration of 60 days after either of the contracting parties shall have given notice of termination to the other, whereupon any citizen of either country incorporated into the military service of the other under this convention shall be, as soon as possible, discharged therefrom.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present convention and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington the 24th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1918.

ROBERT LANSING. [SEAL.]
MACCHI DI CELLERE. [SEAL.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 24, 1918.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Alfred Franklin, of Phoenix, Ariz., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Mexico, in place of Lewis T. Carpenter, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Edwin R. Holmes, of Yazoo City, Miss., to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Mississippi, vice Henry C. Niles, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Harvey A. Baker, of Providence, R. I., to be United States attorney, district of Rhode Island. A reappointment, his term having expired.

Edward C. Day, of Helena, Mont., to be United States attorney, district of Montana, vice B. K. Wheeler, resigned.

John E. Laskey, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney, District of Columbia. A reappointment, his term having expired October 22, 1918.

Myron H. Walker, of Grand Rapids, Mich., to be United States attorney, western district of Michigan. A reappointment, his term having expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

James A. Baggett, of Big Spring, Tex., to be United States marshal, northern district of Texas, vice John L. Terrell, deceased.

CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA.

James P. Connolly, of Omaha, Nebr., to be clerk of the United States Court for China.

COAST GUARD.

First Lieut. Philip H. Scott to be a captain in the Coast Guard from September 27, 1918.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Coast Guard from September 27, 1918:

Wales A. Benham and

Raymond L. Jack.

The following-named cadet engineers to be third lieutenants of engineers in the Coast Guard from the 1st day of October, 1918:

Louis B. Olsen,

Joseph H. Seymour,

Roger C. Helmer,

Laurence G. Bean,

William J. Kossler,

Joseph S. Walker,

Lester E. Wells,

Ulysses V. Henderson, and

Henry G. Kunz.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Dr. Bertrand Earle Roberts to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY FOR THE PERIOD OF THE EXISTING EMERGENCY.

To be lieutenant generals with rank from October 16, 1918.

Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors with rank from August 3, 1918.

Capt. Herbert L. Quickel.

Capt. Chester D. Allen.

Capt. David E. Smith.

Capt. Leon A. Fox.

Capt. Charles M. Hunter.

Capt. Rossner E. Graham.

Capt. Joseph H. Francis.

Capt. Charles K. Berle.

Capt. George C. H. Franklin.

Capt. William T. Weissinger.

Capt. Samuel M. Browne.

Capt. Frank L. Cole.

Capt. Gerald D. France.

Capt. Miner F. Felch.

Capt. Rowland D. Wolfe.

Capt. Bascom F. Morris.

Capt. Clarke Blance.

Capt. William A. Foertmeyer.

Capt. Cornelius O. Bailey.

Capt. Max R. Stockton.

Capt. Frank C. Griffls.

Capt. Frederick H. Mills.
 Capt. Henry C. Bierbower.
 Capt. Val E. Miltenberger.
 Capt. Edgar F. Haines,

To be majors with rank from September 18, 1918.

Capt. John P. Kelly.
 Capt. Edgar J. Farrow.
 Capt. Herbert L. Freeland.

To be captains with rank from August 3, 1918.

First Lieut. Herbert L. Quickel.
 First Lieut. Chester D. Allen.
 First Lieut. David E. Smith.
 First Lieut. Leon A. Fox.
 First Lieut. Charles M. Hunter.
 First Lieut. Rossner E. Graham.
 First Lieut. Joseph H. Francis.
 First Lieut. Charles K. Berle.
 First Lieut. George C. H. Franklin.
 First Lieut. William T. Weissinger.
 First Lieut. Samuel M. Browne.
 First Lieut. Frank L. Cole.
 First Lieut. Gerald D. France.
 First Lieut. Miner F. Felch.
 First Lieut. Rowland D. Wolfe.
 First Lieut. Bascom F. Morris.
 First Lieut. Clarke Blance.
 First Lieut. William A. Foertmeyer.
 First Lieut. Cornelius O. Bailey.
 First Lieut. Max R. Stockton.
 First Lieut. Frank C. Griffis.
 First Lieut. Frederick H. Mills.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Bierbower.
 First Lieut. Val E. Miltenberger.
 First Lieut. Edgar F. Haines.

To be captains with rank from September 18, 1918.

First Lieut. John P. Kelly.
 First Lieut. Edgar J. Farrow.
 First Lieut. Herbert L. Freeland.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Acting Pay Clerk Robert G. Robeson to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously confirmed.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 15th day of September, 1918:

Clifford W. Waters and
 Michael A. Sprengel.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918:

William Elliott,
 Joseph E. Ford,
 Frank M. Sherrill,
 James E. Hunt,
 William R. Diehl,
 Hugh J. McManus,
 Aner Erickson,
 William E. Woods,
 Jesse W. Hilts,
 Roe L. Flowers,
 Olaf Olsen,
 Alexander W. Urquhart,
 Leo A. Ketterer,
 John J. Carroll,
 Erwin A. McKee,
 Edward H. Hult,
 Nicholas A. Brown,
 Tate Mayhall,
 George L. Aulmann,
 John W. Overand,
 Evans D. Steger,
 Howard N. Hill,
 Charles H. Converse,
 Alonzo A. Munsell,
 William R. Davidson,
 Leo V. Flavell,
 William M. Rogers,
 Samuel R. Ullman,
 Archie J. Lourie,
 Isidore R. Meyer,
 Cornelius A. Brinkmann,
 Gilbert A. Jones,

Albert W. Alderd,
 Charles H. Cameron,
 Paul J. Weiss,
 David A. Cain,
 Thayer B. Thomas,
 Jacob H. Kyger,
 Joseph T. Lareau,
 Marion McCray,
 William J. Martin,
 Paul K. Coons,
 Roy L. Koester, and
 James A. Harris.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1918:

Clyde D. Dahlman,
 Carl Axelsson,
 Levi C. Houston,
 Albert A. Elliott,
 William S. Johnson,
 Peter P. Zeller,
 John R. J. Le Roy,
 Cornelius J. O'Connor,
 Frederick A. Olsen,
 William G. Sullivan,
 John J. Dallier,
 Ernest C. Fiedler,
 John Francis Shea,
 Frank E. Powers,
 John S. Bessent,
 Clyde W. Jordan,
 John F. Welch,
 Charles E. Carlson,
 Thomas J. Costello,
 Edward B. Peterson,
 Charles R. Jeffs,
 Thomas J. Quinn,
 Frank P. Moore,
 Albert J. Wheaton,
 Glenn C. Provost,
 Arthur Brown,
 Charley F. Martin,
 Arthur S. Fenton,
 Merion E. Hair,
 Julius J. Lorzing,
 Clinton W. Gray,
 Edward L. Gench,
 George L. Morin,
 William R. Simpson, jr.,
 Luttie E. Tappen, and
 Clarence E. Young.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1918:

Robert A. McCloud,
 Philip L. Emerson,
 Rowland G. Evans, and
 William E. Clow, jr.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918:

Fred A. Luenser,
 Clyde W. Haskins,
 Charles E. Chamberlain,
 Calvin A. Cole,
 Guy R. Bostain,
 Leo L. Walte,
 Roy A. Jones,
 Lawrence S. Tichenor,
 Wallace Cooper,
 Walter A. Irwin,
 Christian W. Manegold,
 Wilfred G. Lebeque,
 Frank L. Burgess, and
 George R. Milbourn.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918:

Elmer D. Lundberg,
 Charles C. Gillis,
 Carl B. Fields, and
 Philip H. Taft.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918:

Henry R. Wharton, jr.,
 Donald D. Leonard,
 Ford K. Lucas,

Julian P. Van Vorst,
Joseph R. Tobin,
Abraham S. Lewis,
Charles G. Lade,
Carletta H. Crawford,
Roy O. Hill,
Thomas F. Kilkenny,
Gordon J. Morrow,
Thomas R. Wells,
Thomas A. West,
Travis F. Beale,
Edgar R. Hill,
Clinton E. Shepard,
Ralph Hicks,
Lloyd M. Thornton,
Ned L. Chapin,
Harold C. Nye,
Hermann P. Knickerbocker, and
Arthur G. Latimer.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Philip R. Baker,
Harvey S. Haislip,
Harrison R. Glennon,
Ralph E. Dennett,
George F. Parrot, jr.,
Charles G. McCord,
Alfred S. Wolfe,
Ralph C. Lawder,
Eugene T. Oates,
Roy W. Lewis,
Marion C. Cheek,
Richard S. Field,
Robert P. Molton, jr.,
William J. Butler,
Robert H. English,
Jay K. Esler,
George D. Murray,
Carroll Q. Wright, jr.,
Oliver M. Read, jr.,
Joseph McE. B. Smith,
George J. McMillin,
William H. O'Brien, jr.,
Howard F. Kingman,
Howard S. Keep,
James G. B. Gromer,
Bushrod B. Howard, and
Rivers J. Carstarphen.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Calvin H. Cobb,
Robert B. Simons,
Lee C. Carey,
Norman Scott,
Glenn A. Smith,
Donald C. Godwin,
Richard P. Myers,
Webb C. Hayes,
Howard D. Bode,
Jay L. Kerley,
Harold E. Snow,
Robert M. Doyle, jr.,
Richard H. Booth,
Morton L. Deyo,
Harold T. Bartlett,
Robert M. Hinkley,
Ralph S. Parr,
Shirley A. Wilson,
Charles H. McMorris,
John A. Byers,
Virgil C. Griffin, jr.,
John H. Holt, jr.,
Henry M. Kleffer,
William A. Corley,
Benjamin Perlman,
Howard H. Good,
Ernest G. Small,
Carleton H. Wright,
Donald Boyden,
Robertson J. Weeks,
Herman E. Fischer,
Mark W. Larimer,
Willard E. Cheadle,

Edward P. Nickinson,
Thomas L. Gatch,
Harry G. Patrick,
Alfred E. Montgomery,
Andrew C. Bennett,
Frederick Baltzly,
Allen H. Guthrie,
Eugene P. A. Simpson,
Oliver W. Bagby,
Lawrence P. Bischoff,
James C. Clark,
James C. Monfort,
Robert D. Moore,
Carl G. Gilliland,
Harold Dodd,
Whitley Perkins,
Warren A. Shaw,
Robert A. Hall,
Guy C. Hitchcock,
Anton B. Anderson,
Ralph S. Wentworth,
George L. Woodruff,
Mahlon S. Tisdale,
Schuyler Mills,
Edmund A. Crenshaw, jr.,
James L. King,
William D. Taylor,
Davis De Treville,
Homer C. Wick,
John P. Dalton,
Louis P. Wenzell,
Robert S. Haggart,
Raymond E. Kerr,
Philip Van Horn Weems,
George H. Fort,
Lunsford L. Hunter,
Earnest W. Broadbent,
Forrest U. Lake,
Robert R. Thompson,
Elliott Buckmaster,
Nelson W. Hibbs,
Emory P. Eldredge,
Albert B. Sanborn,
Ellis M. Zacharias,
Clarence Gulbranson,
Wentworth H. Osgood,
Donald F. Patterson,
Harold B. Grow,
Donald W. Hamilton,
Herbert G. Gates, jr.,
Heister Hoegewerff,
John H. Falge,
Louis E. Denfeld,
Ralph W. Holt,
George W. D. Dashiell,
Emory W. Coil,
Nathan B. Chase,
George W. La Mountain,
Alexander W. Loder,
Harold W. Scofield,
Carroll M. Hall,
William S. Hogg, jr.,
Beriah M. Thompson,
John L. Fox,
Earl R. Morrissey,
Stephan B. Robinson,
William G. Greenman,
Harold H. Little,
Horatio J. Peirce,
Hamilton Harlow,
Hugh C. Frazer,
Thales S. Boyd,
James A. Crutchfield,
Daniel E. Barbey,
Charles P. Mason,
John J. Brown,
Grady B. Whitehead,
Carl K. Martin,
Campbell D. Edgar,
Harry P. Curley,
John P. Bowden,
De Witt C. Ramsey,
Baylis F. Poe,
Roscoe E. Schuirman,
Charles K. Osborne,

Abraham C. Ten Eyck,
Ingram C. Sowell,
Francis E. M. Whiting,
Charles A. Lockwood, jr.,
John K. Richards, jr.,
William H. Burtis,
Stanley G. Womble,
Paul S. Theiss,
John Wilbur,
Charles S. Alden,
Robert E. P. Elmer,
Charles F. Greene,
George S. Gillespie,
Garnet Hulings,
Charles W. McNair,
Otto M. Forster,
Louis R. Ford,
Leonard N. Linsley,
William H. P. Blandy,
Henry L. Abbott,
James C. Jones, jr.,
Elmer L. Woodside,
Herman E. Keisker,
Glenn B. Davis,
Bruce G. Leighton,
Palmer H. Dunbar, jr.,
Roy J. Wilson,
Ray H. Wakeman,
Carl E. Hoard,
Harold C. Van Valzah,
Charles N. Ingraham,
Adolph V. S. Pickhardt,
Stewart F. Bryant,
Paul A. Stevens,
Kenneth R. R. Wallace,
George W. Wolf,
William B. Jupp,
Robin B. Daughtry,
William I. Causey, jr.,
Walter Seibert,
Frank L. Johnston,
Richard H. Knight,
George L. Greene, jr.,
Hugh L. White,
Reginald S. H. Venable,
Norman C. Gillette,
John A. Brownell,
Thomas Shine,
Roy Dudley,
Laurence Wild,
Lloyd R. Gray,
Herbert K. Fenn,
Solomon H. Geer,
Paul Hendren,
Chapman C. Todd, jr.,
Henry M. Briggs,
Paul Cassard,
Joseph Y. Dreisonstok,
Walter O. Henry,
John M. Kates,
Carl T. Hull,
Eric F. Zemke, and
George M. Tisdale.

