By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of citizens of Richmond Hill, N. Y., opposed to the tax on ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Wyandot Club, of the city of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt a resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition requesting United States Government to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1653 (Carpenters), of Cambridge, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of employees of the Hood Rubber Co., of the State of Massachusetts, against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition signed by 96 citizens of Trenton, N. J., protesting against and urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by 84 citizens of Bound Brook, N. J., protesting against and urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Hoboken, N. J., urging the adoption by the Congress of the United States of a resolution providing for the recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Jersey City, N. J., urging the adoption by the Congress of the United States of a resolution providing for the recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Alliance of America, Lodge No. 302, of the city of Trenton, N. J., requesting the United States Government to compel Poland to withdraw her army from the Lithuanian territories and that the United States Government recognize the present Lithuanian government and render it moral and material assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: Petitions of sundry citizens of Alpha and Iron River, Mich., for the repeal of the tax on candy, soda water, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Capt. J. W. Pinder to be given commission in United States Army on retired list without pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of officers of Tenth and One hundred and tenth Pennsylvania Regiments, protesting against use of name and insignia of Twenty-eighth Division in Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of 26 citizens of Amherst, Nebr., asking for the repeal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of numerous citizens of Exeter and Fairmont, Fillmore County, Nebr., urging the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition of sundry citizens of Columbia, Boone County, Mo., asking for repeal of tax on sodas, ice cream, and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Wyandot Club, of the city of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt a resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of 56 residents of Medina, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Idaho State Grange, favoring the enactment of the soldiers' land-settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Nampa, Idaho, urging the removal of the tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of city council of Boise, Idaho, authorizing investigation regarding price reduction of gasoline, oil, and related products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Civil War Veterans, of Wilmington, N. Y., for an increase in the present pension rates granted Civil War veterans and their wives to $50 per month and $30 per month, respectively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the former officers of the One hundred and tenth Infantry and Tenth Pennsylvania Infantry, held June 30, 1919, protesting against the use of the name "Twenty-eighth Division" and the insignia thereof, the red keystone, by any Regular Army unit; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAILE: Petition of Colorado Potato Shippers' Association, protesting against discontinuance of the Denver market news service, urging the continuance of the food products inspection service, and protesting against reduction of funds available for the preservation of fruits and perishables in transit; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of sundry citizens of North Carolina, for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *July 17, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, the uncreated, self-existing God, the source of wisdom and of power, we come to Thee making our humble supplication that we may be fitted for the duties of life. As we face the tremendous problems resting upon us we feel to pray with Thy servant of the ancient day, "if Thy spirit go not with us send us not up hence." Send us forth in the discharge of our duties with Thy spirit guiding us, that we shall meet them as men and accomplish the divine purpose and will in us. Bless us to-day, we pray Thee. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT OF DIRECTOR OF STORAGE (S. DOC. NO. 54).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, a report of photographic equipment under the control of the Director of Storage, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the President of the United States having returned to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, the bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, with his objections thereto, the House proceeded, in pursuance of the Constitution, to reconsider the same, and resolved that the bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Tao Hung Chang and Zeng Tze Wong, citizens of China.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, petitioning Congress to confer the right of statehood upon the Territory. The resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

The resolutions are as follows:

THE TENTH LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
THE SENATE,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 5, petitioning the Congress to confer upon the Territory of Hawaii the right of statehood, which was adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

I have the honor to be
Very respectfully,

O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have ever shown themselves thoroughly capable of self-government both before and since the present Territorial government was established; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have proven their loyalty and devotion to the Federal Government ever since the establishment of said Territorial government; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have further proven their loyalty and patriotism by meeting every request and demand made upon them by the Federal Government during the war just ended; and

Whereas the Hon. JONAH K. KALANIANAOLE, Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, has introduced a bill conferring statehood upon Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of said Territory of Hawaii, as a whole, strongly favor the granting of staethood to Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress be, and it is hereby, petitioned and requested to pass said bill and confer upon the Territory of Hawaii the right of statehood; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Hon. JONAH K. KALANIANAOLE, Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 7, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 7, A. D. 1919.

CHAS. F. CHILLINGWORTH,
President of the Senate.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 25, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on March 25, A. D. 1919.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the governor of Hawaii to appoint a commission for the purpose of assisting the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii. The resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

The resolutions are as follows:

THE TENTH LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
THE SENATE,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 36, authorizing the governor of Hawaii to appoint a commission for the purpose of assisting the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, which was adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully,

O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution.

Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the governor be, and he hereby is, authorized and requested to appoint a commission consisting of two members of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii and two members of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii, to be known as the "Legislative Commission of the Territory of Hawaii," for the purpose of assisting the Delegate to Congress by their presence in Washington in the presentation of any and all measures amendatory of any and all laws of the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That if in the opinion of the governor the presence in Washington of the land commissioner and/or the attorney general shall be necessary, the governor be, and he is hereby, authorized to direct the said land commissioner and/or attorney general to accompany the said commission to Washington for the purpose herein indicated; and be it further

Resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, We recommend to the governor that the expenses of such commission and of the land commissioner and/or the attorney general while absent from the Territory of Hawaii be paid from the governor's contingent fund; and be it further

Resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That copies of this resolution, duly certified to by the president of the senate and by the speaker of the house of representatives, be transmitted to the governor of Hawaii, to the Delegate to Congress, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington, and to the President of the Senate.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was finally adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, A. D. 1919.

CHAS. F. CHILLINGWORTH,
President of the Senate.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 30, A. D. 1919.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, petitioning Congress to enact legislation requiring residence of not less than one year in the Territory to establish eligibility for Federal appointment within the Territory. The resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

The resolutions are as follows:

THE TENTH LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
THE SENATE,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 30, 1919.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 8, requesting the Delegate from Hawaii to secure the enactment of a measure by the Congress requiring residence of not less than one year in the Territory of Hawaii in order to be eligible to Federal appointments within the Territory, which was adopted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

I have the honor to be,
Very respectfully,

O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas the Republican and Democratic Parties in their last national convention inserted a provision in their platforms favoring the appointment of residents of Territories to Federal appointive positions within the Territories; and

Whereas the Republican and Democratic Parties in the Territory of Hawaii have gone on record as favoring such a provision; and

Whereas the enforcement of such a provision would be in keeping with the principle of home rule and of democracy, which are the very foundations of the American doctrine of government: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Delegate in Congress from the Territory of Hawaii be requested and urged to secure the enactment of a measure by the Congress requiring residence of not less than one year in the Territory of Hawaii in order to be eligible to Federal appointments within the Territory; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 4, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii on March 4, A. D. 1919.

CHAS. F. CHILLINGWORTH,
President of the Senate.
O. P. SOARES,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 1, 1919.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii on April 1, A. D. 1919.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Union of Kansas City, Kans., favoring the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Ogoyago Tribe, No. 91, Improved Order of Red Men, of Ottawa, Kans., praying that all American Indians be given the full rights of American citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Scott City, Kans., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the mayor and the board of aldermen of the city of Lewiston, Me., praying for the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Burnham, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior to reclaim arid and swamp lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Equal Suffrage League of Brunswick, Me., praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the attitude of the United States Shipping Board toward the port of Boston. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1919.

Resolutions protesting against the attitude of the United States Shipping Board toward the port of Boston.

Whereas the port of Boston is the business center of the woolen, worsted, cotton, boot and shoe industries of America, with unsurpassed harbor and terminal facilities, and the advantage of being nearer foreign markets than other American ports; and

Whereas the United States Shipping Board is allocating a greater number of vessels and a larger amount of tonnage to ports less favored than the port of Boston: Be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby protest that the present policy of the United States Shipping Board is unwarranted and unfair in its failure to recognize the importance of the New England industries and the opportunity offered in the use of Boston Harbor for aiding in the development of foreign commerce at this critical time and in extending the use of American manufactures in foreign countries;

Resolved, That immediate steps should be taken by the United States Shipping Board to revise its policy so that a sufficient number of ships may be made available immediately for the development of the port of Boston; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the United States Shipping Board, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives adopted July 2, 1919.

In senate adopted in concurrence July 7, 1919.

A true copy.

Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of Local Union No. 4, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, Helpers, and Oilers, of Holyoke, Mass., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens held in Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., favoring the separation of the league of nations covenant from the treaty of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 345, Patrons of Husbandry, of South Carver, Mass., and a petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN (for Mr. KENDRICK) presented a petition of sundry members of the faculty of the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FERNALD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vallejo, Calif., praying for a reduction in rentals charged the employees of the Mare Island Navy Yard, located near that city, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented memorials of 600 employees of the B. F. Sturtevant Co., of Hyde Park; of sundry employees of K. J. Quinn & Co. (Inc.), of Boston; of Gardiner, Beardsell & Co.; of the Mason Brush Works, of Worcester; of the United States Bobbin & Shuttle Co., of Lawrence; of the A. N. F. Shoe Co., of Newburyport; of the J. H. Baker Co., of Beverly; of R. Burleigh Bartels, of Boston; of the Boston Pipe & Fittings Co.; of the Armour Leather Co., of Boston; of the Bristol Patent Leather Co.; of the Gurney Heater Manufacturing Co., of Framingham; of the Boston Blacking Co.; of the Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation, of Holyoke; of Walworth Bros. (Inc.), of Lawrence; of the Shaw Furniture Co., of Cambridge; of E. Frank Lewis, of Lawrence; of Bates Bros. Co., of Athol; of the Boston Duck Co.; of the Franklin Paper Co.; of the MacGregor Instrument Co., of Needham; of the C. H. Hayes Corporation, of Haverhill; of the Wright Manufacturing Co., of Lawrence; of the National Fireproofing Co.; of the Lovell & Covel Co., of Boston; of the A. E. Little Co., of Lynn; of the Tyer Rubber Co., of Andover; of the H. P. Cummings Construction Co.; of the James Hunter Machine Co., of Boston; of the Dedham Mills; of the Kieth Car & Manufacturing Co., of Sagamore; of the Page-Storms Drop Forge Co., of Chicopee; of the Potter Drug & Chemical Corporation, of Malden; of the American Sugar Refining Co., of Boston; of M. W. Carr & Co., of West Somerville; of the Star Worsted Co., of Fitchburg; of the E. B. Badger & Sons Co.; of the Norfolk Woolen Co., of Franklin; of the E. H. Friedrich Co., of Holyoke; of the Barron Anderson Co., of Boston; of the Crane Co., of Boston; and of the Hudson Worsted Co., of Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cranston, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Westerly, R. I., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior to reclaim arid and swamp lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Kans., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Ogoyago Tribe, No. 91, Improved Order of Red Men, of Ottawa, Kans., praying for the granting to all American Indians the full rights of American citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, soda, soft drinks, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks at a convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the abolishment of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of the Southwestern Interstate Coal Operators' Association, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Norden Lodge, No. 37, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enforcement of prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Bakers' Local Union No. 155, of Waterbury, Conn., and a petition of the Central Labor Union of Hartford, Conn., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry employees of the American Thread Co., of Willimantic, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Charles Galgano, of Torrington, Conn., praying for the control of the Adriatic coast by Italy and the annexation of Fiume to Italy, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of district No. 5 of the California State Nurses' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation conferring rank for nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 567, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the repeal of war-time prohibition, so as to permit the manufacture of beer of 2¾ per cent alcohol, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ALLEGED UNLAWFUL PRACTICES OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 121, submitted by Mr. CURTIS on the 15th instant, directing the Judiciary Committee to investigate charges of illegal practices by certain Federal officials in the State of Kansas, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 99, submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] on the 27th ultimo, I report it back favorably with amendments, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, before the words "rate of," to strike out "$1,800" and insert "$1,500," and in line 5, after the word "Senate," to strike out "until otherwise provided by law" and insert "during the Sixty-sixth Congress," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,500 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate during the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EMMA V. KENNEY.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 118, submitted by him on the 14th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

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 Emma V. Kenney, widow of Beverly W. Kenney, late a laborer in the employ 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.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2498) for the relief of Henry von Hess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2499) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Tarpon Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2500) granting an increase of pension to John W. Sharrock; and

A bill (S. 2501) granting a pension to Edward D. Lockwood, alias George E. McDaniel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2502) to amend an act of Congress approved March 12, 1914, authorizing the President of the United States to construct and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

A bill (S. 2503) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Roberts (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2504) granting a pension to Curtis Harlin Lewis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2505) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Long Prairie, Minn., a captured German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2506) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard Station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCE:

A bill (S. 2507) to establish an executive department to be known as the Department of Public Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 2508) to appropriate $5,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen in the drought-stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 2509) to fix the annual salary of the collector of customs for the district of North Carolina; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2510) for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 2511) granting a pension to Ethel Kingsbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2512) granting a pension to Mary C. B. Shultz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Strickler;

A bill (S. 2514) granting a pension to Gertrude B. Swain;

A bill (S. 2515) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hambrook;

A bill (S. 2516) granting a pension to Mary E. Stitt;

A bill (S. 2517) granting a pension to Ernest Court;

A bill (S. 2518) granting a pension to Catharine A. Atkinson;

A bill (S. 2519) granting a pension to John W. Avis;

A bill (S. 2520) granting a pension to Sarah A. Steele;

A bill (S. 2521) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Tyler; and

A bill (S. 2522) granting a pension to Herman T. Ammon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 2523) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate radio communication," approved August 13, 1912; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING (by request):

A bill (S. 2524) to prohibit the transmission through the mails of matter printed, written, or multigraphed in any foreign language under certain conditions and circumstances; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2525) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 2526) granting a pension to George Beals; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to employees of the United States Department of Agriculture who died in the war with Germany; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. I will state that it is merely for information which is required from the Interior Department as to reclamation projects which have already been completed and those that are under way.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish to the United States Senate full and complete information in regard to the various reclamation and irrigation projects and systems, other than those on Indian lands, under his jurisdiction and being constructed by the United States Reclamation Service; said report to contain full information as to the size of each project, the number of acres susceptible to irrigation, the number of acres under each project, the cost of construction to date, the cost of maintenance to date, the cost to complete, the estimated value per acre when complete, the number of acres under each project actually under cultivation, the number of acres farmed by owners, the number of acres farmed by tenants, the funds out of which the project is being constructed, and the amount reimbursed to such funds to date.

REV. E. M. MALLORY AND REV. E. BELL.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I submit a resolution which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to furnish to the Senate the records in the cases, and all papers in his possession connected with the cases of Rev. E. M. Mallory, charged with harboring criminals, and Rev. E. Bell, charged with involuntary homicide, they being citizens of the United States and residents at the time in Korea.

WORLD COTTON CONFERENCE, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919; inclusive, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to all other nations of the world interested in the manufacture or raising of cotton to appoint delegates or representatives to the World Cotton Conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1919: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of such delegates or for any other expenses incurred in connection with said conference.

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

SHANTUNG PENINSULA, CHINA.

Mr. SPENCER. I submit a resolution and ask to have it read and referred to the Commitee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its deep regret at the provisions of the treaty (secs. 156, 157, 158) which transfers to Japan such broad rights and powers and physical possession over the territory and people in the Shantung Peninsula of China, as being alike disregardful of the true rights and deep-seated desires of the more than 36,000,000 of Chinese inhabiting the peninsula, unjust to the Republic of China, and threatening to the future peace of the world.

It is the sincere hope of the United States that this manifest injustice may be speedily reconsidered and remedied.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I ask, if there be no objection, to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald, of Michigan, including a letter from Mr. Taft, regarding reservations upon the league of nations. It seems to me it will be very helpful at this time.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

A SAFE AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(By A. H. Vandenberg, the editor, the Herald.)

Based on a communication received by the Herald yesterday from ex-President William Howard Taft, the Herald believes that Mr. Taft (who, next to President Wilson himself, is the chief American advocate of the league of nations) has come into substantial consent to the Herald's long-preached program for an acceptance of the treaty of peace and a ratification of the league covenant with reservations which shall distinctly make the league safe for the United States.

If this is correct, it should show Washington the way to a speedy and harmonious program of action—acceptable alike in the White House and in the Capitol (if these two citadels be ruled by reason): A program of action which will produce immediate ratification of the treaty and the league covenant, yet which will save American independence, the American Constitution, and American autonomy.

It will be remembered that when Mr. Taft came to Grand Rapids several weeks ago under the auspices of his League to Enforce Peace to plead for the league of nations covenant, the Herald presented him with a questionnaire. In this inquiry, the Herald sought to secure his interpretation upon several muddy sections of the covenant, vitally affecting the destiny of this free nation; and, in addition, begged him to consent to Senate reservations which should officially tell the world that America will always insist upon just such interpretations as he (and other proponents like him) declares, unofficially, to be appropriate. (In each of these important instances, the covenant can be construed two diametrically opposite ways; one way, safe for the United States; the other way, absolutely subvertive of perpetuated independent American Government.)

Mr. Taft did not reply, extemporaneously, in his Coliseum speech that evening. But two days later he favored the Herald with a long and well-sustained communication in which he partially consented that two of the "reservations," which the Herald has urged, would not be inappropriate, provided they did not reopen the entire league problem to renewed international negotiations. At the same time he courteously promised the Herald further investigation into the points we raised.

Yesterday's mail brought a further communication from this eminent statesman. "I send you a suggested series of resolutions," he writes, "which might easily be transformed into reservations." And these are the "resolutions":

"Whereas under article 10 of the covenant, the members undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league, and in case of such aggression or in case of any danger or threat of such aggression, the council is to advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled; and

"Whereas the preservation of the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of members may require, and the council may advise, the employment of force: Now, therefore, it is

"*Resolved*, That nothing contained in this treaty or in article 10 thereof is to be so construed as to require the United States of America to employ or to be called upon by the members of the league to employ military force for the purpose of fulfilling any obligation under article 10 until the Congress of the United States shall have passed appropriate legislation pursuant to the powers reserved to it under Article I of the Constitution of the United States with reference thereto.

"*Resolved*, That the power to declare and maintain war is vested in the Congress of the United States, and if the performance by the United States Government of the obligation assumed by article 10 of the covenant at any time requires the exercise of such power, supplementary action by Congress will become necessary.

"*Resolved further*, That in any approval of the treaty of peace a reservation by resolution should be made that the covenant of the league of nations as now drafted is not to be interpreted—

"(a) As affecting or bringing within the jurisdiction of the league the traditional national policy of the United States known as the 'Monroe doctrine,' as it has been from time to time asserted and whereby for its own defense this Nation has regarded as an unfriendly act any attempt by foreign nations, whether by war or purchase or diplomatic intrigue, to make territorial acquisitions or to secure new strategical footholds upon or near the Western Hemisphere or to secure political advantage in the domestic affairs of American nations; or

"(b) As affecting or bringing under the jurisdiction of the league such domestic matters as the admission of immigrants to this country, the regulation of commerce, including coastwise trade and transportation, or the fiscal policy, including tariff laws."

If such reservations as these meet with Mr. Taft's approval, Mr. Taft and the Herald are at last in concert regarding the proper action which should be taken by the United States Senate. Everything that has happened since we first insisted upon this view has strengthened the Herald's conviction that it was advocating the right course—for the sake of America as well as for the sake of the world; and, certainly, nothing could more completely confirm this conviction than to win Mr. Taft's approval.

If to the reservations above outlined there be added one further clause, making it clear that America will always construe the right of withdrawal on two years' notice as being an affirmative right which cannot be vitiated by any league strictures, based upon alleged misconduct during those "two years" through which the "notice" must run, we believe a solid, substantial, patriotic, safe, sane course has been charted which will readily command a heavy Senate majority and which will be entitled to the whole-hearted indorsement of the people of the United States.

Advocates of the league insist (and will continue to insist) that the league covenant is "safe for the United States," because, say they, it does mean just what these reservations say it means. How, then, can they hope to successfully argue against permitting the Senate to say so officially, concurrent with its act of ratification? Evidently Mr. Taft does not intend to be in that dubious posture.

If the covenant does not mean what these reservations declare and what these sled-length proponents declare, then the league is not safe for the United States and should not be accepted, no matter what the pressure from the seats of the mighty. If the covenant does not mean these things, then it does mean that our children may be called to fight the foreign wars of all the world without any right of independent American decision as required by our Constitution; and it does mean that we are transferring sovereign authority over our own immigration laws and our own tariffs and our own Monroe doctrine to an Old World from which we have been successfully independent for 143 years.

It would be suicidal negligence to ratify the covenant without making these moot points clear, without protecting ourselves while we are yet free agents in the world. On the other hand, with these reservations declared, it would be rank provincialism not to participate in the league experiment for the sake of the great peace good it may be made to accomplish within its legitimate sphere.

And who, pray, will object?

Britain can not complain if we are at least partially as jealous of our rights as she has been of hers. She signed no covenant until her supremacy of the seas had been saved for all time and until her league influence had been beautifully safeguarded. Japan can not complain. She got Shantung, answering her particular national ideal, before she yielded to the call of the dotted line. France can not complain. She obtained, with Mr. Wilson's consent, the greatest "reservation" of all when she negotiated a supplementary alliance under which we are called upon to refight her battles along the German Rhine in case the league does not function satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, no foreign nation can object, (1) because the Old World can not have a league without us, and it wants us at any price to help carry its load; (2) because to "object" to such reservations as these would be to openly confess that there is a foreign intention ultimately to interpret the league against us and our independence and our autonomy.

If no one can object outside of the United States, why, in Heaven's name, should anyone inside the United States, from President Wilson down, object, when the sole and only purpose is to preserve America and make clear to the world that we are not abrogating any of our intentions to preserve America?

REPORT ON SITUATION IN KOREA.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the report of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America on the Korean atrocities.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

REPORT ON SITUATION IN KOREA.

CONTENTS.

Cable messages from Premier Hara.
Introductory statement by commission on relations with the Orient.
The disturbances in Korea (Exhibit I). Historical background of the revolutionary movement.
General survey of the situation in Korea by a committee (Exhibit II):
(a) Beginning of the uprising.
(b) The part played by Christians.
(c) Antiforeign agitation by Japanese (see also Exhibit III).
(d) Indignities to missionaries.
Statements by individual eyewitnesses:
Exhibit IV. Cruelties in Hamheung.
Exhibit V. Atrocities at Suna Ub, Maungsan, Anju, Pan Suk, Keng Syo.
Exhibit VII. Stories of 22 wounded Koreans in Severance Hospital.
Exhibit VIII. Twelve individual interviews (see also Exhibit XVII).
Exhibit IX. Death of Koo Nak Soh.
Exhibit X. Removal of wounded man; story of torture (see also Exhibit XVII).
Exhibit XI. Experience of Korean girl under arrest.
Exhibit XII. Story of released girl prisoner.
Exhibit XIII. Brutalities at Taiku. Occurred late in May (Exhibit XXXIV).
Article in Seoul Press exonerating missionaries (Exhibit XIV).
Demonstration at Tong Chaing. Women stripped and beaten (Exhibit XV).
Police methods. Search of missionary homes. Mowry case (Exhibit XVI).
Massacres and burning of villages:
Exhibit XX. Statement of H. H. Underwood. Village of Chay-amm-ni burned because Christian. No revolutionary demonstration. All Christian men killed in church.
Exhibit XXII. Burning of Cheamni. Visit by American consul's party. Nine burned villages.
Admissions by Governor General Hasegawa (article from Japan Advertiser). Missionaries' report of atrocities to the authorities.
Methods of suppression (Exhibit XXVI). Government attitude to church. The outlook (361 killed, 860 wounded in six weeks).
Personal letters (Exhibits XXVII–VIII–IX):
Exhibit XXX. Letter showing less persecution of Christians in part of Korea, but atrocious handling of revolutionists and women.
Exhibit XXXI. Letter from Korea.
Failure of Japanese imperialism in Korea (Exhibit XXXII).
School statistics showing discrimination against Koreans.
Documents presented to Japanese summarizing Korean complaints (Exhibit XXXIII).

FOREWORD.

IMPORTANT CABLE MESSAGES.

Just as this pamphlet was about to go to press the following cable message was received from Hon. T. Hara, premier of the Japanese cabinet:

"I desire to assure you that the report of abuses committed by agents of the Japanese Government in Korea has been engaging my most serious attention. I am fully prepared to look squarely at actual facts. As I have declared on various occasions, the régime of administration inaugurated in Korea at the time of the annexation, nearly 10 years ago, calls for substantial modification to meet the altered conditions of things. Ever since the formation of the present cabinet in September last I have been occupied in working out the scheme of needed administrative reforms in Korea. A comprehensive plan of reorganization with this object in view has already been on the tapis. For obvious reasons it has not been possible to proceed at once to its formal adoption in the presence of the disturbances which have unfortunately broken out in various parts of the peninsula.

"In view, however, of the recent improvement in the situation, the contemplated reform can now be, in my estimation, safely introduced, and will be carried into effect as soon as the legal requirements of procedure to make them definitive shall have been completed. Announcement of the plan in a more complete form shall be withheld for the present, but I trust that the fixed determination with which my colleagues and I have been endeavoring to promote the lasting welfare of our Korean kinsmen and to insure a distinct betterment of conditions in the country will not be misunderstood or misconstrued."

The foregoing cablegram was received July 10, and came in answer to a cable sent him June 26, 1919, by the Commission on Relations with the Orient, as follows:

"Agitation regarding Chosen abuses increasingly serious, endangering good will. Can not withhold facts. Urgently important you publish official statements that abuses have ceased and reasonable administrative reforms proceeding. Can you cable to this effect? Address Fedcil—Commission Relations Orient, Federal Council Churches."

At an earlier date, namely, April 20, a cablegram regarding the Korean situation had been sent by Consul General Yada to Viscount Uchida, Minister of Foreign Affairs in Tokyo. In reply to that cablegram, the following message was received by Mr. Yada and handed to this commission on May 15, 1919:

* * * * * * *

"Premier Hara has for some time past been most deeply concerned in regard to the introduction of reforms into the governmental administration of Chosen. He is now in the midst of special investigations as to the best methods for the realization of these reforms, which might be seriously interfered with and made more difficult were the press of foreign countries rashly at this time to incite additional excitement.

"Therefore you are instructed to explain the situation as above stated to the members of the Federal Council Commission, conveying to them at the same time the appreciation on my part of their cordial and friendly spirit which has prompted them to take action in this present trouble. It is also the desire of the premier that you should call their attention more especially to the gravity of the whole affair if it is not handled in a proper way and ask for the continuance of their sane and moderate attitude."

* * * * * * *

These cable messages indicate the earnestness with which this commission, the Consul General Yada, and the Premier of Japan himself have been acting in response to the appeals that have come from Korea.

There is every reason to believe that Premier Hara and his colleagues will exert their fullest power to rectify the wrongs and inaugurate a new era in Korea.

WM. I. HAVEN, *Chairman.*
SIDNEY L. GULICK, *Secretary.*

—

THE JAPAN-KOREAN SITUATION.

Early in March telegraphic news from Shanghai and Tientsin began to tell of a remarkable uprising for independence in Korea, which, it was alleged, the Japanese Government was suppressing with great brutality. In April letters began to arrive verifying the telegraphic news, and giving considerable detail. These letters and reports came through many indirect channels in order to escape a rigid censorship and were addressed to the secretaries of foreign mission boards having missions in Korea. Copies of letters from missionaries to friends and kindred in America were also forwarded by them to these board secretaries.

All appealed for some action in America that would save the Koreans from the brutal and inhuman treatment to which they were being ruthlessly subjected.

About the middle of April the first person who came direct from Korea, bringing personal knowledge of the situation, and arriving in New York, was Rev. A. E. Armstrong, secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. He had spent 10 months in the Far East, visiting the stations of his board in China, Manchuria, Korea, and Japan, and was on the point of sailing from Yokohama for America, when he received a wire urging an immediate revisit to Korea. He reached Seoul March 16, was there for three days in consultation with various parties, getting full and accurate information.

On reaching New York he at once consulted Dr. Arthur J. Brown, secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States; Dr. Frank Mason North, secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States; and Dr. William I. Haven, secretary of the American Bible Society. The subject matter to be dealt with was of such a nature that they thought it could best be handled by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America rather than by the mission boards.

A meeting was therefore called of the Commission on Relations with the Orient of the Federal Council of Churches on April 16. Since that date the commission has held a dozen meetings in connection with this question not only to study it but also to take such action as might seem wise. To two of the meetings a group of important Japanese in New York City were invited. Urgent and full cablegrams were promptly sent to Japan by some of these Japanese friends.

The commission sought by these quiet and friendly methods to exert influences that would secure real results. It deemed it only fair and just to take up the matter first with the Japanese before giving to the daily press the rapidly accumulating material from Korea. This has been done. The commission now feels that the time has come when the full and accurate information in its possession should be made available for the public.

The documents printed in the following pages the commission believes to be thoroughly reliable. More than 30 American and British individuals in Korea have shared in their preparation. Some of the documents are carefully prepared reports by committees; some are personal letters; some are signed affidavits of eyewitnesses. If all the material in hand were published, a volume of about 1,000 pages would result.

One of the reports covers 114 closely packed pages. In these days of excitement and political turmoil in many lands we must accept with caution extreme statements that are not capable of proof. Many exaggerations have been circulated. The facts described in the following pages speak for themselves.