Lieut. Edward J. O'Keefe to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 27th day of September, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

William E. O'Connor,
William Twigg, jr.,
Frederick R. Kalde,
Burton W. Lambert,
Allen I. Seaman,
William D. Dadd,
Charles Swanberg,
Malcolm C. Davis,
William H. Muehlhause,
Leroy Neil,
Oscar D. Parker,
John A. Ward,
John C. Hines,
John Gallagher,
George W. Robbins,
Cyrus S. Hansel,

Ernest A. Healy,
Frederick G. Keyes,
William Eberlin,
Frederick Petry,
John Meyer,
Frederick Evans,
Godfrey P. Schurz,
Clarence L. Tibbals,
Thomas J. Bristol,
William Taylor,
Michael J. Breshahan,
Lafayette P. Guy,
Edmond Delavy,
Frank J. Mayer,
Horace DeB. Dougherty,
James J. Joyce,
Joseph A. Rasmussen,
Warner K. Bigger,
Frank Schultz,
Joseph Sperl,
David F. Mead,
Henry A. Lowell,
Charles Antrobus,
Oliver T. Miller,
August Logan,
John J. Coyle,
George F. Blass,
Walter S. Belknap,
George C. Lacock,
Anton Hengst,
John W. Boldt,
Fred San Soucie,
Howard H. Chambers,
Percy R. Abrams,
Vincent F. Le Verne,
Charles E. Briggs,
George B. Llewellyn,
William C. Milligan,
Frederick J. Legere,
James Reilly,
John H. MacDonald,
William A. James,
William A. Fulkerson,
Jerry C. Holmes,
Conrad T. Goertz,
Edwin R. Wroughton,
Nathan E. Cooke,
Lewis H. Cutting, and
Ernest L. Jones.

Lieut. (junior grade) William C. Carpenter to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 18th day of August, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Murry Wolfe,
Charles L. Greene,
Arthur T. Brill,
Ward T. Hall,
Michael Garland,
Erich Richter,
John C. Heck,
James L. McKenna,
George W. Waldo,
Anthony E. Bentfeld,
Arthur Boquett,
John Harder,
Sigvart Thompson,
Stephen A. Farrell,
William A. Vick,
John J. Welch,
Arthur S. Rollins,
Charles C. Stotz,
John C. Maxon,
Bailey E. Rigg,
Walter A. Buckley,
Frank E. Nelson,
Norman McL. McDonald,
Phillip S. Flint,
Charles W. Wagner,
Henry A. Reynolds,
George F. Veth,
James E. Kemmer,
James A. Newell,
William W. Holton,

Fred C. Wolf,
 Charles J. Naprstek,
 Max Bayer,
 Paxton Hotchkiss,
 Leon W. Knight,
 Harry M. Peaco,
 Henry H. Beck,
 Frank F. Webster,
 John Reber,
 Charles N. Koch,
 Fred T. Rider,
 William S. Evans,
 Sofus K. Sorensen,
 George J. Romulus,
 Arthur L. Hecykell,
 Charles King,
 Quintus R. Thomson, jr.,
 Ora A. Martin,
 John A. Pierce,
 Stephen Ingham,
 William R. Spear,
 William T. Shaw,
 Roy K. Madill,
 William R. McFarlane,
 Nils Anderson,
 Melvin C. Kent,
 John E. Armstrong,
 Albert C. Fraenzel,
 William A. Martin,
 Ralph B. Wallace,
 James Roberts,
 Joseph D. Glick,
 Anthony Prastka,
 Joseph W. Birk,
 Edmund DuV. Duckett,
 Raymond A. Walker,
 Hermann Jorgensen,
 Charles F. Dame,
 Arthur J. Holton,
 Vincent Benedict,
 Ola D. Butler,
 Edgar C. Wortman,
 Joseph O'N. Johnson,
 David Duffy,
 Clyde H. McLellon,
 Noel Chatillon,
 William F. Schlegel,
 Lee W. Drisco,
 James J. Delany,
 William H. Stephenson,
 Arthur E. Rice,
 John P. Millon,
 Frank L. Elkins,
 Sol Shaw,
 Ernest J. Leonard,
 Thomas J. Sullivan,
 John P. Sasse,
 Will Mueller,
 John H. Chase,
 Will S. Holloway,
 George J. Blessing,
 James D. Brown,
 Patrick H. Cassidy,
 Franklin A. Manuel,
 Frank Flaherty,
 Frank G. Waugh,
 Arthur A. F. Alm,
 Bennett McC. Proctor,
 James Donaldson,
 John A. Silva,
 James Hauser,
 John E. Sullivan,
 Charles A. Armstrong,
 Chauncey R. Doll,
 James S. Trayer,
 Gregoire F. J. Labelle,
 Theodore Anderson,
 Henry Hartley,
 Eugene J. Friebe,
 Philip J. Kelly,
 Andrew G. C. Dalgard,
 Alfred Doucet,
 William E. Benson,
 Fred C. A. Plagemann,
 Peter J. Gundlach,

Albert M. Hinman,
 Leon W. Becker,
 William Cox,
 Stephen A. Loftus,
 Herman C. Schrader,
 Asa Van R. Watson,
 William A. Eaton,
 James M. MacDonnell,
 Herbert R. Mytinger,
 Harold A. Turner,
 Charles B. Bradley,
 Curry E. Eason,
 Samuel C. Washington,
 Brice H. Mack,
 James A. Featherston,
 Walter N. Fanning,
 Herbert J. Meneratti,
 Niels Drustrup,
 Abraham De Somer,
 George Bradley,
 Donald McDonald,
 Warren E. Magee,
 Robert J. Kingsmill,
 Charles F. Merrill,
 Charles B. Shackelton,
 Benjamin F. Ranger,
 Robert C. McClure,
 Carl S. Chapman,
 George C. Martin,
 Wilmer W. Weber,
 Mark Strosk,
 William W. Wilkins,
 Helge Ohlsson,
 Elroy G. True,
 James W. O'Leary,
 Warren H. Langdon,
 Andrew C. Skinner,
 Emery Smith,
 Benjamin F. Maddox,
 George Keeser,
 John A. Rogers,
 Alfred E. Raue,
 John C. Richards,
 Frank W. Yurasko,
 Albert H. Mellien,
 Philip A. Astoria,
 Thomas A. Graham,
 William A. Mason,
 Everest A. Whited,
 John F. Murphy,
 Charles A. Kohls,
 Clarence R. Rockwell,
 Paul E. Kuter,
 William E. Snyder,
 David McWhorter, jr.,
 George H. Kellogg,
 Elery A. Zehner,
 Samuel E. Lee,
 Frank Stinchcomb,
 Simon L. Shade,
 Ludwig W. Gumz,
 Wildon A. Ott,
 Hugh W. Nimmo,
 Junius G. Sanders,
 Frederick B. Webber,
 George T. Campbell,
 Charles A. Dannenmann,
 Harold G. Billings,
 Albert E. Freed,
 Frank Kinne,
 Andrew N. Anderson,
 Frank Kerr,
 Arthur H. Cummings,
 Harry J. Hansen,
 Rony Snyder,
 Newcomb L. Damon,
 Jack K. Campbell,
 George Kleinsmith,
 Albert G. Martin,
 Daniel McCallum,
 John M. Buckley,
 John J. Madden,
 Robert Semple,
 Henry H. Fowler,
 Stanley H. Sacker,

Elmer J. McCluen,
 John M. Kirkpatrick,
 Clyde Lovelace,
 Claude B. Arney,
 Martin Dickinson,
 Jesse J. Alexander,
 John J. Enders,
 Jesse J. Oettinger,
 William H. Farrel,
 Thomas M. Buck,
 John Shottroff,
 John Whalen,
 Raymond C. McDuffie,
 Oscar Benson,
 William Martin,
 John S. Conover,
 Fayette Myers,
 John G. M. Johnson,
 Frederick Clifford,
 Alexander Anderson,
 Frederick T. Walling,
 Charles V. Kane,
 Joseph M. Gately,
 Joseph H. Gerrior,
 George S. Dean,
 Ralph A. Laird,
 Charles F. Fielding,
 Collins R. Buchner,
 Warwick M. Tinsley,
 Archie R. Wolfe,
 Francis P. Brewer,
 Henry A. Stuart,
 Aaron Eldridge,
 Judson E. Scott,
 Clyde H. Dougherty,
 Edward L. Newell,
 Robert B. England,
 Howard S. Raber,
 George O. Farnsworth,
 Lars O. Peterson,
 Omar B. Earle,
 Alfred R. Eubanks,
 Thomas Flynn,
 John F. Piotrowski,
 Alexander B. Holman,
 Ralph A. Scott,
 Michael Burke,
 Irwin V. Herin,
 William F. Schlesinger,
 Herman A. Bauchot,
 Earle G. Gardner,
 William W. Eagers,
 William K. Johnstone,
 John F. Craig,
 Frank T. Green,
 Augustus K. Goffe,
 Robert S. Savin,
 William J. Graham,
 Emmette F. Gumm,
 George B. Evans,
 Edwin Fisher,
 Charles O. Bain,
 Clarence H. Fogg,
 Joseph A. Flynn,
 James J. Lucas,
 Thomas Southall,
 Bernard S. Riley,
 George C. Neilsen,
 Sidney C. Seale,
 Joseph C. Herman,
 Thomas G. Shanahan,
 George R. Blauvelt,
 Eric P. Teschner,
 Erich O. Tauer,
 Jens Nelson,
 Harry A. Bryan,
 Edwin H. Briggs,
 George Schneider,
 Frank V. Shepard,
 Warren L. Graeff,
 Hector L. Ross,
 Emmet L. Bourke,
 John H. Chinnis,
 Earl V. Hand,
 Alonzo W. Esworthy,

Abram L. Broughton,
 Robert I. Hart,
 Albert F. Blake,
 Charles Waters,
 William F. Morris,
 Jesse S. Hooper,
 Edward I. Dailey,
 John Heep,
 James H. Cain,
 Hugh J. Finn,
 Carl J. Hanson,
 William H. Wright,
 Thomas T. Emerton,
 Charles F. Ware,
 John R. McMeekin,
 Edgar T. Hammond,
 John R. McKean,
 John D. Thompson,
 Raymond R. Smith,
 Clarence E. Williams,
 George E. Tarbell,
 Albert Wing,
 John L. Scheidemen,
 Harold A. Clough,
 Earl Swisher,
 Albert C. Buck,
 Walter L. Hawk,
 Jesse L. Harmer,
 Fred H. Stewart,
 John W. Ross,
 Francis H. McAdoo,
 Almy C. Maynard,
 James A. Burbank,
 Ralph L. Dodge,
 Charles K. Cobb, jr.,
 Joseph L. Day,
 Raymond L. Watrous,
 Bulkeley L. Wells,
 Winn D. Faris,
 Walter R. O'Sullivan,
 Chester L. Nichols,
 Jay H. Keller,
 John S. Brayton, jr.,
 Thomas M. Leovy,
 Conant Wait,
 John Hemphill,
 Charles R. Westbrook,
 Richard S. Maynard,
 Robert M. Curtis,
 Ernest Gregory,
 George T. Jarvis,
 Thomas Robins, jr.,
 Arthur C. Saxe,
 George G. Jones,
 Samuel E. Raymond,
 Lyman S. King,
 Evans R. Dick, jr.,
 Miles Wambaugh,
 Herbert M. Corse,
 George E. McQuestion,
 Arthur W. Ford,
 DeLancy Nicoll, jr.,
 Lewis G. Smith,
 Schuyler Dillon,
 Paul A. Scherer,
 Frederick A. Merrill,
 Douglas G. Lovell,
 William F. Kurfess,
 William W. Slaymaker,
 Harold F. Fultz,
 Alfred G. Gennert,
 Edwin Cowles,
 Sydney P. Clark,
 John A. Burgwin,
 Frank T. Hogg,
 Walter H. Wheeler, jr.,
 Junius S. Morgan,
 Folke E. Sellman,
 Walter P. Shiel,
 Arthur M. Tschirgi,
 Wayne F. Palmer,
 George D. Howell, jr.,
 Donald McClench,
 Charles Higginson,
 Clifford D. Smith,

Hamilton Vose, jr.,
 Robert F. Herrick, jr.,
 Joseph C. Storey,
 Horton Brown,
 William C. Bok,
 John H. Wilcox,
 Edward Lloyd, jr.,
 Donald M. Ryerson,
 Elmer J. Stoffel,
 Horace Butler,
 Selim E. Woodworth,
 Benjamin W. Cloud, 2d,
 John S. Lionberger,
 Philip C. Kauffman,
 Roy D. Keyes,
 Richard H. Cobb,
 Frank W. Morrell,
 Franklin King,
 Francis T. Hunter,
 Conrad Chapman,
 Harold S. Simmons,
 George Taylor,
 Robert W. Emmons, 3d,
 William T. Kirk, 3d,
 Arthur T. Leonard,
 William H. May,
 John L. Merrill,
 John E. P. Morgan,
 William V. Couchman, jr.,
 Thomas N. Page,
 William W. Grace,
 George R. Hann,
 Winslow H. French,
 Andrew C. Little,
 Irving R. Gale,
 Hallowell V. Morgan,
 Howard G. Cann,
 Robert B. Noyes,
 Thomas I. H. Powell,
 Eugene R. Sturtevant,
 Bryan Frere,
 Henry Hale, jr.,
 Thornton Emmons,
 Chester J. La Roche,
 Mallery K. Aiken,
 Milton H. Bird,
 Paul A. Hourigan,
 John R. Litchfield,
 Stanford Harmon,
 John D. Schuler,
 Carter B. Burnet,
 Clarence W. Schmidt,
 John T. Scully,
 Arthur C. Smith,
 William J. Curtis, jr.,
 Howard P. Hart,
 Hayden Crocker,
 Frederick S. Connor,
 Matthew P. Waller,
 James L. Sprunt,
 Robert R. Theobald,
 Arthur C. Hoyt,
 Marlon W. Lee,
 Ralph W. Preston,
 Gould T. Miner,
 James H. R. Cromwell,
 William E. D. Stokes, jr.,
 Robert D. Bartlett,
 John S. Upton,
 Charles H. Bowman,
 George F. Talbot,
 Herbert D. Glass,
 Percival V. Harris,
 Allan C. Brown,
 Fleet W. Corwin,
 Howard W. Kitchin,
 Leland D. Webb, and
 William Knox.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clyde C. Laws to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 22d day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry E. Rung to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 27th day of September, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward J. Carr to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 28th day of September, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of October, 1918:

Benjamin F. Strawbridge and
 Roy M. Cottrell.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Brady J. Dayton,
 Philip J. Drake,
 Putnam M. Morrison,
 John A. Sweetser,
 Frederick R. Bowes,
 Raymond E. Baldwin,
 Leicester S. Pettit,
 John F. English,
 Wilbert A. Smith,
 Nelson B. Wolfe,
 Thomas R. Parkhurst,
 Herbert N. French,
 Edward M. Shingler,
 Paul R. Webb,
 Jesse B. Perlman,
 William H. Parsons, jr.,
 John V. K. Richards,
 Edgar R. Payson, jr.,
 Harry L. M. Capron,
 Louis S. Davidson,
 Howell Evans,
 Bainbridge D. Folwell,
 Eben H. Ellison, jr.,
 Francis D. Harrower,
 Edwin B. Dunphy,
 Ernest C. Haaren,
 Alexander L. McKaig,
 John H. Magee,
 Laurence Schwab,
 Douglas S. Moore,
 John H. Russell,
 Weyman S. Crocker,
 Charles K. Wallace,
 John I. Wylde,
 Sumner F. Fuller,
 Edward N. Crosman, jr.,
 Lewis P. Scott,
 Franklin Pettit, jr.,
 Walter W. Burnham,
 Henry M. Lamberton,
 Lindsay Bradford,
 Arthur E. Bartlett,
 John G. Quinby, jr.,
 William L. Kimball,
 John B. Clapp,
 Elliot L. Ward,
 Francis S. Wilson,
 Walter E. Chase, jr.,
 Albert W. Findeisen,
 Bradford Norman, jr.,
 L. Selden Taylor,
 Charles E. A. Spiegel,
 Morris Phinney,
 Bennet F. Schauflier,
 Gilman M. Gay,
 George F. Newton, jr.,
 Alden Lee,
 Martin J. Quinn, jr.,
 William L. G. Gibson,
 Jacob S. Disston, jr.,
 Henry C. Taylor,
 Richard S. Walker,
 Joseph Winlock,
 James E. Kelly,
 Arthur H. Haaren,
 Harold J. Wright,
 Campbell Higgins,
 John S. Bauman,
 Samuel M. Haslett, jr.,
 Clarence H. Cull,
 John B. Burnham,
 Charles M. Boswell, jr.,
 Johnston L. Redmond,

Francis Brooks,
Thomas L. Entwisle,
John L. Graham,
Marquis Pope,
Carl O. W. Sparkman,
John deK. Bowen,
Robert J. Orr,
William W. Baler,
Marcus A. Sutcliffe,
Anthony D. Bullock,
Franklin W. Hobbs, jr.,
Addison Stillwell,
Oliver B. Jennings,
Arthur D. Murray,
James M. Owens,
Foster M. Hampton,
Caspar S. Chisolm,
Leroy K. Howe,
Theodore C. Marceau, jr.,
Lester S. Moll,
Charles C. Savage, jr.,
Oliver P. Shattuck,
Louis M. Pratt, jr.,
John U. Lemmon, jr.,
Arleigh D. Richardson,
Harry L. Butler,
John G. Rayley,
William Durfee, jr.,
Chester J. Mattson,
Cornelius Shields,
Olin McN. Richardson,
Richard V. Dolan,
John H. Minnis,
Frederick W. Johns,
George W. Burden,
William K. B. Urquhart,
Harold J. Kline,
Thaddeus C. Jones,
Richard Williams,
J. Otto Holcomb,
John G. Gross,
Phillip L. Coddington,
Wilfred I. Stiles,
George E. Finlay,
Edward M. McIlvain,
Alden Kimball,
Edgar M. Jaeger,
Francis M. Smith,
Harold M. Wright,
Edwin E. Sheridan,
Kavanaugh C. Downey,
Carl J. Koehler,
J. Willis Gale,
Gordon W. Ayer,
Nelson L. Fortin,
John P. Holland,
Carroll E. Miller,
Brothwell H. Baker,
Frank H. Storms,
Cornelius A. Wood,
Kenneth C. Woodruff,
George W. Palmer, 3d,
Burmain A. Grimbail,
Fred L. McNally,
Thomas D. Shepherd,
Clarence J. O'Neill,
Albert J. Porter,
Charles A. Winter,
Thomas T. Hassell,
Elbert M. Burnett,
Stanley H. Freihofer,
Talbert N. Daughtrey,
Russell A. Beck,
John W. Chapman,
Matthew F. Tracey,
Oliver A. Bowers,
Otis E. Bennett,
John J. Gaskin,
Chester N. White,
Thomas H. Murphy,
Leo E. Schlimme,
Bernard S. Rodey, jr.,
Thomas P. Kane,
Alfred J. Byrholdt,
Oliver H. Briggs,

Frederick G. Trummer,
Francis A. Knauss,
Carl J. Hallbert,
Albert T. Lang,
Christian Christensen,
Henry L. Bixbee,
Alexander C. Cornell,
William G. Gillis,
Fred G. Peterman,
Frank E. Norlin,
Leslie R. Heselton,
Lawrence J. Murphy,
George R. Woods,
Robert J. Vierthaler,
George H. Frederick,
Carl Hupp,
John L. Blomquist,
Edwin P. Lacey,
Charles A. Goebel,
John McKean,
Heinrich C. A. Deglau,
John O. Strickland,
Raymond J. Comstock,
Virgil F. Wright,
George F. Evanson,
Clarence C. McDow,
Ralph M. Gerth,
William S. Burns,
Charles A. Strumsky,
Joseph F. Caveney,
William H. Tracy,
John D. Morris,
Charles R. Kehler,
Elliott Kauth,
James E. Finn,
Arthur O. Kolstad,
Stonewall B. Stadtler,
Homer F. McGee,
Sydney W. Ford,
John Harrison, jr.,
Washington E. Bogardus,
William T. Brown,
Philip McK. Zenner,
Stephen E. Haddon,
Clarence E. Jackson,
Arthur V. Holmes,
Frederick Ellison,
James K. Smallwood,
Thomas J. Malarkey,
Frederick T. Mayes,
Edward J. Murnane,
Harold H. Ralph,
Matthew Woessner,
Albert Wood,
Kenneth H. Stetson,
Joseph Murtagh,
John E. Pedersen,
Lansford F. Kengle,
Stanley A. Jones,
Frank A. Brandecker,
Arthur Wrightson,
Joseph A. Clark,
Arthur A. Hewitt,
William A. Lynch,
Edward H. Smith,
Martin F. Comeau,
Robert B. McEwan, jr.,
Forest W. Allen,
Dwight W. Jennings,
Robert A. Haynie,
Watson K. Blair,
Francis H. Cabot,
Ralph Forween,
Harold K. Smoot,
Adolph Bloom,
Charles C. Roberts,
Charles L. Allen,
Guy A. Walker,
Nicholas Kedinger,
Percy C. Becker,
Stockard R. Hickey,
Alfred E. Stulb,
Walter Hinton,
George B. Kessack,
Oscar Erickson,

John J. Bayer,
Oscar F. Bandura,
Guy McLaughlin,
Russell G. McNaughton,
Eduard G. Jahnke,
Otto Beran,
David J. Spahr,
William E. McClendon,
Fred S. Wade,
John W. Collier,
Enos Dahuff,
Delos A. Humphrey,
William J. Sharkey,
George H. Charter,
Edward Reavely,
Niels Andersen,
Howard C. Heald,
Robert S. Dunn,
Lawrence E. Myers,
Robert S. Smith, jr.,
John E. Hatch,
Frederick Shea,
Clarence J. Gale,
Albert Nashman,
Charles E. Olson,
Robert Martin,
William S. Quesinberry,
James C. White,
Edward Reynolds, jr.,
Henry O. Rea,
Frederick W. Boldt,
Horace L. Ham,
George Berton,
Alexander B. Provost,
Harry A. Mewshaw,
Chris Halverson,
William G. Scott,
Harry Bennett,
Elmer J. Tugend,
Morey H. Downs,
John C. Mayhew,
Tom H. Williamson,
Hubert K. Stubbs,
Harold V. Andrews,
Clarence V. Waggonner,
Henry C. Flanagan,
Omer L. Brewington,
Cecil A. McKay,
Duncan W. Frick,
Nathan Young,
Stuart Parker,
Caleb Loring,
Ralph J. A. Stern,
William L. Hickey,
B. Thatcher Feustman,
Barnes Newberry,
Bruce Burns,
Charles H. Duell, jr.,
John R. Haire,
Donald M. Lovejoy,
Edgar M. Queeny,
Charles H. Sterrett,
Allen L. Welch,
Leroy H. Ripley,
Frank A. Saunders,
Warren P. Boardman,
Benjamin J. Shinn,
William J. Clarke,
Merton R. Hinkle,
Caspar Yeager,
Lon H. Robb,
William Y. Rorer,
Cedric O. Eaton,
Charles A. Oliver,
Fred C. Forster,
George E. Ernest,
Albert J. Fern,
Frank Leghorn,
Edward F. Manning,
William G. Spurlock,
Theodore A. Kelly,
William H. Fiddler, jr.,
Frederick J. Leonard,
Alan M. Gray,
Hale G. Knight,

George L. Heyer,
Charles A. Williams,
Harold B. Collins,
William C. Eberle,
Henry John Behrends,
William Henry Meyer,
Will Frank Roseman,
Joseph Alphonse Oellet,
Howard E. Haynes,
Gustav Adolf Curt Leutritz,
Thomas Noland,
Walter Adam Krueck,
Leo John Sutton,
John Benedict Manghan,
Alexander Otto Schory,
Jesse Gilbert McFarland,
Simon Peter Swynenburg,
Joie Carwin Wilkins,
John Reid,
Charles Reading Shaw,
James Charles Humphreys,
John Joseph Coogan,
Herbert Augustus Anderson,
William G. Burgess,
Arthur E. LeGros,
William E. Bringham,
Robert E. Dwyer,
Leland C. Poole,
Chester C. Rounds,
Herbert J. Wiker,
George W. Brown,
John Cusick,
Clarence E. Beach,
Claudius G. Pendill,
John M. O'Neil,
John S. Danner,
John P. Dix,
Glenn F. Hulse,
Robert E. Davenport,
Ralph B. Raymond,
Louis Verbrugge,
Raymond Leo Morrissey,
Walter Hansen,
George W. Adams,
Rudolf Winzer,
Charles J. Ingersoll,
Albert J. Courtney,
Edward J. Birmingham,
Frank A. Saar,
Wiley B. Jones,
Charles H. Phillips,
Claude Farmer,
Abraham M. Rosenberg,
Harry B. Luessen,
Eldridge L. Lineberry,
Harry A. Wentworth,
William F. Verleger,
Walter E. Hewitt,
Robert L. Bryan,
Gottlieb Grosch,
Walter M. McCarthy,
Ralph J. Pyatt,
Alfred E. Green,
Rodney B. Starr,
William Wakefield,
Thomas H. Escott,
Timothy Brown,
John C. Bauman, jr.,
Harley E. Barrows,
Francis S. Page,
Irving N. Eustis,
Jay P. Clymer,
Benjamin W. Taylor,
Sidney B. Baisdell,
Harry L. Dodson,
Ray W. Bruner,
Adolphe H. Wenzel,
Oliver C. Field,
Harry R. Pendarvis,
Russel H. Lindsay,
Duane L. Taylor,
Joseph P. Maguire,
Roger F. McCall,
Oscar E. Finlay,
Clarence E. Kraehn,

Richard C. Bartlett,
Henry W. Piquet,
William L. Phillips,
Nathaniel Krasnoff,
Louis Dreller,
George S. Harris,
Frederick J. Silvernail,
Edwin J. Johannessen,
Harry J. Carey,
James H. Alvis,
Murray T. Wilkinson,
Joel R. Conrad,
Charles F. Hudson,
Edwin V. Annatoyn,
James D. Barner,
Arthur L. Mundo,
Walter L. Hunley,
Leon W. Mills,
Edward W. Neville,
Fred E. Patrick,
Philip D. Butler,
John A. Westrom,
Edward Danielson,
Harry F. Breckel,
Clyde L. Lewis,
Joseph L. Norvell,
Joseph A. Wetzel,
Andrew Simmons,
Arthur F. Dietrich,
William J. Charles,
John W. White,
Duncan P. Houser,
Edward A. Wardell,
Francis H. Stone,
Bartholomew J. Patterson,
Malcolm F. Schoeffel,
Thomas G. W. Settle,
Lucien M. Grant,
James E. J. Kiernan,
Richard M. Rush,
James R. Allen,
Daniel W. Hand, jr.,
Charles A. Nicholson, 2d,
Paul W. Hains,
Ralph A. Ofstie,
Rex LeG. Hicks,
Herbert M. Scull,
Matthias B. Gardner,
Leslie C. Stevens,
Charles H. Cushman,
Howard W. Fitch,
Creighton C. Carmine,
Robert F. Nelson,
Antonio S. Pitre,
Winfield A. Brooks,
Thomas P. Wynkoop, jr.,
Ernest E. Herrmann,
James M. Johnston,
Arthur S. Adams,
William E. Hilbert,
Hugh W. Olds,
Albert T. Sprague, 3d,
Maurice H. Stein,
Hobart A. Sailor,
William McC. Callaghan,
Rodman D. de Kay,
Harold L. Challenger,
John J. Orr,
Hubert H. Anderson,
Joseph Buchalter,
Thomas P. Jeter,
Robert G. Waldron,
Adolph O. Gieselmann,
David H. Clark,
Jeffrey C. Metzel,
Festus F. Foster,
Russell M. Ihrig,
James J. Graham,
Ralph B. Netting,
Ralph H. Roberts,
Valentine H. Schaeffer,
Floyd S. Crosley,
Eugene L. Kell,
Allen D. Brown,
John W. Roper,