The commission gives this material to the public for two principal reasons. First, because it wishes that every possible influence may be brought to bear for the protection of Koreans from inhuman treatment and injustice. Second, because there is need of a sound and enlightened public opinion here in America, a public opinion that will strengthen the progressive, antimilitaristic forces in Japan in their efforts to secure justice and fair dealing in Korea.

The commission wishes to state with utmost clearness that as a commission it is not concerning itself with the political questions involved in the Korean independence movement. Whether or not Korea should be granted political independence is not a question upon which it is called to express judgment. The commission is, however, concerned with all right-minded men that brutality, torture, inhuman treatment, religious persecutions, and massacres shall cease everywhere. The evidence of the wide prevalence of such deeds in Korea has become convincing.

In dealing with this situation there is need of an accurately informed and just public opinion, able in its criticism of Japan to discriminate between the reactionary and militaristic forces on the one hand and those that are liberal and progressive on the other hand. Wholesome and fair criticism will recognize the disaster that has come upon the whole world through the spirit and practice of militarism. Japan, too, has been caught in its meshes. But in Japan, too, as in other lands, there is a liberal antimilitaristic movement, led by humane and progressive men, who, we believe, share the distress of mind which their friends in America feel over what is being done in Korea.

The present cabinet, having as premier the first "Commoner" who has risen to that high post of responsibility, though liberal itself, is the heir of the disastrous militaristic policies and methods of preceding cabinets. There is good ground for belief that even before the uprising it was earnestly grappling with the problem of administrative reform in Korea. The turmoil has halted its program. Its political foes, moreover, bureaucratic and militaristic, are many and strong and are watching for any opportunity for causing the downfall of the cabinet.

Americans should give the strongest possible moral support to the progressive and antimilitaristic movements in that land. This we can do, especially in this instance, as just indicated above, not by wholesale condemnation of the Japanese Government and people but by distinguishing between the reactionary, autocratic forces that have too largely dominated her policies and leaders in the past and the new liberal policies and leaders that are now coming to the fore. Hope for Korea, and indeed for China and the whole world, lies in the overthrow of militarism in Japan, as in every land, and in the firm establishment of civil liberty and popular rights for every section of the population.

WILLIAM I. HAVEN, *Chairman,*
SIDNEY L. GULICK, *Secretary,*
Commission on Relations with the Orient of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

—

EXHIBIT I.

THE DISTURBANCES IN KOREA.

(By ———.)

MARCH 21, 1919.

Korea at the present time would be a fertile field for another Bryce investigating commission. Because the stirrings of the present age have reached Korea and have aroused her people to demand freedom the Japanese military system has since the 1st of March exhibited all the characteristics of the Prussian machine which was recently smashed in Europe. Many of the atrocities perpetrated in Belgium have been duplicated in Korea. According to one newspaper 6,000 Koreans are now in jails and prisons, and this is probably below the actual number. The movement for more freedom is country wide; its propagandists include Christians, members of the reformed native cult, the Chuntokyo and Buddhists. Students of Government schools are equally involved with those of mission schools. And in the name of "law and order" countless offenses against humanity are daily being committed.

THE JAPANESE COLONIAL SYSTEM.

Japan established a protectorate over Korea in 1908, and in 1910 formally annexed the country. Prior to the annexation the administrative system was chaotic. By stern enforcement the Japanese have introduced quiet and order, have commenced to exploit the natural resources of the country, set up a judiciary, developed the beginning of an educational system, improved communications, and cultivated hygiene. There is no denying the fact that many reforms have been brought about under Japanese auspices. But the methods employed in governing Korea have not won the hearts of the people. The genius of the Japanese people is attracted by systems which are autocratic. Their police system is German to the core, and in their colonial government they have taken the Prussian rather than the British method as their model. The sword is the emblem of authority. Not only is it carried by the military, gendarmerie, and police, but by the civilian members of the civil service. Every male school-teacher wears a sword; in fact, almost everyone who holds a Government office carries a sword as the symbol of his authority. To bolster up the militaristic system a vast system of espionage exists. Consequently there is no freedom of assembly, no free speech, no freedom of the press. And there is no right of petition of grievances with immunity from arrest. Needless to say, there is no participation in self-government. In the law courts it is alleged that a Korean has no chance in a suit with a Japanese. Habeas corpus is unknown. The State has a right to keep a prisoner for two weeks or more before producing him in open court, and if it desires by means of securing extensions of 10 days ad lib. need not produce a prisoner in practice until it desires to do so. The prisoner is not allowed to consult a lawyer or to see his friends. Torture is freely applied, and a man is considered guilty until proved innocent. Neither is the Korean permitted to enjoy many offices of emolument under the Government. There are some Korean police and gendarmes, but there are very few Koreans in other departments of the civil service. Korea is a paradise for the Japanese job hunter. Efforts have been made by Government officials to deprave the youth of Korea. Commercialized prostitution is flourishing and is extending from the capital to the country parts. A manisfesto describing the grievances of the people has been issued by the independence committee. Another grievance which strikes deeply to the heart of the Korean is the determination of the Japanese to drive out the use of the Korean language from the schools. The proclamation which provides that Japanese is to be the sole language of instruction comes into force in 1920. The lesson of Poland and other countries seems to be lost upon the Japanese. Then there seems to be an organized attempt to deprive the Koreans in the southern part of Korea—which is the warmer portion—of their land and to force them to emigrate to Manchuria. Pressure is put upon the Korean landholder or tenant to sell, usually at a disadvantageous price, and he and his family go north to make a new home. Japanese settlers replace the Korean. This policy is fostered by a semiofficial company called the Oriental Development Co., which receives valuable concessions from the Government. A veteran missionary summed up the situation trenchantly the other day in these words: "This that builds railways, constructs roads, promotes education, understands hygiene, is none the less German."

JAPANESE REFORM TENDENCIES.

In a word, the whole system of government throughout the Japanese Empire reflects the German system in this—that the civil arm of the Government is dominated by the military. Last September the bureau-

cratic ministry of Count Terauchi fell, and was succeeded by that of Mr. Hara. The new ministry was acclaimed by the Japanese press as the first democratic government that Japan has had, and from its acts it would seem to deserve the title. Shortly after the Diet opened one of the new ministers replied to a question inquiring what would be the colonial policy of the new ministry, that the Government realized that they could not continue to rule the colonies by Imperial ordinances, but that new methods were under consideration. The minister could not say when they would go into effect. Later press references seemed to reveal an inner struggle in the Government, the civil element apparently wishing to replace the military government of Korea by a civilian administration, and the militarists opposing any such transformation. At the present moment the militarist element is vociferating in the daily press that it is impossible for Japan to ratify the action of its delegates at the peace conference in regard to the abolition of conscription. This by the way: On March 1, a monster popular demonstration took place in Tokyo demanding manhood suffrage, and the Hara ministry a few days later introduced an electoral reform bill, which has passed the popular house, greatly extending the franchise. It would appear therefore that democracy is slowly gaining in the heart of the Empire, and that there were hopes for a brighter day for the colonies from that end.

THE GENESIS OF THE KOREAN INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT.

Meanwhile a series of happenings combined to precipitate a crisis in Korea. The first of these was the peace conference and the dissemination of the doctrine of self-determination of races. The following story was told to a representative group of missionaries by the minister of internal affairs of the government general of Chosen.

He stated that the Government had information that a Korean had interviewed President Wilson before he had left for Paris, and asked the President if he would bring up the question of Korea at the conference. The President replied, it is alleged, that the conference could only deal with countries which were affected by the war, and that the question of a country at peace, as Korea was, could not be properly raised. The interviewer then asked whether if it could be unmistakably shown that the Koreans were dissatisfied would the case of Korea then be discussed at the peace conference? To which the President is reported to have said that in that case he would not say that it could not be. According to information from other sources it seems that this is quite a likely story. There are many Koreans in the Western States, in Hawaii, Siberia, and China, and throughout all the centers of Korean population the movement for independence rapidly spread.

The proceedings of the peace conference formed another link in the chain of events. The league of nations, the gospel of the right of small nations to self-determination, the reviving of oppressed nations set free by the war, all fired the imagination of the educated Koreans.

Then an event nearer home occurred to bring out national feeling. On January 20 the ex-Emperor of Korea died, just on the eve of the marriage of his son to a Japanese princess. It was officially reported that the ex-Emperor's death was due to apoplexy. But rumors got into circulation that his death was due either to suicide or poisoning. It was claimed that he had refused to sign a paper which stated that the Koreans were contented under Japanese rule and was made away with because he had refused to do so. It has been officially denied that any such paper was ever presented to the ex-ruler. The news of the ex-Emperor's death was suppressed for a time.

Arrangements were made for the funeral. The Diet at Tokyo adjourned out of respect, after voting 100,000 yen toward the funeral expenses. The consort of the ex-Emperor, who had been assassinated in 1894, was buried not far out of the East Gate of Seoul. It had been decided that the King should be buried about 17 miles from that city, and in accordance with Korean custom it was necessary to bury the Queen by his side. Consequently the body of the Queen was disinterred, and on February 12 the reburial ceremonies were begun and carried through with great pomp, all of the expenses being borne by the Koreans.

These events brought back to the Koreans in a poignant way the remembrance of their national humiliation. March 3 was set for the date of the ex-Emperor's funeral, and it had been arranged that the ceremonies inside the city should be Japanese and outside the city Korean. Needless to say, the arrangements for the Japanese part of the ceremony were not made with the hearty concurrence of the Koreans.

DEMONSTRATIONS BEGIN.

The atmosphere was becoming tense. Evidently the authorities had an inkling that something was brewing, for the principals of schools were called before the prefect at the city hall and told to warn their students not to be led away by the actions of the Korean students in Japan. It should be stated here that during February the Korean students who were attending the various colleges in Japan had started a movement for the self-determination of Korea and many had been imprisoned.