William C. Vose,
Harry B. Slocum,
Charles E. Olsen,
Robert P. Briscoe,
Harry R. Thurber,
James B. Sykes,
Lyle N. Morgan,
Clarence H. Schildhauer,
Cuthbert A. Griffiths,
Franz O. Willenbacher,
Harry McC. Jones,
Thomas J. Griffin,
William H. Ferguson,
Ernest H. Von Heimbürg,
Morton T. Seligman,
Douglas A. Powell,
William N. Updegraff,
Stuart S. Murray,
John O. Huse,
Charles J. Palmer,
William D. Sample,
Arthur P. Thurston,
Logan C. Ramsey,
Scott G. Lamb,
Alfred P. Moran, jr.,
William E. Clayton,
Richard B. Tuggle,
Harry Goodstein,
John H. Cassady,
Julian B. Noble,
Gerald L. Schetky,
Donald C. King,
Henry R. Herbst,
Charles E. Coney,
Dean D. Francis,
Wade E. Griswold,
William H. Mays,
Clayton Demarest, jr.,
Elmer R. Hill,
Henry D. Baggett,
William L. Marsh,
Bayard H. Colyear,
Charles L. Andrews, jr.,
Ralph W. Hungerford,
Charles B. Hunt,
George McF. O'Rear,
Herschel P. Cook,
John W. Cullens,
James D. Lowry, jr.,
Albert P. Burleigh,
Eric M. Grimsley,
Charles K. Post,
John B. Griggs, jr.,
Eliot H. Bryant,
George C. Dyer,
Alonzo B. Alexander,
Walter D. Whitehead,
David S. Crawford,
Charles J. Rend,
Everett D. Kern,
Ten Eyck DeW. Veeder, jr.,
Robert L. Boller,
Albert R. Staudt,
Henry C. Fengar,
Chauncey Camp,
John Neal,
Gordon H. Mason,
Dorrance K. Day,
Paul F. Lee,
Marshall R. Greer,
Philip P. Welch,
George J. Downey,
Walter S. Barlow,
Joseph R. Lannon,
Louis B. Pelzman,
Harry A. Rochester,
Edwin Friedman,
George Kirkland,
James J. Hughes,
Carl K. Fink,
John J. Patterson, 3d,
Walter Ansel,
Wilfred C. Wilcock,
Adrian O. Rule, jr.,
Miles P. Duval, jr.,

Walther G. Maser,
 Elmer R. Runquist,
 Walton R. Read,
 Daniel M. McGurl,
 William E. Tarbutton,
 Homer I. Sherritt,
 Philip V. Sullivan,
 Stephen K. Hall,
 Robert McL. Smith, jr.,
 Robert B. Crichton,
 Paul H. Talbot,
 Russell S. Barrett,
 James L. Holloway, jr.,
 Gustave H. Bowman,
 James L. Wisenbaker,
 Ralph E. Jennings,
 Frank N. Sayre,
 Peyton S. Cochran,
 Paul B. Thompson,
 Fred W. Beltz,
 John B. McDonnald, jr.,
 Kenneth D. Muir,
 Tracy M. Kegley,
 John G. Crawford,
 Paul D. Dingwell,
 James G. Atkins,
 Frank V. Aler, jr.,
 Leonard C. Parker,
 Cyril K. Wildman,
 Francis H. Gilmer,
 Earle H. Kincaid,
 Carleton McGaully,
 George W. Brashears, jr.,
 Charles R. Smith,
 Giles E. Short,
 Van Rensselaer Moore,
 Thomas B. Fitzpatrick,
 Dixie Kiefer,
 Horace R. Whittaker,
 Willis W. Pace,
 Harold M. Martin,
 Joseph S. Ives,
 Edgar R. Winckler,
 John L. Reynolds,
 William J. Strachan,
 John R. Redman,
 Ross A. Dierdorff,
 George F. Mentz,
 Herbert S. Woodman,
 George H. Mills,
 Charles Allen,
 Jack C. Richardson,
 Robert M. Dorsey,
 Desmond J. Sinnott,
 John C. Williams,
 Spencer H. Warner,
 John S. Spaven,
 Grayson B. Carter,
 Riffel G. Rhoton,
 Willment P. Martin,
 Franklin P. Waller,
 Charles H. Rocky, and
 Gordon M. Jackson.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Irving A. Chapman,
 Edward P. Street,
 David D. Smead, jr.,
 Raymond H. Finlay,
 Amory Coolidge,
 Cortland F. Ames, jr.,
 Wayland H. Sanford,
 Albert V. Hall,
 Henry R. Guild,
 Louis C. Seavernes,
 Edward Kneass,
 Francis B. Thorne,
 Benjamin F. McGuckin,
 George C. Cutler, jr.,
 Richard T. Guilbert,
 Leslie A. Wiggins,
 Harry A. Thornton,
 Atherton K. Dunbar,
 Warren D. Arnold,

Arthur B. Homer,
 John C. Hurd,
 Clifton B. Herd,
 Innis O'Rourke,
 Rufus D. W. Ewing,
 Ayres Boal,
 Donald S. Sexton,
 Heroy M. Dyckman,
 Clement M. Gile,
 Harold W. Brooks,
 James B. Bergs,
 Ellis W. Taylor,
 Martin L. Dunn,
 James W. Ryan,
 George Gregory, jr.,
 Earle S. Barker,
 Edwin K. Hoover,
 Walter Antrim,
 Laurence C. Murdoch,
 John N. Leonard,
 Henry G. Anderson,
 Edwin Nelson,
 Arthur E. Childs,
 Dietrich G. Schmitz,
 Thomas C. Parsons,
 James M. Connally,
 Edmund Ocumpaugh, 3d,
 Lawrence Oliphant,
 Arthur McL. Bartley,
 William O. Kenney,
 Thomas Buel,
 John F. A. Davis,
 Elliott De Bevoise,
 John E. Sayler,
 John R. Marsh,
 Traver Briscoe,
 Gorham Hubbard, jr.,
 Harold E. Barden,
 Edgar Denton, jr.,
 Whitley P. McCoy,
 Ransom Henshaw,
 Donald Scott,
 James H. Waller,
 Percival W. Buzby,
 Thomas C. Nicholls, jr.,
 Roderick T. Smith,
 Philler Lee,
 Hobart M. Birmingham,
 Richard E. Wheeler,
 Robert N. Hoefflich,
 Frederick H. Bosbyshell,
 Theodore C. Briggs,
 Arthur T. Lyman,
 Earle H. Parkins,
 Alfred V. Janotta,
 Edwin D. King,
 Edward G. Schmidheiser,
 Leroy H. Davidson,
 Henry E. Coe, jr.,
 Norman D. Weir,
 Vernon C. Bixby,
 Howard W. Kitchell,
 Vallette S. Church,
 Joseph M. Shoemaker,
 Chandler Bennitt,
 Robert R. Gleason,
 William M. Akin,
 Julian P. Burlingham,
 Thomas W. Allen,
 Henry Hilton-Green,
 David H. Frantz,
 John Garey,
 Leonard Jacob,
 Frank M. Orton,
 Alexander Loewy,
 Newton C. Elkin, and
 Kenneth C. Kennedy.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918:

Arthur F. Peterson,
 Lewis F. Kepple,
 John A. Manfrin,
 George O. Augustine,
 Samuel M. Thompson,
 Edward L. Garnett,

Philip L. Reid,
Arthur E. Maginniss,
Joseph Mather,
Otto Gmelich,
William R. Schimmeyer,
Marshall Anderson,
Denis J. Kieley,
Mortimer Laurence,
Elmer T. Marr,
Charles E. Reynolds,
John H. Kevers,
James N. McTwiggan,
Herman A. Berch,
Wade Lash,
Frederick W. Ickes, and
Ira D. Spoonmoore.

The following named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918:

William K. Riddle and
John G. Church.

The following named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Eric L. Barr and
William M. Quigley.

The following named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Alfred E. Montgomery,
Allen H. Guthrie,
Ralph S. Wentworth,
Edmund A. Crenshaw,
Robert S. Haggart,
Forrest U. Lake,
Nathan B. Chase,
Earl R. Morrissey,
Harold H. Little,
Horatio J. Pierce, and
Abraham C. TenEyck.

The following named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Archie E. Glann,
Myron J. Walker,
Stephen H. Matteson,
Burton W. Chippendale,
Cornelius W. Flynn,
Robert W. Clark,
Winthrop Winslow,
De Witt C. Watson,
Ralph W. Christie, and
William D. Thomas.

Gunner Clarence L. Tibbals to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 15th day of February, 1918.

Machinist Ernest A. Healy to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1918.

Brig. Gen. (temporary) Charles G. Long to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of October, 1918.

Col. Smedley D. Butler to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of October, 1918.

Col. (temporary) Newt H. Hall to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of October, 1918.

Lieut. Col. (temporary) Harold C. Snyder to be lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of October, 1918.

The following named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Ethelbert Talbot,
Louis R. de Roode, and
John A. Minnis.

The following named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Robert P. Jeter,
Lawrence B. Smith,
Richard O. Sanderson,
Louis S. Davis,
Jonathan Lucas, jr.,
Archie W. French,
William L. York,
Harry D. Gibbons,
John F. Williams,
Howard B. Freeman, and
Bruce J. Mansfield.

The following named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of August, 1918:

Melvin J. Stinchfield, jr.,
Pierson M. Tuttle,
Herman L. McLeod,

Clarence H. Hartley,
John T. Selden,
Frank C. Myers,
Joseph D. Broderick,
Louis A. Perraud,
Grant L. Hill,
Arthur F. Sennholtz,
Carl R. Dietrich,
Edward B. Irving,
Wells W. Miller,
Keesler B. Low,
George Ehrhart, jr.,
Elmer E. Hall, and
Charles F. Worthen.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 24, 1918.

CONSUL GENERAL.

CLASS 4.

Evan E. Young to be a consul general of class 4.

CONSULS.

CLASS 5.

Albert H. Putney to be a consul of class 5.

CLASS 7.

John R. Putnam to be a consul of class 7.

William L. Jenkins to be a consul of class 7.

CLASS 8.

Frank Bohr to be a consul of class 8.

Henry B. Hitchcock to be a consul of class 8.

Luther K. Zabriskie to be a consul of class 8.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

Albert Strauss to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

George W. Anderson to be United States circuit judge, first circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Edwin R. Holmes to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Mississippi.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

James A. Baggett to be United States marshal northern district of Texas.

Cooper Stout to be United States marshal eastern district of Illinois.

Emmet R. Jordan to be United States marshal District of Alaska, division No. 2.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Oscar B. Gordon to be receiver of public moneys at Camden, Ark.

Homer V. Sewell to be receiver of public moneys at Little Rock, Ark.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Benjamin F. Spires to be register of the land office at Little Rock, Ark.

Benjamin M. Tribble to be register of the land office at Camden, Ark.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Alfred Franklin to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Mexico.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Acting Pay Clerk Robert G. Robeson to be an assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign, for temporary service.

The following named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters with the rank of ensign, for temporary service:

Clifford W. Waters,
Michael A. Sprengel,
William Elliott,
Joseph E. Ford,
Frank M. Sherrill,
James E. Hunt,
William R. Diehl,
Hugh J. McManus,
Aner Erickson,
William E. Woods,
Jesse W. Hilts,
Roe L. Flowers,
Olaf Olsen,
Alexander W. Urquhart,
Leo A. Ketterer,
John J. Carroll,

Erwin A. McKee,
Edward H. Hulit,
Nicholas A. Brown,
Tate Mayhall,
George L. Aulmann,
John W. Overand,
Evans D. Stegar,
Howard N. Hill,
Charles H. Converse,
Alonzo A. Munsell,
William R. Davidson,
Leo V. Flavell,
William M. Rogers,
Samuel R. Ullman,
Archie J. Lourie,
Isidore R. Meyer,
Cornelius A. Brinkmann,
Gilbert A. Jones,
Albert W. Alderd,
Charles H. Cameron,
Paul J. Weiss,
David A. Cain,
Thayer B. Thomas,
Jacob H. Kyger,
Joseph T. Lareau,
Marion McCray,
William J. Martin,
Paul K. Coons,
Roy L. Koester, and
James A. Harris.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Clyde D. Dahlman,
Carl Axelson,
Levi C. Houston,
Albert A. Elliott,
William S. Johnson,
Peter P. Zeller,
John R. J. Le Roy,
Cornelius J. O'Connor,
Frederick A. Olsen,
William G. Sullivan,
John J. Dallier,
Ernest C. Fiedler,
John Francis Shea,
Frank E. Powers,
John S. Bessent,
Clyde W. Jordan,
John F. Welch,
Charles E. Carlson,
Thomas J. Costello,
Edward B. Peterson,
Charles R. Jeffs,
Thomas J. Quinn,
Frank P. Moore,
Albert J. Wheaton,
Glenn C. Provost,
Arthur Brown,
Charley F. Martin,
Arthur S. Fenton,
Merion E. Hair,
Julius J. Lorzinger,
Clinton W. Gray,
Edward L. Gench,
George L. Morin,
William R. Simpson, jr.,
Lutlie E. Tappen, and
Clarence E. Young.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Robert A. McCloud,
Phillip L. Emerson,
Rowland G. Evans, and
William E. Clow, jr.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Fred A. Luenser,
Clyde W. Haskins,
Charles E. Chamberlain,
Calvin A. Cole,
Guy R. Bostain,
Leo L. Waite,
Roy A. Jones,
Lawrence S. Tichenor,

Wallace Cooper,
Walter A. Irwin,
Christian W. Manegold,
Wilfred G. Lebeque,
Frank L. Burgess, and
George R. Milbourn.

The following-named enlisted men, to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Elmer D. Lundberg,
Charles C. Gillis,
Carl B. Fields, and
Phillip H. Taft.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Henry R. Wharton, jr.,
Donald D. Leonard,
Ford K. Lucas,
Julian P. Van Vorst,
Joseph R. Tobin,
Abraham S. Lewis,
Charles G. Lade,
Carlet H. Crawford,
Roy O. Hill,
Thomas F. Kilkenny,
Gordon J. Morrow,
Thomas R. Wells,
Thomas A. West,
Travis F. Beale,
Edgar R. Hill,
Clinton E. Shepard,
Ralph Hicks,
Lloyd M. Thornton,
Ned L. Chapin,
Harold C. Nye,
Hermann P. Knickerbocker, and
Arthur G. Latimer.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders, for temporary service:

Phillip R. Baker,
Harvey S. Haislip,
Harrison R. Glennon,
Ralph E. Dennett,
George F. Parrot, jr.,
Charles G. McCord,
Alfred S. Wolfe,
Ralph C. Lawder,
Eugene T. Oates,
Roy W. Lewis,
Marion C. Cheek,
Richard S. Field,
Robert P. Molton, jr.,
William J. Butler,
Robert H. English,
Jay K. Esler,
George D. Murray,
Carroll Q. Wright, jr.,
Oliver M. Read, jr.,
Joseph McE. B. Smith,
George J. McMillin,
William H. O'Brien, jr.,
Howard F. Kingman,
Howard S. Keep,
James G. B. Gromer,
Bushrod B. Howard,
Rivers J. Carstarphen,
Calvin H. Cobb,
Robert B. Simons,
Lee C. Carey,
Norman Scott,
Glenn A. Smith,
Donald C. Godwin,
Richard P. Myers,
Webb C. Hayes,
Howard D. Bode,
Jay L. Kerley,
Harold E. Snow,
Robert M. Doyle, jr.,
Richard H. Booth,
Morton L. Deyo,
Harold T. Bartlett,
Robert M. Hinkley,
Ralph S. Parr,
Shirley A. Wilson,
Charles H. McMorris,
John A. Byers,

Virgil C. Griffin, jr.,
 John H. Holt, jr.,
 Henry M. Kieffer,
 William A. Corley,
 Benjamin Perlman,
 Howard H. Good,
 Ernest G. Small,*
 Carleton H. Wright,
 Donald Boyden,
 Robertson J. Weeks,
 Herman E. Fischer,
 Mark W. Larimer,
 Willard E. Cheadle,
 Edward P. Nickinson,
 Thomas L. Gatch,
 Harry G. Patrick,
 Alfred E. Montgomery,
 Andrew C. Bennett,
 Frederick Baltzly,
 Allen H. Guthrie,
 Eugene P. A. Simpson,
 Oliver W. Bagby,
 Lawrence P. Bischoff,
 James C. Clark,
 James C. Monfort,
 Robert D. Moore,
 Carl G. Gilliland,
 Harold Dodd,
 Whitley Perkins,
 Warren A. Shaw,
 Robert A. Hall,
 Guy C. Hitchcock,
 Anton B. Anderson,
 Ralph S. Wentworth,
 George L. Woodruff,
 Mahlon S. Tisdale,
 Schuyler Mills,
 Edmund A. Crenshaw, jr.,
 James L. King,
 William D. Taylor,
 Davis De Treville,
 Homer C. Wick,
 John P. Dalton,
 Louis P. Wenzell,
 Robert S. Haggart,
 Raymond E. Kerr,
 Philip Van Horn Weems,
 George H. Fort,
 Lunsford L. Hunter,
 Earnest W. Broadbent,
 Forrest U. Lake,
 Robert R. Thompson,
 Elliott Buckmaster,
 Nelson W. Hibbs,
 Emory P. Eldredge,
 Albert B. Sanborn,
 Ellis M. Zacharias,
 Clarence Gulbranson,
 Wentworth H. Osgood,
 Donald F. Patterson,
 Harold B. Grow,
 Donald W. Hamilton,
 Herbert G. Gates, jr.,
 Heister Hoogewerff,
 John H. Falge,
 Louis E. Denfeld,
 Ralph W. Holt,
 George W. D. Dashiell,
 Emory W. Coil,
 Nathan B. Chase,
 George W. La Mountain,
 Alexander W. Loder,
 Harold W. Scofield,
 Carroll M. Hall,
 William S. Hogg, jr.,
 Beriah M. Thompson,
 John L. Fox,
 Earl R. Morrissey,
 Stephan B. Robinson,
 William G. Greenman,
 Harold H. Little,
 Horatio J. Peirce,
 Hamilton Harlow,
 Hugh C. Frazer,
 Thales S. Boyd,

James A. Crutchfield,
 Daniel E. Barbey,
 Charles P. Mason,
 John J. Brown,
 Grady B. Whitehead,
 Carl K. Martin,
 Campbell D. Edgar,
 Harry P. Curley,
 John P. Bowden,
 De Witt C. Ramsey,
 Baylis F. Poe,
 Roscoe E. Schuirman,
 Charles K. Osborne,
 Abraham C. Ten Eyck,
 Ingram C. Sowell,
 Francis E. M. Whiting,
 Charles A. Lockwood, jr.,
 John K. Richards, jr.,
 William H. Burtis,
 Stanley G. Womble,
 Paul S. Theiss,
 John Wilbur,
 Charles S. Alden,
 Robert E. P. Elmer,
 Charles F. Greene,
 George S. Gillespie,
 Garnet Hulings,
 Charles W. McNair,
 Otto M. Forster,
 Louis R. Ford,
 Leonard N. Linsley,
 William H. P. Blandy,
 Henry L. Abbott,
 James C. Jones, jr.,
 Elmer L. Woodside,
 Herman E. Keisker,
 Glenn B. Davis,
 Bruce G. Leighton,
 Palmer H. Dunbar, jr.,
 Roy J. Wilson,
 Ray H. Wakeman,
 Carl E. Hoard,
 Harold C. Van Valzah,
 Charles N. Ingraham,
 Adolph V. S. Pickhardt,
 Stewart F. Bryant,
 Paul A. Stevens,
 Kenneth R. R. Wallace,
 George W. Wolf,
 William B. Jupp,
 Robin B. Daughtry,
 William I. Causey, jr.,
 Walter Seibert,
 Frank L. Johnston,
 Richard H. Knight,
 George L. Greene, jr.,
 Hugh L. White,
 Reginald S. H. Venable,
 Norman C. Gillette,
 John A. Brownell,
 Thomas Shine,
 Roy Dudley,
 Laurence Wild,
 Lloyd R. Gray,
 Herbert K. Fenn,
 Solomon H. Geer,
 Paul Hendren,
 Chapman C. Todd, jr.,
 Henry M. Briggs,
 Paul Cassard,
 Joseph Y. Dreisonstok,
 Walter O. Henry,
 John M. Kates,
 Carl T. Hull,
 Eric F. Zemke, and
 George M. Tisdale.
 Lieut. Edward J. O'Keefe to be lieutenant commander, for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants, for temporary service:

William E. O'Connor,
 William Twigg, jr.,
 Frederick R. Kalde,
 Burton W. Lambert,
 Allen I. Seaman,

William D. Dadd,
Charles Swanberg,
Malcolm C. Davis,
William H. Muehlhause,
Leroy Nell,
Oscar D. Parker,
John A. Ward,
John C. Hines,
John Gallagher,
George W. Robbins,
Cyrus S. Hansel,
Ernest A. Healy,
Frederick G. Keyes,
William Eberlin,
Frederick Petry,
John Meyer,
Frederick Evans,
Godfrey P. Schurz,
Clarence L. Tibbals,
Thomas J. Bristol,
William Taylor,
Michael J. Breshahan,
Lafayette P. Guy,
Edmond Delavy,
Frank J. Mayer,
Horace DeB. Dougherty,
James J. Joyce,
Joseph A. Rasmussen,
Warner K. Bigger,
Frank Schultz,
Joseph Sperr,
David F. Mead,
Henry A. Lowell,
Charles Antrobus,
Oliver T. Miller,
August Logan,
John J. Coyle,
George F. Blass,
Walter S. Belknap,
George C. Lacock,
Anton Hengst,
John W. Boldt,
Fred San Soucie,
Howard H. Chambers,
Percy R. Abrams,
Vincent F. Le Verne,
Charles E. Briggs,
George B. Llewellyn,
William C. Milligan,
Frederick J. Legere,
James Reilly,
John H. MacDonald,
William A. James,
William A. Fulkerson,
Jerry C. Holmes,
Conrad T. Goertz,
Edwin R. Wroughton,
Nathan E. Cooke,
Lewis H. Cutting, and
Ernest L. Jones.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William C. Carpenter to be a lieutenant, for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants, for temporary service:

Murry Wolfe,
Charles L. Greene,
Arthur T. Brill,
Ward T. Hall,
Michael Garland,
Erich Richter,
John C. Heck,
James L. McKenna,
George W. Waldo,
Anthony E. Bentfeld,
Arthur Boquett,
John Harder,
Sigvart Thompson,
Stephen A. Farrell,
William A. Vick,
John J. Welch,
Arthur S. Rollins,
Charles C. Stotz,
John C. Maxon,
Bailey E. Rigg,
Walter A. Buckley,

Frank E. Nelson,
Norman McL. McDonald,
Philip S. Flint,
Charles W. Wagner,
Henry A. Reynolds,
George F. Veth,
James E. Kemmer,
James A. Newell,
William W. Holton,
Fred C. Wolf,
Charles J. Naprstek,
Max Bayer,
Paxton Hotchkiss,
Leon W. Knight,
Harry M. Peaco,
Henry H. Beck,
Frank F. Webster,
John Reber,
Charles N. Koch,
Fred T. Rider,
William S. Evans,
Sofus K. Sorensen,
George J. Romulus,
Arthur L. Hecykell,
Charles King,
Quintus R. Thomson, jr.,
Ora A. Martin,
John A. Pierce,
Stephen Ingham,
William R. Spear,
William T. Shaw,
Roy K. Madill,
William R. McFarlane,
Nils Anderson,
Melvin C. Kent,
John E. Armstrong,
Albert C. Fraenzel,
William A. Martin,
Ralph B. Wallace,
James Roberts,
Joseph D. Glick,
Anthony Prastka,
Joseph W. Birk,
Edmund DuV. Duckett,
Raymond A. Walker,
Hermann Jorgensen,
Charles F. Dame,
Arthur J. Holton,
Vincent Benedict,
Ola D. Butler,
Edgar C. Wortman,
Joseph O'N. Johnson,
David Duffy,
Clyde H. McLellan,
Noel Chatillon,
William F. Schlegel,
Lee W. Drisco,
James J. Delany,
William H. Stephenson,
Arthur E. Rice,
John P. Millon,
Frank L. Elkins,
Sol Shaw,
Ernest J. Leonard,
Thomas J. Sullivan,
John P. Sasse,
Will Mueller,
John H. Chase,
Will S. Holloway,
George J. Blessing,
James D. Brown,
Partick H. Cassidy,
Franklin A. Manuel,
Frank Flaherty,
Frank G. Waugh,
Arthur A. F. Alm,
Bennett McC. Proctor,
James Donaldson,
John A. Silva,
James Hauser,
John E. Sullivan,
Charles A. Armstrong,
Chauncey R. Doll,
James S. Trayer,
Gregoire F. J. Labelle,

Theodore Anderson,
Henry Hartley,
Eugene J. Frieh,
Philip J. Kelly,
Andrew G. C. Dargard,
Alfred Doucet,
William E. Benson,
Fred C. A. Plagemann,
Peter J. Gundlach,
Albert M. Hinman,
Leon W. Becker,
William Cox,
Stephen A. Loftus,
Herman C. Schrader,
Asa Van R. Watson,
William A. Eaton,
James M. MacDonnell,
Herbert R. Mytinger,
Harold A. Turner,
Charles B. Bradley,
Curry E. Eason,
Samuel C. Washington,
Brice H. Mack,
James A. Featherston,
Walter N. Fanning,
Herbert J. Meneratti,
Niels Drustup,
Abraham De Somer,
George Bradley,
Donald McDonald,
Warren E. Magee,
Robert J. Kingsmill,
Charles F. Merrill,
Charles B. Shackelton,
Benjamin F. Ranger,
Robert C. McClure,
Carl S. Chapman,
George C. Martin,
Wilmer W. Weber,
Mark Strosk,
William W. Wilkins,
Helge Ohlsson,
Elroy G. True,
James W. O'Leary,
Warren H. Langdon,
Andrew C. Skinner,
Emery Smith,
Benjamin F. Maddox,
George Keeser,
John A. Rogers,
Alfred E. Raue,
John C. Richards,
Frank W. Yurasko,
Albert H. Mellien,
Phillip A. Astoria,
Thomas A. Graham,
William A. Mason,
Everest A. Whited,
John F. Murphy,
Charles A. Kohls,
Clarence R. Rockwell,
Paul E. Kuter,
William E. Snyder,
David McWhorter, Jr.,
George H. Kellogg,
Elery A. Zehner,
Samuel E. Lee,
Frank Stinchcomb,
Simon L. Shade,
Ludwig W. Gumz,
Wildon A. Ott,
Hugh W. Nimmo,
Junius G. Sanders,
Frederick B. Webber,
George T. Campbell,
Charles A. Dannenmann,
Harold G. Billings,
Albert E. Freed,
Frank Kinne,
Andrew N. Anderson,
Frank Kerr,
Arthur H. Cummings,
Harry J. Hansen,
Rony Snyder,
Newcomb L. Damon,