On Saturday, March 1, notices were posted on the streets of Seoul that public gatherings would be held at Pagoda Park, and printed proclamations of independence signed by 33 men were distributed. Shortly after noon a large number of the signers of this manifesto met at a Korean hotel and telephoned to the authorities that they had declared the independence of the country, announcing where they were. The authorities thereupon sent and arrested them. The police published in the newspapers that they had surrounded the ringleaders in an eating house as they were drinking success to their plot.

Meanwhile the people, including many students, had gathered at the park, and from there started to parade some of the principal streets. They walked along in an orderly way, with hands held aloft, calling their national cry of "Mansei," which means "10,000 years." In front of public buildings, such as police headquarters and the various consulates, they would stop and take off their hats and wave them, uttering their cry of "Mansei." At the consulates they sent in letters and their proclamation manifesto. No single act of violence was done. At one point mounted gendarmes charged the crowd and inflicted some saber cuts. The police were arresting as many as they could, and all that evening and on the following day, Sunday, men were being arrested at their homes on suspicion of having been connected with the demonstration. Of the 33 signers, 15 were members of the native cult, the Chuntokyo; 15 were Christians; and 3 were Buddhists. Of the Christians the majority were ministers of the various city churches, many of them college-trained men; one was a Y. M. C. A. secretary; another was connected with the Severance Hospital. Since that day arrests have been made daily, until at present there is scarcely a city church which has not its minister locked up.

On Sunday, March 2, no demonstrations occurred in Seoul. The following day was the day of the ex-King's funeral. The schools had been allocated definite places along the line of march for the Japanese ceremonies. Not one of the higher schools, government, private, or mission, was represented by any but the members of the faculties. The students cut the ceremony dead. The funeral was a military spectacle. The first section, which consisted of naval and military detachments, took 18 minutes to pass a given point. The second section, which took in the Shinto priests, the bier, and the governmental representatives and functionaries, was not so large, and the third section was a line of troops and sailors almost as long as the first. The following day was quiet in Seoul, the Korean ceremonies taking place outside the city. These two days were school holidays.

The next day, March 5, not a single student in the higher schools was in his place, and rumors began to come to the heads of schools that there would be no more students until the country had secured its independence. Since that time, nearly a month ago, not a higher school has been able to open.

On Wednesday, March 5, at the stroke of 9 in the morning, commotion was heard on the main street in front of the railway station. Young men were swarming out of the stores and alleys and making toward the railway station, calling out their national cry. In a remarkably brief time a man in a rickisha started up the street toward the South Gate, surrounded by the throng, who with uplifted arms, carrying red bands, ran through the gate and into the old city toward the palace. This demonstration was composed almost entirely of students, and as it proceeded was joined by high-school girls. The police apparently had been taken by surprise, for the demonstrators had run about half a mile before they were opposed. In the large open space in front of the palace the police were drawn up and charged the crowd with sabers. Many wounds were inflicted. No respect was shown to sex, girls being handled roughly and beaten. Hundreds of arrests were made, including a number of the schoolgirls. No violence was attempted by the students. Their object apparently was merely to demonstrate, and they considered it an honor to be arrested for their country. Nearly all of the student nurses at Severance Hospital rushed out when the crowd passed by the street. They were carrying bandages and were prepared to do Red Cross work if required. Fifteen were arrested and were held in the police station until afternoon. They were questioned closely as to whether the heads of their institutions (the missionaries) had ordered them out. The younger high-school girls who were taken did not fare so well. Most were kept in custody, and more will be told of their sufferings in the jails later.

Various other demonstrations occurred. The street railway employees struck for several days as a protest. The Korean shopkeepers put up their shutters, and have kept their stores closed for over three weeks. The literati prepared a petition sending it to the office of the governor general by the hands of a Christian preacher and a non-Christian. At the office of the governor they were told that such documents should be received at the police department. To the police they accordingly went, and were immediately arrested. It should be noted that the independence manifesto and the petition of the literati are both couched in stately phraseology and breathe a spirit of charity toward those who have inflicted on the Korean nation a mental "reign of terror." (Later another petition was prepared by men who had been ennobled by the Japanese after the annexation, one of these men being the man who in 1866 had petitioned the Korean ruler to conclude a treaty with Japan and open Korea to the west. This man being over 80 years of age and too weak to rise from his bed was not arrested, but all his male relatives were taken into custody and a cordon of soldiers posted about his house. The other was immediately arrested. Both are viscounts.)

DEMONSTRATIONS OUTSIDE THE CAPITAL.

Synchronizing with the outbreaks at Seoul, demonstrations of a similar nature occurred at the leading centers throughout the country. Again, they were orderly. But the minions of the law at the outside centers, where there were fewer foreign eyes to see what took place, behaved in many places with the utmost ferocity. The crowds were fired on and deaths occurred. Two cases of gunshot wounds were sent in from a point in the north to Severance Hospital. At Pyengyang, a large center, foreign observers report that the the crowds were attacked by the members of the fire brigade, who were armed with their hooks which are used to pull the burning thatch off the houses. Many ugly wounds were inflicted. Five men died in a hospital from gunshot wounds, but the authorities are reported to have issued orders that the deaths must not be reported as due to that cause. In the north the authorities seem to have decided to penalize the Christian population, and churches have been wantonly destroyed. In many cases the police have questioned demonstrators and have arrested only those who admitted being Christians. An attempt was made to get 24 wealthy Koreans to sign a statement which said that the 33 signers were low-class people. They refused to do so, and pressure was brought to bear on them for several days before the attempt was given up. It should be said here, to make this point clear, that wealthy men are compelled to submit to periodical police audits of their private finances. There is no halfway government in Korea.

In Hamheung, a point on the east coast, where the Canadian Presbyterians have a mission station, scenes similar to those at Pyengyang were enacted. The fire brigade and coolies armed with clubs perpetrated outrages on the people. An eyewitness statement by Rev. ——— is in our possession. Here the authorities refused to let those injured be treated in the mission hospital. Mr. ——— had occasion to go to the police station during the demonstrations, and saw in a tent the fire brigade, with their hooked poles in hand, and coolies armed with clubs, waiting for the signal to leave the police compound to attack the crowd. The conclusion is irresistible that these men were under the orders of the police. An attempt was made by the chief of police to intimidate the foreigners by saying that their lives were in danger from the non-Christians, but refused to be bluffed, and told the chief that he would be held responsible for any harm that befell the foreigners.

It is not possible at this time to record in detail all of the uprisings in various places. These are fair samples of what occurred throughout the country. The truth will eventually come out as to what has happened in places where no foreigners were present to record what has transpired.

In the official press reports, particularly those which came out in the early stages, the missionaries were openly accused as being the instigators of the movement, and capital was made out of the fact that so many Christians were concerned in it. Every effort was made to minimize the part played by other sections of the population. The police reporters played up the Christian schools and glossed over the facts in regard to the participation of the Government school students and the Buddhists. At the demand of the American consul, official statements have since appeared that the Government discredits the stories of missionary instigation, but the police reports and vernacular press still continue to print them.

POLICE ATROCITIES.

Beating and torture are the cardinal principles of police methods in Korea. When making arrests, usually the victim is cuffed and kicked by several policemen. In the demonstration of March 5 a student noticed that the girl he was engaged to was being attacked by several policemen. He went to her rescue, and was at once set upon by several policemen and severely beaten. He was arrested and has not yet been released, having now been in custody about three weeks. Instances are not infrequent where Japanese in civilian clothes have arrested demonstrators in the presence of the police and have treated them shamefully. Stories of this kind come from Pyengyang and other points as well as Seoul.

From released prisoners stories of cruelty and torture are now pouring out. One student was asked to tell who the leaders were, and his finger nails were pushed back from the skin to assist his memory. Still another prisoner had his finger tips burned for the same purpose. Still another was put in an upright press, which operated with a screw from the back. When the screw is turned the four sides contract, and while the pressure becomes stronger the questioning is carried on—a way of squeezing out information. After being subjected to this torture, the same man had a strong cord tied around the middle finger of his right hand; the cord was then passed through a hook in the ceiling, and his body was pulled up until he was resting on the tips of his toes. He became insensible during the process, and when he awoke found himself lying down while a salve was being applied to his wounds. He left the jail with a swollen hand, which had to be lanced immediately.

The girls fared even worse. For the first few days after being arrested they were confined in the several police stations. As far as can be ascertained, no matrons were on duty in those jails. Or course, the girls were not allowed to communicate with relatives or friends. The main facts in the story of one released girl are as follows: A few hours after being arrested she was brought before an officer, questioned, and beaten by him on the face, shoulders, and legs. The following day the same process was repeated before a second officer. The third day she was taken before a third officer, who called her by vile names and insinuated that she and the other girl prisoners were pregnant. "You can cut us open and see," she retorted. He then said that the Bible taught that sinless people were naked (some coarse references to Adam and Eve being intended) and ordered her to disrobe. She cried, and he did not press his demand. She was again beaten, and the fourth day before still another officer she was questioned and beaten again. One of her ordeals was to kneel down on the floor and hold a heavy board at arms' length for an hour. If her arm trembled, she was beaten again. The girls were always accompanied to the toilet under guard. On the fifth day she was removed to the West Gate prison. She and two other girls were summoned to an officer's desk. She was told to wait outside while her two companions went in. A little later she saw them pass out stark naked, with hair down their backs, holding their clothes in a bundle before them. She was then called in and found two Japanese matrons present with the officer. After being questioned by the officer, she was ordered by the matrons to take off her clothes. After resisting for a time, and being threatened, she did so. Her hair had first been taken down by the matrons. There was no apparent purpose in this request except to humiliate her. After standing several minutes disrobed, she was told to follow one of the matrons. She wrapped her skirt around her and, carrying the rest of her clothes, walked through the hall to a cell, where she found two other girls. On the way thither she passed several male employees of the prison. The following day she was taken out by a matron and taken to a room where a very youthful Japanese doctor was waiting. Again she was ordered to disrobe for a physical examination.

After a long altercation she was allowed to retain one garment. The doctor tapped her chest, asked no questions whatever about her health, and she was in due course taken back to her cell. Several days later a gold-braided official came into her cell, asked her to remove her waist, examined her back and chest, and left the cell. Shortly after this she and a few other girls were released. They were handed over to relatives or school principals, who had been notified to be in attendance. They were constantly guarded by matrons while in the cells, were not allowed to talk, had to remain in a very irksome squatting position all day, and were beaten if they changed their position. They were allowed 15 minutes open-air walking daily after breakfast.

When stories of torture and cruelty to prisoners became current among the missionary community, the Seoul Press ran a couple of editorial articles pointing out that the Koreans were "atrocious liars" and that the stories of cruelties had been investigated, and that the prison authorities assured them that no tortures were taking place. When a missionary showed this article to a Japanese, he naïvely replied that it was intended to mean that there had been no tortures since they had been sent to a certain prison. Another foreigner discussed the editorial with the editor of the paper, who replied that he knew there were cruelties, but that in making that statement he was "speaking officially."

INDIGNITIES TO MISSIONARIES.

The mission body has not escaped uninjured. At Pyengyang, two ladies were prodded with rifle butts as they walked along the street. Two male missionaries were arrested there while trying to protect by their presence only a body of native women whom the police were trying to arrest. After being marched through the streets guarded by soldiers after a stay of a few minutes in the police station, they were released. One of these men was the Rev. Stacy L. Roberts and the other the Rev. E. W. Thwing, of Peking, whose work in antiopium movements has made him an international figure. In southern Korea two lady members of the Australian Presbyterian Mission were arrested and subsequently released. On March 20 the Rev. John Thomas, a missionary of the Oriental Missionary Society, was attacked by soldiers at Kokei and severely beaten. When he produced his British passport it was thrown on the ground and stamped on, as was also a preaching permit which had been given him by the authorities. All of these cases involved consular action, which was promptly taken. At Syenchun the homes of the missionaries were searched shortly after the demonstrations began. On March 17 a body of police, led by a procurator, came to the Severance Union Medical College, placed guards at all the gates and at intervals through the compound, and searched the various buildings of the institution. As already mentioned in connection with the Hamheung incidents, the authorities have tried to get rid of their responsibilities for the protection of foreigners. Rumor has it that a certain consul was asked to warn his nationals to keep off the street, as they could not guarantee to protect them, and the consul is said to have replied that he would issue no such warning and would hold the authorities responsible in case any of his nationals were molested. Two or three days ago the leading newspaper in the capital in an inspired editorial invited the missionaries to confer with the authorities as to the best means of bringing the troubles to a close, and the suggestions of the missionary body have been invited by some representative Japanese. That is the status of the matter at this moment.

On Saturday, March 22, another street demonstration took place at Seoul. It was quickly headed off, and a number of arrests made. On the following Sunday evening demonstrations broke out simultaneously in several different parts of the city. At the East Gate bayonets were freely used and many were wounded. There are persistent reports that a number of deaths occurred. The city is being patrolled by soldiers and is virtually under martial law. It has been so since March 1.

What the outcome will be it is too early to prophesy at this stage. Whether the Koreans will weaken in their stand for complete independence, or pursue their policy of passive resistance until the end, or whether they will accept a program of fundamental reforms, can not be foretold. The revelation of the organizing ability shown in the movement thus far is the surprise and admiration of all who know the Koreans; it is a veritable renaissance. There are many Japanese who realize that their methods of colonial administration have failed to achieve their end, and who are sincerely desirous of bringing about a happier condition. Japan's system has been wrong; it was a German colonial policy, not a British one; it has been an effort to exploit a people and benefit them at the same time. It has been an effort to impose "culture" against the desires of a people with a culture of its own. In the meantime, whatever the outcome, publicity will help both Korea and Japan in their ascent to a higher plane of civilization.

—

EXHIBIT II.

A GENERAL SURVEY OF SITUATION IN KOREA.

(By a committee.)

APRIL 7, 1919.

It may be well to give you a general résumé of the situation. For some time past the Japanese authorities had planned to marry the young Korean prince, called the Heir to Prince Yi, to a Japanese princess, the marriage to be a symbol of the amalgamation of the two peoples. The date had been set for January 25, and preparations made, when on January 22 the father of the prince, the ex-Emperor, died under very peculiar circumstances. This, of course, postponed the marriage, and from that time on it was evident to all that the Koreans were becoming agitated in mind. Also the peace conference was deliberating in Paris, and the principle of "self-determination of nations" evidently appealed to Koreans as applicable to their country. Koreans living outside of Korea, in China, Hawaii, and America, had also been looking for some opportunity to accomplish something for the liberation of their country, and were evidently in touch with leaders in Korea. How all these streams of influence acted upon each other we do not know precisely, but their interaction resulted in a demonstration which first broke out on March 1, two days before the date set for the funeral of the ex-Emperor.

Thirty-three representative men from all parts of the country drew up and signed a declaration which they printed by the thousands. Fifteen of these men were leaders of the "Chun Do Kyo" (The Heavenly Way Association), which perpetuates the "Tonk Hak" and "Ill Chin Whei" movements, which were prominent in the years immediately preceding and during the Japanese occupation and annexation of Korea. Fifteen others were Christians, and included some of our most prominent pastors, such as Kil Sun Chu of Pyengyang and Yang Chun Paik of Syenchun. The other three were said to be Buddhists. The head of the Chun Do Kyo signed first and Pastor Kil second.

On March 1 these 33 men met in Seoul, sent one of their number to one of the parks of the city to read the declaration of independence to an assembled crowd of people, after which all the signers surrendered themselves to the police. On the same day and at the same hour similar demonstrations were held in seven or eight other cities of Korea. At these demonstrations it was stated that the participants, although Christians or members of the Chun Do Kyo or Buddhists, as the case might be, were acting wholly as individuals. It was further stated that the movement was to be one of passive resistance, no property was to be destroyed and no Japanese or others injured in any way. This character of the demonstration has been consistently maintained up to the present time except as qualified by statements below, police reports to the contrary notwithstanding. After the reading of the declaration of independence, Korean flags were given out to the demonstrators, who stood up, waving them and shouting "Hurrah (Mansei) for Korean independence!"

In Seoul thousands of people had gathered for the funeral of the late exemperor, and on this day surged up the main streets in dense crowds, shouting for independence but otherwise conducting themselves in an orderly manner. In Pyengyang and other cities, also, as far as foreigners have witnessed the demonstrations, although thousands of people joined in the demonstrations, no rioting occurred. The next day, Sunday, was quiet although church services were forbidden in some cities; but on Monday the 3d similar demonstrations were held in many places but not in Seoul, because there the Koreans wished to have nothing mar the funeral ceremonies in honor of the ex-Emperor.

The movement was so secretly organized that neither the missionaries nor the secret police of the Government knew what was going to happen, though all were conscious of the great tensity of the time. There is, moreover, a remarkably efficient organizing power apparently directing the movement. In a very few days it spread to all parts of the land, even to remote mountain valleys. The police, gendarmes, and soldiers were everywhere called out to disperse the crowds and to arrest the leaders. The first day or so no very rough methods were used, but from then on, and especially out in the country districts the most brutal methods have been employed. Men, women, and children have been repeatedly kicked, beaten with fists or gun butts, bayoneted, sabred, and shot, until our mission hospitals and, if report be true, the Government and other private hospitals, too, are filled with the wounded; Severance Hospital having cots and beds in every available space, even the hallways. Testimony gathered from these wounded is consistent that until attacked the crowds of demonstrators used no force but simply shouted for independence, and were fired upon or otherwise attacked. In one place after the crowd was fired upon it attacked the gendarmes, killing four, and in several country towns gendarme stations are said to have been wrecked. In many instances the gendarmes and soldiers have made no attempt at arrests, but merely fired without warning, and have often fired indiscriminately in the direction from which cheering was heard. In addition to this, even women have been stripped of their clothing in

the open and beaten severely. Soldiers, gendarmes, and police have broken into houses, and not finding the men they wanted, have dragged women and even children around by the hair and beaten them. In one case at least fire was used to torture a man. These Hunnish barbarities have stirred us all to deepest indignation and have to a certain extent terrorized the people who were expecting merely arrest, yet they remain firm in their determination, although they are changing their method of demonstration and protest for the purpose of saving life. For instance, in the cities of Seoul and Pyengyang especially they have closed their places of business and kept them closed for nearly a month now, and it is said that they are going to inaugurate boycotts and strikes along various lines and to refuse to pay taxes. It is obvious, however, that if the brutal methods of repression are continued, retaliation on the part of the Koreans will inevitably be the result, even though they have no weapon.

In the repression of these demonstrations the authorities have evidently decided that the Christian Church as a church, and not merely Christians as individuals, is responsible, and in some places have arrested every officer of the local church, a course which, together with the general terrorization of the people, has prevented services being held during the month. This, however, is particularly true in South Pyengan Province.

Of course, our mission schools have been involved from the start, the students, both young men and women, giving their enthusiastic support to the movement. The natural result has been that with the exception of Ewa Haktang, which is making a rather unsuccessful effort to keep open, all mission schools have been closed since March 1. They have not been closed by the Government, which, indeed, is anxious to maintain the appearance of normal times and the fiction of tranquillity in Korea, but their closure is due to the fact that many students and teachers are already under arrest, while the great majority refuse to study until the object of these demonstrations has been attained. This is a very serious condition and one which may result in the permanent closing of our schools, the Government taking advantage of this opportunity to order them permanently closed on the technical ground that they have not maintained the required continuous course of study. At least two schools have already been warned to this effect. If this should be the result, a very absurd injustice would be involved, inasmuch as the Government schools are in much the same condition as ours, but are being kept "officially" open by the teachers meeting and going through the motions every day.