Jack K. Campbell,
George Kleinsmith,
Albert G. Martin,
Daniel McCallum,
John M. Buckley,
John J. Madden,
Robert Semple,
Henry H. Fowler,
Stanley H. Sacker,
Elmer J. McCluen,
John M. Kirkpatrick,
Clyde Lovelace,
Claude B. Arney,
Martin Dickinson,
Jesse J. Alexander,
John J. Enders,
Jesse J. Oettinger,
William H. Farrel,
Thomas M. Buck,
John Shottroff,
John Whalen,
Raymond C. McDuffie,
Oscar Benson,
William Martin,
John S. Conover,
Fayette Myers,
John G. M. Johnson,
Frederick Clifford,
Alexander Anderson,
Frederick T. Walling,
Charles V. Kane,
Joseph M. Gately,
Joseph H. Gerrior,
George S. Dean,
Ralph A. Laird,
Charles F. Fielding,
Collins R. Buchner,
Warwick M. Tinsley,
Archie R. Wolfe,
Francis P. Brewer,
Henry A. Stuart,
Aaron Eldridge,
Judson E. Scott,
Clyde H. Dougherty,
Edward L. Newell,
Robert B. England,
Howard S. Raber,
George O. Farnsworth,
Lars O. Peterson,
Omar B. Earle,
Alfred R. Eubanks,
Thomas Flynn,
John F. Piotrowski,
Alexander B. Holman,
Ralph A. Scott,
Michael Burke,
Irwin V. Herin,
William F. Schlesinger,
Herman A. Bauchot,
Earle G. Gardner,
William W. Eagers,
William K. Johnstone,
John F. Craig,
Frank T. Green,
Augustus K. Goffe,
Robert S. Savin,
William J. Graham,
Emmette F. Gumm,
George B. Evans,
Edwin Fisher,
Charles O. Bain,
Clarence H. Fogg,
Joseph A. Flynn,
James J. Lucas,
Thomas Southall,
Bernard S. Riley,
George C. Neilsen,
Sidney C. Seale,
Joseph C. Herman,
Thomas G. Shanahan,
George R. Blauvelt,
Eric P. Teschner,
Erich O. Tauer,
Jens Nelson,
Harry A. Bryan,

Edwin H. Briggs,
George Schneider,
Frank V. Shepard,
Warren L. Graeff,
Hector L. Ross,
Emmet L. Bourke,
John H. Chinnis,
Earl V. Hand,
Alonzo W. Esworthy,
Abram L. Broughton,
Robert I. Hart,
Albert F. Blake,
Charles Waters,
William F. Morris,
Jesse S. Hooper,
Edward I. Dalley,
John Heep,
James H. Cain,
Hugh J. Finn,
Carl J. Hanson,
William H. Wright,
Thomas T. Emerton,
Charles F. Ware,
John R. McMeekin,
Edgar T. Hammond,
John R. McKean,
John D. Thompson,
Raymond R. Smith,
Clarence E. Williams,
George E. Tarbell,
Albert Wing,
John L. Scheidemen,
Harold A. Clough,
Earl Swisher,
Albert C. Buck,
Walter L. Hawk,
Jesse L. Harmer,
Fred H. Stewart,
John W. Ross,
Francis H. McAdoo,
Almy C. Maynard,
James A. Burbank,
Ralph L. Dodge,
Charles K. Cobb, jr.,
Joseph L. Day,
Raymond L. Watrous,
Bulkeley L. Wells,
Winn D. Faris,
Walter R. O'Sullivan,
Chester L. Nichols,
Jay H. Keller,
John S. Brayton, jr.,
Thomas M. Leovy,
Conant Wait,
John Hemphill,
Charles R. Westbrook,
Richard S. Maynard,
Robert M. Curtis,
Ernest Gregory,
George T. Jarvis,
Thomas Robins, jr.,
Arthur C. Saxe,
George G. Jones,
Samuel E. Raymond,
Lyman S. King,
Evans R. Dick, jr.,
Miles Wambaugh,
Herbert M. Corse,
George E. McQuestion,
Arthur W. Ford,
DeLancy Nicoll, jr.,
Lewis G. Smith,
Schuyler Dillon,
Paul A. Scherer,
Frederick A. Merrill,
Douglas G. Lovell,
William F. Kurfess,
William W. Slaymaker,
Harold F. Fultz,
Alfred G. Gennert,
Edwin Cowles,
Sydney P. Clark,
John A. Burgwin,
Frank T. Hogg,
Walter H. Wheeler, jr.,

Junius S. Morgan,
Folke E. Sellman,
Walter P. Shiel,
Arthur M. Tschirgl,
Wayne F. Palmer,
George D. Howell, jr.,
Donald McClench,
Charles Higginson,
Clifford D. Smith,
Hamilton Vose, jr.,
Robert F. Herrick, jr.,
Joseph C. Storey,
Horton Brown,
William C. Bok,
John H. Wilcox,
Edward Lloyd, jr.,
Donald M. Ryerson,
Elmer J. Stoffel,
Horace Butler,
Selim E. Woodworth,
Benjamin W. Cloud, 2d,
John S. Lionberger,
Philip C. Kauffman,
Roy D. Keyes,
Richard H. Cobb,
Frank W. Morrell,
Franklin King,
Francis T. Hunter,
Conrad Chapman,
Harold S. Simmons,
George Taylor,
Robert W. Emmons, 3d,
William T. Kirk, 3d,
Arthur T. Leonard,
William H. May,
John L. Merrill,
John E. P. Morgan,
William V. Couchman, jr.,
Thomas N. Page,
William W. Grace,
George R. Hann,
Winslow H. French,
Andrew C. Little,
Irving R. Gale,
Hallowell V. Morgan,
Howard G. Cann,
Robert B. Noyes,
Thomas I. H. Powell,
Eugene R. Sturtevant,
Bryan Frere,
Henry Hale, jr.,
Thornton Emmons,
Chester J. La Roche,
Mallery K. Aiken,
Milton H. Bird,
Paul A. Hourigan,
John R. Litchfield,
Stanford Harmon,
John D. Schuler,
Carter B. Burnet,
Clarence W. Schmidt,
John T. Scully,
Arthur C. Smith,
William J. Curtis, jr.,
Howard P. Hart,
Hayden Crocker,
Frederick S. Connor,
Matthew P. Waller,
James L. Sprunt,
Robert R. Theobald,
Arthur C. Hoyt,
Marion W. Lee,
Ralph W. Preston,
Gould T. Miner,
James H. R. Cromwell,
William E. D. Stokes, jr.,
Robert D. Bartlett,
John S. Upton,
Charles H. Bowman,
George F. Talbot,
Herbert D. Glass,
Percival V. Harris,
Allan C. Brown,
Fleet W. Corwin,
Howard W. Kitchin,

Leland D. Webb, and
William Knox.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clyde C. Laws to be a lieutenant, for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry E. Rung to be a lieutenant, for temporary service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward J. Carr to be a lieutenant, for temporary service.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants, for temporary service:

Benjamin F. Strawbridge and

Roy M. Cottrell.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade), for temporary service:

Brady J. Dayton,

Philip J. Drake,

Putnam M. Morrison,

John A. Sweetser,

Frederick R. Bowes,

Raymond E. Baldwin,

Leicester S. Pettit,

John F. English,

Wilbert A. Smith,

Nelson B. Wolfe,

Thomas R. Parkhurst,

Herbert N. French,

Edward M. Shingler,

Paul R. Webb,

Jesse B. Perlman,

William H. Parsons, jr.,

John V. K. Richards,

Edgar R. Payson, jr.,

Harry L. M. Capron,

Louis S. Davidson,

Howell Evans,

Bainbridge D. Folwell,

Eben H. Ellison, jr.,

Francis D. Harrower,

Edwin B. Dunphy,

Ernest C. Haaren,

Alexander L. McKaig,

John H. Magee,

Laurence Schwab,

Douglas S. Moore,

John H. Russell,

Weyman S. Crocker,

Charles K. Wallace,

John I. Wyld,

Sumner F. Fuller,

Edward N. Crosman, jr.,

Lewis P. Scott,

Franklin Pettit, jr.,

Walter W. Burnham,

Henry M. Lamberton,

Lindsay Bradford,

Arthur E. Bartlett,

John G. Quinby, jr.,

William L. Kimball,

John B. Clapp,

Eliot L. Ward,

Francis S. Wilson,

Walter E. Chase, jr.,

Albert W. Findeisen,

Bradford Norman, jr.,

L. Selden Taylor,

Charles E. A. Speigel,

Morris Phinney,

Bennet F. Schauffer,

Gilman M. Gay,

George F. Newton, jr.,

Alden Lee,

Martin J. Quinn, jr.,

William L. G. Gibson,

Jacob S. Disston, jr.,

Henry C. Taylor,

Richard S. Walker,

Joseph Winlock,

James E. Kelly,

Arthur H. Haaren,

Harold J. Wright,

Campbell Higgins,

John S. Bauman,

Samuel M. Haslett, jr.,

Clarence H. Cull,

John B. Burnham,

Charles M. Boswell, jr.,

Johnston L. Redmond,

Francis Brooks,

Thomas L. Entwisle,

John L. Graham,

Marquis Pope,

Carl O. W. Sparkman,

John deK. Bowen,

Robert J. Orr,

William W. Baier,

Marcus A. Sutcliffe,

Anthony D. Bullock,

Franklin W. Hobbs, jr.,

Addison Stillwell,

Oliver B. Jennings,

Arthur D. Murray,

James M. Owens,

Foster M. Hampton,

Caspar S. Chisolm,

Leroy K. Howe,

Theodore C. Marceau, jr.,

Lester S. Moll,

Charles C. Savage, jr.,

Oliver P. Shattuck,

Louis M. Pratt, jr.,

John U. Lemmon, jr.

Arleigh D. Richardson,

Harry L. Butler,

John G. Rayley,

William Durfee, jr.,

Chester J. Mattson,

Cornelius Shields,

Olin McN. Richardson,

Richard V. Dolan,

John H. Minnis,

Frederick W. Johns,

George W. Burden,

William K. B. Urquhart,

Harold J. Kline,

Thaddeus C. Jones,

Richard Williams,

J. Otto Holcomb,

John G. Gross,

Philip L. Coddington,

Wilfred I. Stiles,

George E. Finlay,

Edward M. McIlvain,

Alden Kimball,

Edgar M. Jaeger,

Francis M. Smith,

Harold M. Wright,

Edwin E. Sheridan,

Kavanaugh C. Downey,

Carl J. Koehler,

J. Willis Gale,

Gordon W. Ayer,

Nelson L. Fortin,

John P. Holland,

Carroll E. Miller,

Brothwell H. Baker,

Frank H. Storms,

Cornelius A. Wood,

Kenneth C. Woodruff,

George W. Palmer, 3d,

Burmair A. Grimball,

Fred L. McNally,

Thomas D. Shepherd,

Clarence J. O'Neill,

Albert J. Porter,

Charles A. Winter,

Thomas T. Hassell,

Elbert M. Burnett,

Stanley H. Freihofer,

Talbert N. Daughtrey,

Russell A. Beck,

John W. Chapman,

Matthew F. Tracey,

Oliver A. Bowers,

Otis E. Bennett,

John J. Gaskin,

Chester N. White,

Thomas H. Murphy,

Leo E. Schlimme,

Bernard S. Rodey, jr.,

Thomas P. Kane,

Alfred J. Byrholdt,
Oliver H. Briggs,
Frederick G. Trummer,
Francis A. Knauss,
Carl J. Hallbert,
Albert T. Lang,
Christian Christensen,
Henry L. Bixbee,
Alexander C. Cornell,
William G. Gillis,
Fred G. Peterman,
Frank E. Norlin,
Leslie R. Heselton,
Lawrence J. Murphy,
George R. Woods,
Robert J. Vierthaler,
George H. Frederick,
Carl Hupp,
John L. Blomquist,
Edwin P. Lacey,
Charles A. Goebel,
John McKean,
Heinrich C. A. Deglau,
John O. Strickland,
Raymond J. Comstock,
Virgil F. Wright,
George F. Evanson,
Clarence C. McDow,
Ralph M. Gerth,
William S. Burns,
Charles A. Strumsky,
Joseph F. Caveney,
William H. Tracy,
John D. Morris,
Charles R. Kehler,
Elliott Kauth,
James E. Finn,
Arthur O. Kolstad,
Stonewall B. Stadtler,
Homer F. McGee,
Sydney W. Ford,
John Harrison, jr.,
Washington E. Bogardus,
William T. Brown,
Philip McK. Zenner,
Stephen E. Haddon,
Clarence E. Jackson,
Arthur V. Holmes,
Frederick Ellison,
James K. Smallwood,
Thomas J. Malarkey,
Frederick T. Mayes,
Edward J. Murnane,
Harold H. Ralph,
Matthew Woessner,
Albert Wood,
Kenneth H. Stetson,
Joseph Murtagh,
John E. Pedersen,
Lansford F. Kengle,
Stanley A. Jones,
Frank A. Brandecker,
Arthur Wrightson,
Joseph A. Clark,
Arthur A. Hewitt,
William A. Lynch,
Edward H. Smith,
Martin F. Comeau,
Robert B. McEwan, jr.,
Forest W. Allen,
Dwight W. Jennings,
Robert A. Haynie,
Watson K. Blair,
Francis H. Cabot,
Ralph Forween,
Harold K. Smoot,
Adolph Bloom,
Charles C. Roberts,
Charles L. Allen,
Guy A. Walker,
Nicholas Kedinger,
Percy C. Becker,
Stockard R. Hickey,
Alfred E. Stulb,

Walter Hinton,
George B. Kessack,
Oscar Erickson,
John J. Bayer,
Oscar F. Bandura,
Guy McLaughlin,
Russell G. McNaughton,
Eduard G. Jahnke,
Otto Beran,
David J. Spahr,
William E. McClendon,
Fred S. Wade,
John W. Collier,
Enos Dahuff,
Delos A. Humphrey,
William J. Sharkey,
George H. Carter,
Edward Reavely,
Niels Andersen,
Howard C. Heald,
Robert S. Dunn,
Lawrence E. Myers,
Robert S. Smith, jr.,
John E. Hatch,
Frederick Shea,
Clarence J. Gale,
Albert Nashman,
Charles E. Olson,
Robert Martin,
William S. Quesinberry,
James C. White,
Edward Reynolds, jr.,
Henry O. Rea,
Frederick W. Boldt,
Horace L. Ham,
George Berton,
Alexander B. Provost,
Harry A. Mewshaw,
Chris Halverson,
William G. Scott,
Harry Bennett,
Elmer J. Tugend,
Morey H. Downs,
John C. Mayhew,
Tom H. Williamson,
Hubert K. Stubbs,
Harold V. Andrews,
Clarence V. Waggonner,
Henry C. Flanagan,
Omer L. Brewington,
Cecil A. McKay,
Duncan W. Frick,
Nathan Young,
Stuart Parker,
Caleb Loring,
Ralph J. A. Stern,
William L. Hickey,
B. Thatcher Feustman,
Barnes Newberry,
Bruce Burns,
Charles H. Duell, jr.,
John R. Halre,
Donald M. Lovejoy,
Edgar M. Queeny,
Charles H. Sterrett,
Allen L. Welch,
Leroy H. Ripley,
Frank A. Saunders,
Warren P. Boardman,
Benjamin J. Shinn,
William J. Clarke,
Merton R. Hinkle,
Caspar Yeager,
Lon H. Robb,
William Y. Rorer,
Cedric O. Eaton,
Charles A. Oliver,
Fred C. Forster,
George E. Ernest,
Albert J. Fern,
Frank Leghorn,
Edward F. Manning,
William G. Spurlock,
Theodore A. Kelly,
William H. Fiddler, jr.,

Frederick J. Leonard,
 Alan M. Gray,
 Hale G. Knight,
 George L. Heyer,
 Charles A. Williams,
 Harold B. Collins,
 William C. Eberle,
 Henry John Behrends,
 William Henry Meyer,
 Will Frank Roseman,
 Joseph Alphonse Oellet,
 Howard E. Haynes,
 Gustav Adolf Curt Leutritz,
 Thomas Noland,
 Walter Adam Krueck,
 Leo John Sutton,
 John Benedict Manghan,
 Alexander Otto Schory,
 Jesse Gilbert McFarland,
 Simon Peter Swynenburg,
 Jolie Carwin Wilkins,
 John Reid,
 Charles Reading Shaw,
 James Charles Humphreys,
 John Joseph Coogan,
 Herbert Augustus Anderson,
 William G. Burgess,
 Arthur E. LeGros,
 William E. Bringham,
 Robert E. Dwyer,
 Leland C. Poole,
 Chester C. Rounds,
 Herbert J. Wiker,
 George W. Brown,
 John Cusick,
 Clarence E. Beach,
 Claudius G. Pendill,
 John M. O'Neill,
 John S. Danner,
 John P. Dix,
 Glenn F. Hulse,
 Robert E. Davenport,
 Ralph B. Raymond,
 Louis Verbrugge,
 Raymond Leo Morrissey,
 Walter Hansen,
 George W. Adams,
 Rudolf Winzer,
 Charles J. Ingersoll,
 Albert J. Courtney,
 Edward J. Birmingham,
 Frank A. Saar,
 Wiley B. Jones,
 Charles H. Phillips,
 Claude Farmer,
 Abraham M. Rosenberg,
 Harry B. Luessen,
 Eldridge L. Lineberry,
 Harry A. Wentworth,
 William F. Verleger,
 Walter E. Hewitt,
 Robert L. Bryan,
 Gottlieb Grosch,
 Walter M. McCarthy,
 Ralph J. Pyatt,
 Alfred E. Green,
 Rodney B. Starr,
 William Wakefield,
 Thomas H. Escott,
 Timothy Brown,
 John C. Bauman, jr.,
 Harley E. Barrows,
 Francis S. Page,
 Irving N. Eustis,
 Jay P. Clymer,
 Benjamin W. Taylor,
 Sidney B. Baisdell,
 Harry L. Dodson,
 Ray W. Bruner,
 Adolphe H. Wenzel,
 Oliver C. Field,
 Harry R. Pendarvis,
 Russel H. Lindsay,
 Duane L. Taylor,
 Joseph P. Maguire,

Roger F. McCall,
 Oscar E. Finlay,
 Clarence E. Kraehn,
 Richard C. Bartlett,
 Henry W. Piquet,
 William L. Phillips,
 Nathaniel Krasnoff,
 Louis Dreler,
 George S. Harris,
 Frederick J. Silvernail,
 Edward J. Johannessen,
 Harry J. Carey,
 James H. Alvis,
 Murray T. Wilkinson,
 Joel R. Conrad,
 Charles F. Hudson,
 Edwin V. Annatoyn,
 James D. Barner,
 Arthur L. Mundo,
 Walter L. Hunley,
 Leon W. Mills,
 Edward W. Neville,
 Fred E. Patrick,
 Philip D. Butler,
 John A. Westrom,
 Edward Danielson,
 Harry F. Breckel,
 Clyde L. Lewis,
 Joseph L. Norvell,
 Joseph A. Wetzel,
 Andrew Simmons,
 Arthur F. Dietrich,
 William J. Charles,
 John W. White,
 Duncan P. Houser,
 Edward A. Wardell,
 Francis H. Stone,
 Bartholomew J. Patterson,
 Malcolm F. Schoeffel,
 Thomas G. W. Settle,
 Lucien M. Grant,
 James E. J. Kiernan,
 Richard M. Rush,
 James R. Allen,
 Daniel W. Hand, jr.,
 Charles A. Nicholson, 2d,
 Paul W. Hains,
 Ralph A. Ofstie,
 Rex LeG. Hicks,
 Herbert M. Scull,
 Matthias B. Gardner,
 Leslie C. Stevens,
 Charles H. Cushman,
 Howard W. Fitch,
 Creighton C. Carmine,
 Robert F. Nelson,
 Antonio S. Pitre,
 Winfield A. Brooks,
 Thomas P. Wynkoop, jr.,
 Ernest E. Herrmann,
 James M. Johnston,
 Arthur S. Adams,
 William E. Hilbert,
 Hugh W. Olds,
 Albert T. Sprague, 3d,
 Maurice H. Stein,
 Hobart A. Sailor,
 William McC. Callaghan,
 Rodman D. de Kay,
 Harold L. Challenger,
 John J. Orr,
 Hubert H. Anderson,
 Joseph Buchalter,
 Thomas P. Jeter,
 Robert G. Waldron,
 Adolph O. Gieschmann,
 David H. Clark,
 Jeffrey C. Metzel,
 Festus F. Foster,
 Russell M. Ibrig,
 James J. Graham,
 Ralph B. Netting,
 Ralph H. Roberts,
 Valentine H. Schaeffer,
 Floyd S. Crosley,

Eugene L. Kell,
 Allen D. Brown,
 John W. Roper,
 William C. Vose,
 Harry B. Slocum,
 Charles E. Olsen,
 Robert P. Briscoe,
 Harry R. Thurber,
 James B. Sykes,
 Lyle N. Morgan,
 Clarence H. Schildhauer,
 Cuthbert A. Griffiths,
 Franz O. Willenbacher,
 Harry McC. Jones,
 Thomas J. Griffin,
 William H. Ferguson,
 Ernest H. Von Helmburg,
 Morton T. Seligman,
 Douglas A. Powell,
 William N. Updegraff,
 Stuart S. Murray,
 John O. Huse,
 Charles J. Palmer,
 William D. Sample,
 Arthur P. Thurston,
 Logan C. Ramsey,
 Scott G. Lamb,
 Alfred P. Moran, jr.,
 William E. Clayton,
 Richard B. Tuggle,
 Harry Goodstein,
 John H. Cassady,
 Julian B. Noble,
 Gerald L. Schetky,
 Donald C. King,
 Henry R. Herbst,
 Charles E. Coney,
 Dean D. Francis,
 Wade E. Griswold,
 William H. Mays,
 Clayton Demarest, jr.,
 Elmer R. Hill,
 Henry D. Baggett,
 William L. Marsh,
 Bayard H. Colyear,
 Charles L. Andrews, jr.,
 Ralph W. Hungerford,
 Charles B. Hunt,
 George McF. O'Rear,
 Herschel P. Cook,
 John W. Cullens,
 James D. Lowry, jr.,
 Albert P. Burleigh,
 Eric M. Grimsley,
 Charles K. Post,
 John B. Griggs, jr.,
 Eliot H. Bryant,
 George C. Dyer,
 Alonzo B. Alexander,
 Walter D. Whitehead,
 David S. Crawford,
 Charles J. Rend,
 Everett D. Kern,
 Ten Eyck DeW. Veeder, jr.,
 Robert L. Boller,
 Albert R. Staudt,
 Henry C. Fengar,
 Chauncey Camp,
 John Neal,
 Gordon H. Mason,
 Dorrance K. Day,
 Paul F. Lee,
 Marshall R. Geer,
 Philip P. Welch,
 George J. Downey,
 Walter S. Barlow,
 Joseph R. Lannon,
 Louis B. Pelzman,
 Harry A. Rochester,
 Edwin Friedman,
 George Kirkland,
 James J. Hughes,
 Carl K. Fink,
 John J. Patterson, 3d,
 Walter Ansel,

Wilfred C. Wilcock,
 Adrian O. Rule, jr.,
 Miles P. Duval, jr.,
 Walther G. Maser,
 Elmer R. Rungquist,
 Walton R. Read,
 Daniel M. McGurl,
 William E. Tarbutton,
 Homer I. Sherritt,
 Philip V. Sullivan,
 Stephen K. Hall,
 Robert McL. Smith, jr.,
 Robert B. Crichton,
 Paul H. Talbot,
 Russell S. Barrett,
 James L. Holloway, jr.,
 Gustave H. Bowman,
 James L. Wisenbaker,
 Ralph E. Jennings,
 Frank N. Sayre,
 Peyton S. Cochran,
 Paul B. Thompson,
 Fred W. Beltz,
 John B. McDonnald, jr.,
 Kenneth D. Muir,
 Tracy M. Kegley,
 John G. Crawford,
 Paul D. Dingwell,
 James G. Atkins,
 Frank V. Aler, jr.,
 Leonard C. Parker,
 Cyril K. Wildman,
 Francis H. Gilmer,
 Earle H. Kincaid,
 Carleton McGaully,
 George W. Brashears, jr.,
 Charles R. Smith,
 Giles E. Short,
 Van Rensselaar Moore,
 Thomas B. Fitzpatrick,
 Dixie Kiefer,
 Horace B. Whittaker,
 Willis W. Pace,
 Harold M. Martin,
 Joseph S. Ives,
 Edgar R. Winckler,
 John L. Reynolds,
 William J. Strachan,
 John R. Redman,
 Ross A. Dierdorff,
 George F. Mentz,
 Herbert S. Woodman,
 George H. Mills,
 Charles Allen,
 Jack C. Richardson,
 Robert M. Dorsey,
 Desmond J. Sinnott,
 John C. Williams,
 Spencer H. Warner,
 John S. Spaven,
 Grayson B. Carter,
 Riffel G. Rhoton,
 Willment P. Martin,
 Franklin P. Waller,
 Charles H. Rocky, and
 Gordon M. Jackson.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade),
 for temporary service:

Irving A. Chapman,
 Edward P. Street,
 David D. Smead, jr.,
 Raymond H. Finlay,
 Amory Coolidge,
 Cortland F. Ames, jr.,
 Wayland H. Sanford,
 Albert V. Hall,
 Henry R. Guild,
 Louis C. Seavernes,
 Edward Kneass,
 Francis B. Thorne,
 Benjamin F. McGuckin,
 George C. Cutler, jr.,
 Richard T. Guilbert,
 Leslie A. Wiggins,
 Harry A. Thornton,

Atherton K. Dunbar,
 Warren D. Arnold,
 Arthur B. Homer,
 John C. Hurd,
 Clifton B. Herd,
 Innis O'Rourke,
 Rufus D. W. Ewing,
 Ayres Boal,
 Donald S. Sexton,
 Heroy M. Dyckman,
 Clement M. Gile,
 Harold W. Brooks,
 James B. Bergs,
 Ellis W. Taylor,
 Martin L. Dunn,
 James W. Ryan,
 George Gregory, jr.,
 Earle S. Barker,
 Edwin K. Hoover,
 Walter Antrim,
 Laurence C. Murdoch,
 John N. Leonard,
 Henry G. Anderson,
 Edwin Nelson,
 Arthur E. Childs,
 Dietrich G. Schmitz,
 Thomas C. Parsons,
 James M. Connally,
 Edmund Ocumpaugh, 3d,
 Lawrence Oliphant,
 Arthur McL. Bartley,
 William O. Kenney,
 Thomas Buel,
 John F. A. Davis,
 Elliott De Bevoise,
 John E. Sayler,
 John R. Marsh,
 Traver Briscoe,
 Gorham Hubbard, jr.,
 Harold E. Barden,
 Edgar Denton, jr.,
 Whitley P. McCoy,
 Ransom Henshaw,
 Donald Scott,
 James H. Waller,
 Percival W. Buzby,
 Thomas C. Nicholls, jr.,
 Roderick T. Smith,
 Philler Lee,
 Hobart M. Birmingham,
 Richard E. Wheeler,
 Robert N. Hoeflich,
 Frederick H. Bosbyshell,
 Theodore C. Briggs,
 Arthur T. Lyman,
 Earle H. Parkins,
 Alfred V. Janotta,
 Edwin D. King,
 Edward G. Shmidheiser,
 Leroy H. Davidson,
 Henry E. Coe, jr.,
 Norman D. Weir,
 Vernon C. Bixby,
 Howard W. Kitchell,
 Vallette S. Church,
 Joseph M. Shoemaker,
 Chandler Bennitt,
 Robert R. Gleason,
 William M. Akin,
 Julian P. Burlingham,
 Thomas W. Allen,
 Henry Hilton-Green,
 David H. Frantz,
 John Garey,
 Leonard Jacob,
 Frank M. Orton,
 Alexander Loewy,
 Newton C. Elkin, and
 Kenneth C. Kennedy.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns, for temporary service:

Arthur F. Peterson,
 Lewis F. Kepple,
 John A. Manfrin,
 George O. Augustine,

Samuel M. Thompson,
 Edward L. Garnett,
 Philip L. Reid,
 Arthur E. Maginniss,
 Joseph Mather,
 Otto Gmelich,
 William R. Schimmeyer,
 Marshall Anderson,
 Denis J. Kiely,
 Mortimer Laurence,
 Elmer T. Marr,
 Charles E. Reynolds,
 John H. Kevers,
 James N. McTwiggan,
 Herman A. Berch,
 Wade Lash,
 Frederick W. Ickes, and
 Ira D. Spoonmoore.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders from the 1st day of July, 1918:

William K. Riddle and
 John G. Church.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:

Eric L. Barr,
 William M. Quigley,
 Alfred E. Montgomery,
 Allen H. Guthrie,
 Ralph S. Wentworth,
 Edmund A. Crenshaw,
 Robert S. Haggart,
 Forrest U. Lake,
 Nathan B. Chase,
 Earl R. Morrissey,
 Harold H. Little,
 Horatio J. Pierce, and
 Abraham C. TenEyck.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Archie E. Glann,
 Myron J. Walker,
 Stephen H. Matteson,
 Burton W. Chippendale,
 Cornelius W. Flynn,
 Robert W. Clark,
 Winthrop Winslow,
 De Witt C. Watson,
 Ralph W. Christie, and
 William D. Thomas.