Although the foregoing might seem to indicate that the movement for independence is largely supported by Christians and followers of the Chun Do Kyo, it is far from being confined to these two classes. It met immediate response from the people generally, and in some places, in fact, Christians have not taken part in it, although their non-Christian neighbors have. Neither is the movement local, as an inspired press reports, but has spread to all parts of the country and among every class of the population. Furthermore, in the last two weeks the old literati, and even the new nobility, created since the Japanese annexation, in recognition largely of their pro-Japanese services, have sent in to the Government petitions asking for independence and have been promptly arrested. In fact, one of these men is the man who in 1866 first petitioned the old Korean King to conclude a treaty with Japan and open the country to the West, a man who has always up to the present been pro-Japanese and was made a viscount by His Imperial Japanese Majesty. It is reported that such petitions will continue to be presented until even the Government is forced to recognize that all classes of the people support the movement.

In regard to the part which has been taken by the Christians special emphasis should be laid upon a report which comes to us on the best authority to the effect that in the consultations which preceded this demonstration the members of the Chun Do Kyo stood for a declaration of independence and the use of force if necessary, while the Christian leaders maintained that they should petition for redress of abuses and wrongs and governmental reforms, but without the use of force. The compromise program finally adopted was to declare independence and to use no force. In a conference with Government officials, to which we shall presently refer, it was admitted by a prominent official that all must recognize that the absence of the element of force in the demonstrations was due to the participation of the Christians.

One of the inevitable concomitants of this turmoil was the charge that missionaries are the instigators and abettors of the whole movement, a charge which bitter articles in the vernacular press violently supported. We inclose a copy of such an article taken from the second most prominent Japanese paper in the peninsula. The American consul general at Seoul protested to the authorities against these articles, but, although this particular one was afterwards officially "withdrawn," articles of a similar import have appeared in all parts of the country and, of course, in Japan. It is only natural that a strong antiforeign feeling should be aroused especially directed toward Americans. You have doubtless heard ere now of the attack upon Rev. John Thomas, a British subject, of the Oriental Missionary Society, who was set upon and severely beaten by police and soldiers under the belief that he was an American instigator of these demonstrations. There have been reports that Japanese were going to beat up some of the missionaries, and, as a matter of fact, Japanese thugs, armed with clubs and knives, have held a parade through the streets of Seoul headed by a mounted gendarme. These men have been brought in not merely to intimidate Koreans and to precipitate violent rioting but to take part in any underhand work that it may seem wise for the authorities to wink at in these disturbed days. So far as foreigners are concerned, the Japanese officials told a newspaper correspondent that if he would carry a lighted cigarette at night he would be safe, because no Japanese would then mistake him for a missionary. Mr. Holdcroft was stopped by two such men, armed with clubs, when on his way to the railway station at night and subjected to cross-questioning as to his nationality, occupation, destination, etc.

You have possibly seen references to reports published in the Chinese newspapers, notably the Peking-Tientsin Times, the North China Star, and the China Press, giving instances of brutality on the part of Japanese soldiers witnessed by missionaries in Pyengyang, Syenchun, and elsewhere. Some of these were never intended for publication in any form, and certainly not with names, dates, and places embodied and involving missionaries in an apparently anti-Japanese propaganda. They were gathered from individuals by an indiscreet missionary from North China, not connected with our board, who was in Korea for the first two weeks of the demonstration. Most of the material was intrusted to him with the understanding that it was to be transmitted to friends in America, but this individual published them verbatim as soon as he got over the border, and even insisted that they go in with names. We are just as indignant over this as anybody else and realize to what an extent our position has been compromised and to what extent also this will stimulate antimissionary feeling, but, of course, it can not be helped now, and since the American consul general is exerting pressure on Japanese authorities to prevent further attacks on Americans in the local press or by Japanese subjects we hope that none of the missionaries will encounter violence. For the most part we are remaining quietly at home, not even attempting country itineration, and not venturing out at night except in case of necessity. In regard to the reports mentioned above as having been published in the Chinese papers, you should know, however, that though they were not intended to be published in this way and not to be used at all in China, they contain a reliable account of actual occurrences, supported by affidavits now on file at the American consulate general, Seoul.

The ultimate effect of this movement on the church in Korea is wholly problematical. The leaders went into it with their eyes open, realizing that failure of their efforts meant persecution and probably severe repression of church activity, but they said they had prayed the matter through and felt that it was God's will for them to make this attempt to secure not merely civil, but real religious, liberty at this particular time in the world's history, when so many small peoples are apparently to secure these blessings. We learned this from the moderator of the Korean General Assembly and others after the demonstrations began and before he and other leaders were arrested. It is reported that officials have stated that the Chun Do Kyo is to be suppresssed entirely and that the Christian Church is to be reduced to about half its present size. Certainly if the military government remains in Korea and the present movement collapses, the outlook for the future is very dark. If, on the other hand, in view of the obvious failure of the administration of the last nine years to conciliate the people, a civil administration and governmental reforms are introduced, while there probably would not be such an aggressive anti-Christian activity, we must anticipate great restriction of Christian propaganda at best. It is quite evident that the most rigorous repression of demonstrations is directed against Christians in those sections of the country where the church is prominent. In the north a number (15, according to credible reports) of churches have had windows, furniture, bells, and Bibles destroyed by soldiers, gendarmes, or authorized thugs, and in many communities where general arrests are made discrimination is always against the Christians. Undoubtedly the Government regards Christianity as the chief factor of the disturbance, and, conceiving that its previous suspicions have been justified, is acting accordingly.

The effect of the movement on mission work is equally problematical, for the Government, while officially stating that they do not regard the missionaries as having any direct responsibility for this uprising, which took Government and missionaries alike by surprise, seems to be making every effort in the examination of prisoners to fasten responsibility upon the missionary body. This we are repeatedly told by released prisoners, but the Koreans under examination uniformly insist that the missionaries are not connected with the movement. The examinations, it may be said in passing, are frequently conducted with all the approved methods of 1912 "conspiracy case." But the situation is none the less grave. Word has just come that Mr. Mowry, of Pyengyang, has been arrested under charge of permitting the production of seditious literature on his premises. We can only surmise the underlying reason for his arrest. Copies of the independence proclamations and news sheets which he has been translating may have been found in his house, or his secretary may have, without his knowledge, used his mimeograph for printing notices regarding local demonstrations. Anything else is inconceivable. Two Australian missionary ladies were arrested and detained two days. They had gone out to call their school girls out of the demonstrations and were arrested on the charge that they were taking part. These instances indicate the critical character of the situation.

At least three informal conferences have been held with representative officials and civilians in Seoul. At the first Mr. Usami called in a group of missionaries (Drs. Gale, Avison, Hardy, Noble, Sharrocks, Mr. Bernheisel, Mr. Bunker, Mr. Gerdine, and Mr. Hugh Miller) and asked their opinion as to the causes of the uprising. Very frank statements were made, notably one by Dr. Gale (who, after many years of consistent pro-Japanese effort, is now plainly outspoken in condemnation of the failure of the military administration), who told Mr. Usami that the Koreans had been living under a reign of terror for the past nine years. The second and third conferences included such men as Judge Watanabe, Mr. Sekiya, Mr. Niwa, Mr. Yamagata, of the Seoul Press, and some other civilians, and, in addition to most of the above missionaries, Dr. Moffett and Mr. Whittemore and Bishop Welch (and at the third conference Dr. Egbert Smith). The gist of the position of the Japanese was the plainly stated desire that missionaries should cooperate with the Government in suppressing the uprising. Bishop Welch, by a previous agreement among the missionaries, replied, stating that anything other than absolute neutrality was impossible, for three reasons: First, it would be useless for us to try to stop the movement. Secondly, it would be resented and destroy our influence; and, finally, it was forbidden by our home Government. The Japanese continued to urge, however (especially through the semiofficial Seoul Press), that missionaries ought to abandon this technically correct position and undertake real cooperation. We need not point out to you the delicacy and difficulty of the situation. At this conference the question of the actuality of atrocities was raised. Dr. Moffett gave his own personal experience as an eyewitness. In private conversation with Dr. Moffett, Mr. Yamagata, editor of the Seoul Press, cheerfully admitted that he was convinced of the truth of the atrocities, but he said that the denials as published in the Press were "official." In a subsequent interview Dr. Avison and Bishop Welch were assured by Mr. Sekiya that the present "lenient" methods of suppression were to be exchanged for extreme measures in the near future. Dr. Welch assured him that any great amount of bloodshed occurring in this connection would alienate the sympathies of the western nations. The missionaries feel that nothing is to be gained by a continuance of such conferences, which might easily be used to compromise our position still further.

As to the possible success of the independence movement we can only give our personal judgment that it is hopeless; that unless there is outside international interference (which is scarcely conceivable in the present state of the world), administrative reform and possibly, in the future, some measure of self-government is the most that can ever be secured. Japan would scarcely grant autonomy without a complete change of heart and the overthrow of the military party in Japan, and, of course, the revolt may be a flat failure and secure nothing.

This is a disappointment. We have not the remotest thought of meddling in politics, and we can not hold any brief in defense of Christians who have deliberately committed themselves to a program of revolutionary agitation, but it is maddening to have to stand by and see unarmed and unresisting people treated with brutality and violence and even shot down indiscriminately and to know that these things are daily occurring in all parts of the country.

As we look toward the future we need scarcely point out to you that, if and when reforms in administration are granted, any possible pressure that can be brought to bear in the proper quarter should be exerted to secure real religious liberty in Korea. There has not been such liberty in the past, either in regard to Christian propaganda or in Christian education in private schools, as you are aware.

—

EXHIBIT III.

As a sample of the way in which the local Japanese press is dealing with the situation, we give here a translation of an editorial in a recent edition of the Shosen Shinmun:

"The stirring up of the minds of the Koreans is the sin of American missionaries. This uprising is their work. In investigating the causes of the uprising two or three missionaries have been arrested and have been examined. There are a good many shallow-minded people among the missionaries, and they make the minds of the Koreans bad, and they plant the seeds of democracy. So the greater part of the 300,000 Korean Christians do not like the union of Japan and Korea, but they are waiting for an opportunity for freedom.