Gunner Clarence L. Tibbals to be a chief gunner.
 Machinist Ernest A. Healy to be a chief machinist.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Sam T. Moss, Warrior.
 William H. Welch, Wadley.
 Hubert H. Hughston, Tusculumbia.
 Clement T. Fitzpatrick, Montgomery.

ARKANSAS.

Everett A. Matthews, Ola.
 John F. Hunt, Mammoth Springs.
 William E. Floyd, Little Rock.
 Charles B. Gregg, Jonesboro.
 John A. Bridgford, Eureka Springs.
 William L. Newton, Camden.

CALIFORNIA.

Anne M. Bearhope, Oceanside.
 John L. Steward, Monterey.
 Henry R. Gewe, Los Alamos.
 Charles Brainerd, Loomis.
 Charles W. Collins, El Centro.

GEORGIA.

Pleasant N. Little, Madison.

ILLINOIS.

Matthew N. Price, Zion.
 Perley B. Colwell, Wyoming.
 Glenn P. Wyatt, Wyand.
 Grover C. Gregory, Willisville.
 William V. Lambe, Wheaton.
 Mumford L. Briscoe, Westfield.
 Robin Etter, Waverly.
 George W. Cress, Washington.
 Fred A. Ehringer, Washburn.
 Charles S. Murphy, Warren.
 Charles M. Webber, Urbana.

Charles B. Taylor, Tuscola.
 Otto Bacmesiter, Toulon.
 Herbert I. Baldwin, Tonica.
 Randall A. Thompson, Thompsonville.
 Herman Richarz, Techny.
 Thomas J. Ronin, Sycamore.
 James O. McDowell, Sumner.
 Joseph P. Lawrence, Steger.
 George H. Luker, Staunton.
 Robert C. Probasco, Sparta.
 Jennie McNulty, South Wilmington.
 Clement L. Butler, Sheldon.
 Charles E. Wescott, Sheffield.
 George Hanlon, Shawneetown.
 Edwin R. Smith, Saunemin.
 Adam A. Funk, St. Joseph.
 Lucian D. Lyons, St. David.
 Asa B. Fagan, St. Charles.
 Howard F. Dyson, Rushville.
 Joseph R. Hudelson, Royalton.
 Leo J. Byrne, Rossville.
 Harry P. Simpson, Rock Island.
 William P. Stevens, Richmond.
 William P. Purviance, Pleasant Plains.
 Henry Stahle, Plano.
 Henry J. Richardson, Pecatonica.
 Robert T. Ross, Palmyra.
 James J. Dougherty, Ottawa.
 Charles S. Barker, Oswego.
 Torrence B. McGovern, Oneida.
 Barney A. Iaun, Olney.
 William H. Evans, O'Fallon.
 Franklin S. Lyman, Oak Forest.
 Solomon E. Avey, Mount Morris.
 William H. Ryan, Minonk.
 David McFadden, Milford.
 Charles A. Brandenburg, Milan.
 Carl Montag, Mascoutah.
 Robert D. Bolen, Maroa.
 Joseph O. Smith, Manteno.
 Ferdinand A. McGowan, Manhattan.
 James E. Conlin, Lstant.
 Charles W. Shade, Lexington.
 John B. Henry, Lewistown.
 William B. Hogan, Lanark.
 John W. Payne, Lamoille.
 Fred H. Stevens, La Grange.
 William C. Stewart, Kirkland.
 Fred O. Grissom, Kinmundy.
 Otis E. Boyer, Kansas.
 Sylvester J. Jackson, Kankakee.
 Joel E. Cory, Jerseyville.
 Ralph I. Dunlap, Jacksonville.
 Fred C. Smith, Ipava.
 Daniel W. Touhey, Hume.
 William Finley, Hoopeston.
 John L. Schmidt, Hinckley.
 Mary B. Boyd, Heyworth.
 Milton M. Sharp, Greenville.
 Fred B. Bock, Girard.
 Bernard J. Reilly, Gilman.
 David M. Flynn, Geneva.
 William H. J. Hoeft, Geneseo.
 Ernest L. Benson, Galva.
 William Whalen, Franklin.
 Benjamin F. Wineland, Flora.
 Charles D. Rock, Farmer City.
 Gustav L. Burmeister, Elmhurst.
 Lewis T. Rash, Elizabethtown.
 Charles G. McClary, Edinburg.
 Edgar H. Little, East St. Louis.
 Foy O. Lovins, East Moline.
 Leonard P. Cooper, East Alton.
 Anson I. Graves, Dwight.
 Martin B. Dolan, Durand.
 Marlon C. Cook, Duquoin.
 Louis J. Dyroff, Dupu.
 Myrtle E. Smith, Depue.
 James N. Hall, Delavan.
 Arthur F. Hiland, De Kalb.
 Fred H. Henckler, Columbia.
 John Jakle, Cissna Park.
 Charles C. Wescott, Chillicothe.
 William H. Stolte, Chicago Heights.
 John A. O'Neil, Chatsworth.

Charles J. Mullikin, Champaign.
 Elby Ozment, Carriers Mills.
 Walter C. Shoupe, Carlyle.
 Bernard McManus, jr., Cairo.
 John A. Lentz, Blue Island.
 Michael M. Morrissey, Bloomington.
 Edmond P. Hectorne, Avon.
 Frank W. Meisenheimer, Ava.
 Louis A. Stoll, Aurora.
 Alphus O. Haines, Atlanta.
 John F. Atkinson, Astoria.
 Joseph A. Roesler, Ashton.
 John McCann, Arcola.
 Frank B. Huber, Antioch.
 John P. Harvey, Amboy.
 Henrietta A. Rehwald, Altamont.
 Charles E. Duvall, Aledo.
 Frank Howey, Albion.

KENTUCKY.

John J. Hagan, Corbin.
 Stephen A. D. Thompson, Owingsville.
 John R. Paxton, Lawrenceburg.
 Golder Johnson, Hickman.

MAINE.

David N. Cheney, South Berwick.
 Fred E. Grant, Cherryfield.
 Alphonso F. Russell, jr., Canton.

MISSISSIPPI.

Essie F. McCormick, Yazoo City.

NEVADA.

Florence S. Doherty, Goodsprings.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Adelbert O. Jones, Dixville Notch.

NEW JERSEY.

Karl A. Anderson, Yardville.
 Isaiah C. Shinn, Woodstown.
 Leo M. Danerhirsh, Woodbine.
 Howard J. Tombleson, Williamstown.
 George N. Smith, Wildwood.
 John P. Walsh, Whippany.
 James Walters, Wharton.
 William F. Bodecker, Tenafly.
 Robert J. Quince, Sussex.
 Charles W. Simonson, Spring Lake Beach.
 John J. O'Hanlon, South Orange.
 Edward J. Tidaback, Short Hills.
 Frank C. Tomlin, Sewell.
 Thomas F. Dolan, Sayreville.
 James H. Mahaney, Roebling.
 Henry Walter, Riverside.
 Frank Pittenger, Red Bank.
 William Slattery, Raritan.
 Henry Bell, Ramsey.
 George L. Kirchgassner, Rahway.
 T. Harry Obert, Pleasantville.
 Clarence D. Garis, Phillipsburg.
 James J. Cowley, Passaic.
 William H. Cook, Palmyra.
 John J. Roche, Palisades Park.
 Edward W. Sharps, Oxford.
 George F. Moore, Oradell.
 Benjamin F. Smith, Ocean City.
 Eugene S. Burke, Morristown.
 Martin A. Madden, Morris Plains.
 Carlton J. Garwood, Medford.
 Anton J. Mikolajczak, Maurer.
 Patrick J. Devlin, Matawan.
 Walter D. Finch, Mahwah.
 Thomas L. Slocum, Long Branch.
 Albert C. Derby, Little Falls.
 Sadie M. Wood, Linden.
 Andrew F. Stout, Lawrenceville.
 James A. Cleary, Lambertville.
 Arthur J. Halladay, Kenilworth.
 Benjamin F. Apgar, Hampton.
 George H. Abel, Haddon Heights.
 Lewis E. Matteson, Grantwood.
 Thomas J. Foley, Gloucester City.
 Watson Rinehart, Glen Gardner.
 Daniel J. Murphy, Fort Hancock.
 Charles H. Hitchner, Elmer.
 Emery Benoit, Edgewater.

William Griffin, Cresskill.
 John F. Peniston, Cranford.
 Reuben Coyte, Coytesville.
 Arthur M. Cowie, Cedargrove.
 Valentine Gleckner, Carteret.
 Edward C. Wheaton, Cape May Courthouse.
 Joseph P. Cullen, Boonton.
 Cyrus B. Honce, Belmar.
 William B. Loudenslager, Atlantic City.
 Robert Bright, Anglesea.
 John W. Winter, Allendale.

NEW YORK.

Joseph J. O'Reilly, Willsboro.
 Albert C. Salisbury, Waterville.
 C. Gordon Simmons, Vernon.
 Edward J. Madden, Upper Saranac.
 Edward F. Dougherty, Tonawanda.
 William A. Cochran, Southold.
 Anna E. Joyce, Roslyn Heights.
 Albert R. Kessinger, Rome.
 Horatio S. Ransom, Ransomville.
 Besse R. Griffin, Quogue.
 Matthew T. Hutchinson, Port Washington.
 Andrew G. Senecal, Plattsburgh.
 Carroll F. Simpson, Phoenicia.
 George H. Steele, Oriskany.
 W. Cooke Oille, North Tonawanda.
 Thomas F. Connolly, Norfolk.
 Stephen Van Tassel, Mount Vernon.
 James A. McDonald, Mamaroneck.
 George D. Hughes, Madrid.
 Bessie Sullivan, Lisbon.
 Wilbur C. Box, Linbrook.
 Joseph E. Downs, Islip.
 John D. Crosby, Inwood.
 Joseph L. Durney, Huntington Station.
 Mark L. Mount, Hewlett.
 Francis J. Mulgannon, Hempstead.
 Herbert W. Rackett, Greenport.
 George H. Martens, Fort Totten.
 Charles E. Dempsey, Fort Covington.
 Abram Lang, Eden.
 Arthur E. Hammond, East Aurora.
 Owen J. Burns, Clinton.
 Frank T. Kelly, Central Islip.
 Nicholas Reilly, Brentwood.
 Patrick A. Hallahan, Brasher Falls.
 Irving Barrett, Bedford Hills.
 Edward J. Woods, Bayport.
 Robert E. L. Reynolds, Amsterdam.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Sarah A. Lunceford, Smithfield.
 Robert N. Cook, Graham.
 Benjamin B. Arrington, Beaufort.
 Samuel A. Branch, Apex.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Anna Carmody, Hillsboro.
 Mary A. Leavy, Granville.
 Reuben H. Leavitt, Carson.

OHIO.

Della Boone, Spencer.

OKLAHOMA.

Daniel R. Wright, Taloga.
 George H. Blackwood, Hominy.
 Thomas P. Stone, Custer.
 George W. Barefoot, Chickasha.

OREGON.

Charles W. Holloman, Haines.
 Henry D. Reed, Gold Hill.
 Mamie E. Gould, Burns.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George S. Dickson, Valencia.
 Glenmar G. Gaston, Tionesta.
 John H. Rifeuberick, Spartansburg.
 Edward W. Workley, Smethport.
 Thomas O. Humphrey, Sharon Hill.
 Harvey Ziegler, Red Lion.
 Frederick P. D. Hazell, Norwood Station.

John A. Rick, Girard.
 Bernard Doherty, Clifton Heights.
 William V. Wirtz, Albion.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Virginia Gantt, Wagener.
 Theron L. Gregory, Kershaw.
 Thomas M. Douglas, Chester.

TENNESSEE.

Lewis N. Lumpkins, Lawrenceburg.

TEXAS.

William T. McDonald, jr., Wylie.
 William B. Smith, Shamrock.
 William A. Garner, Runge.
 Herman P. Talley, Rockdale.
 Walter L. Crofford, Quitman.
 Edward H. Daniel, Port Neches.
 Grace R. Rubert, Port Lavaca.
 Walter L. Francis, Kosse.
 Joe F. Coffey, Eddy.
 William G. Hardin, Brownfield.

UTAH.

Stephen W. Stoker, Milford.

WASHINGTON.

Alberta Gilson, Valley.
 Mary A. Illy, Uniontown.
 Jessie Knight, Shelton.
 Albert Meade, Pe Ell.
 Arthur Bailey, Monroe.

WISCONSIN.

Kathryn Meisner, Wittenberg.
 Paul C. Dierschke, North Freedom.
 Louie B. Halsey, Brandon.
 Carroll R. Eaton, Adams.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, October 24, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who canst right all wrongs, soothe all sorrows, and bring Thy children in harmony with Thy will, exercise, we beseech Thee, Thy holy influence upon us and guide us to clear conceptions of right, justice, and liberty, that we may protect the weak, uplift the downfallen, and further Thy purposes; that hunger, starvation, disease, and all the evils which doth beset us shall be removed. Strengthen our armies on land, sea, and sky, that a righteous peace may be established and bring all hearts under Thy sway; and we will praise and magnify Thy holy name, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 21, 1918, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved bills and a joint resolution, as follows:

On October 16, 1918:

H. R. 12402. An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes.

On October 17, 1918:

H. R. 12982. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to purchase from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a large dry dock and appurtenant lands.

On October 19, 1918:

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces.

On October 22, 1918:

H. R. 10609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building site at Eatonton, Ga., for another site on the public square in said city.

On October 23, 1918:

S. 3470. An act to amend section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States.