"These missionaries look upon the present Korean as they did upon the old Korean, and they consider it proper for the Koreans to say anything they want, if only they enter the Christian schools. They take the statement of Wilson about the 'self-determination of nations' and hide behind their religion and stir up the people.

"The missionaries have tried to apply the free customs of other nations to these Korean people, who are not wholly civilized. From the part that even girl students in Christian schools have taken, it is evident that this uprising has come from the missionaries.

"Behind this uprising, we see the ghost-like appearance of waving his wand. This ghost is really hateful, malicious, fierce. Who is this ghost wearing the dark clothes? The missionaries and the head of the Chuntokyo. These missionaries have come out of the American Nation. They have sold themselves for the petty salary of some 300 yen ($150) per year, and they have crept out like reptiles on their belly as far as Korea. There is nothing of good that can be said of their knowledge, character, and disposition.

"These messengers of God are only after money and are sitting around their homes with a full stomach. The bad things of the world all start from such trash as these. They planned this dirty work, and got into league with the Chuntokyo. If we take all this into consideration these missionaries are all hated brutes.

"Why no public apology in the press? No wonder John Thomas was so brutally attacked. They would not believe him brutal."

—

EXHIBIT IV.

(Statement by ———.)

On the night of March 2, and the early morning of March 3, 1919, before any demonstration occurred in Hamheung city, a number of the students and one teacher of the Christian school were arrested and taken to the police station.

On Monday, the 3d, it is said that the stores were ordered closed by the police. This caused a large number of people to congregate on the main streets. Some one in the crowd blew a bugle, and with this the crowd shouted, "Three cheers for the independence of Korea," and waved Korean flags. Students from the different schools in the city were present and a large number of them were arrested. On this day Japanese firemen appeared with the fire-fighting lance hooks, but no one was seriously hurt.

On March 4, about 12.30 noon, loud cheering was again participated in by the Koreans. With this cheer the Japanese fire brigade was let loose among the crowds with clubs; some carried pickax handles; others their long lance fire hooks, some iron bars, others hardwood and pine clubs, some with short-handled club hooks. They rushed into the crowds, clubbing them over the heads, hooking them here and there with their lance hooks, until in a short time many had been seriously wounded, and with blood streaming down their faces were dragged to the police station by the fire brigade.

Among those so treated was a young man named Chai Kyusae, a student and a younger brother of one of the Korean policemen. He was crying as if in great pain; his head hung to one side from a terrible wound in the left side of his head; blood was streaming down his face. This man was sent home after a few days in a critical condition.

Another man was being dragged along toward the police station by two Japanese firemen. Across his head was the mark of a violent blow, and his face was knocked out of shape from a blow on the left side, from which blood was flowing. His left leg also hung limp, and he, too, groaned in pain. This man is a Christian, about 50 years of age. After treatment in the hospital for several days he was set free by the police with no charge against him. His name is Chai Haksung.

Another of those dragged to the police station was Fak Yichin, a student from one of the non-Christian schools. His skull was so badly crushed that after a few days he was sent out in apparently a dying condition to the home of his friends.

On this same day at least seven Korean men and a number of girls were taken to the police station in a pitiful condition from the wounds received.

While these scenes were being enacted the police and gendarmes seemed to take no part in the arrests, but simply kept guard over the Japanese fire brigade as they clubbed and arrested the Koreans.

So far as was seen there was no resistance made by the Koreans; they neither lifted a stick nor hurled a stone to defend themselves, nor did they utter a word of abuse against the Japanese.

On March 6 the stores in Hamheung were still closed and consequently a large number of people were out on the streets. Near the cattle market cheering was again indulged in, and with this the Japanese fire brigade again rushed out with their clubs. A number were clubbed and arrested, among whom was one Pyon Eung Kwan. He was struck on the back of the head with a club and was carried, apparently dead, to the police station. Even on this occasion not a stone or a stick was raised by a Korean; not even a word of abuse was heard. After a few days Pyon was sent home a free man, but with no redress.

A few days later, it is said on reliable information, about 10 miles out from Hamheung on market day the Koreans cheered as they had done in Hamheung. They were not interfered with by the police, and after they had cheered the police officer spoke a few kind words to them and they all went home. It is also said that on March 13 the Koreans at Sinheung on market day cheered for Korea. The police opened fire on the defenseless crowd and four were killed and four were wounded. Among the killed was a woman who, at the time, was passing with a jar of water on her head. The sight of the dead and wounded wallowing in their blood so exasperated the Koreans that they stoned the gendarmes.

Four Koreans are reported killed at Sungdok, near Hamheung.

During these days a large number have been arrested, among whom are many leading Christians. This is, in brief, what has happened in Hamheung and vicinity up to the 15th of March.

I was an eyewitness to what happened on March 4, as hereinabove stated.

—

EXHIBIT V.

DECLARATIONS REGARDING ATROCITIES.

(Original signed by ———.)

At Suna Ub.

During the first days of the demonstration in March a crowd of two or three hundred people visited the gendarme station at Suna Ub, Whanghai Province, and told the gendarmes that the country had declared its independence and that they should leave. The gendarmes replied that, of course, if the country had secured its independence they would leave, but that they would need to receive orders from Seoul before they could do so. This satisfied the crowd and it left. A matter of two hours later another crowd of people came and made the same demand. This time the gendarmes opened fire on them and killed five people. A number of others were wounded and thrown into the prison. Later on an old man went to the gendarme station to protest against the treatment meted out to the Koreans. This man the gendarmes shot dead. His wife came in and, finding the body, sat down beside it, wailing, as is the custom of the Koreans. She was told to keep still, and not doing so was also killed. That day or the next morning the daughter of this couple, going to the gendarme station, was slashed with a sword. The wounded men who had been thrown into prison were kept two days; a little bit of rice given them, but not a bit of water. They were in such terrible thirst that they say they drank their own urine. After two days they were turned out by the gendarmes, and some of them were taken over to the Suan Mining Co.'s hospital at Tulmichang. Their wounds having had no proper treatment, gangrene had set in. One man had a bad wound in the thigh which was gangrenous. Another had to have his arm amputated at the shoulder because of the poisoned condition due to neglect after he had been wounded. Of the men who were brought to the hospital one man was about 39 years of age; the others were over 60 years of age.

At Maungsan.

During the first part of March, after the people at this place had shouted for independence, 56 people were asked by the gendarmes to come to the gendarme station, which they did. When they were all inside the gendarmerie compound the gates were closed, gendarmes climbed upon the wall, and shot all the people down. Then they went in among them and bayoneted all who still lived. Of the 56, 53 were killed, and 3 were able later to crawl out of the heap of dead. Whether they lived or not is not known. A Christian woman, in whom we have confidence, made her way to foreign friends after several days' travel and made the above statement. Undoubtedly it is true.

At Anju.

On the night of the — of March, when the people had shouted for independence, but had used no violence at all, the police and gendarmes fired on them and killed seven and wounded many others. These were taken to the local hospital. Later the police visited all the houses in the city looking for those who had taken part in the demonstrations. When they did not find them often they beat the women and dragged them about by their hair. One woman had seven teeth knocked out. The mother of one of the wounded men having told a policeman that if her son died she would take revenge on him, this policeman went to her house and again stabbed her son, who was lying on the floor wounded. The people having protested to the magistrate, he admitted that he had done badly, and the woman whose teeth had been knocked out was able to identify the man who had done it.

At Pan Suk.

To-day, March 29, 1919, I visited the village of Pan Suk, 16 miles to the east of Pyengyang. Here at the edge of the village of some 50 houses is a church and schoolhouse combined. On the 7th of March was held one of the independence demonstrations. Soldiers came and pulled over the bell tower, breaking the bell. With the clapper of the bell and other means they broke all but three of the many panes of glass in the 20 or more three by five windows in the building. They broke the lamps and the pulpit and destroyed all the Bibles and hymn books. Five men and one woman were stripped of all clothing and beaten with guns and with clubs. One man was burnt with matches. The house of the school-teacher was broken into; the chest in which his clothes were was smashed and the clothes burnt. Several were arrested. One man of between 50 and 60 years was taken to Kyengyang and beaten till he died, about the 26th of March. On the 24th of March soldiers came to the village near by, looking for one of the elders of the church. Not being able to find him, they took his wife, a bright looking woman of about 30. They led her, with her 2-year-old baby, to a near-by grove and attempted to force her to tell where her husband was. She would not tell. No doubt she did not know, as the leaders of the church have fled. They stripped her of all her clothing and beat her without mercy. I talked with the woman to-day and she was still stiff and sore from the beating.

At Keng Syo.

On Sunday, March 30, 1919, Rev. ——— and Miss ——— went to Keng Syo. They found, as they said, "A pretty bad condition." The people had not waited for the arrival of the missionaries in the afternoon, but at 11 a. m. had met for Sunday school. As about 25 were praying, soldiers came in, stuck their guns through four panes of glass, beat the keeper, and arrested four men and three women. None of these were officials, the officials either all having been arrested or having fled long ago.

—

EXHIBIT VI.

(Statement by ———.)

On Wednesday, March 19, 1919, I telegraphed to our Korean preacher at Kokei that I would be coming to Kokei on the following day, object being to see the property of the Oriental Missionary Society, of which I am the superintendent in Chosen.

On Thursday, March 20, 1919, I arrived at Kokei at about 3 p. m., in company with my Korean helper, who can speak the Japanese language fluently. Our preacher there had already informed the police of my intended visit. We had tea at a Japanese hotel and ordered

our supper for 6.30 p. m. At about 4 o'clock I went to examine the preacher's house and mission, and while standing outside, examining the land with the object of making some alterations, we saw about five young lads running down the hill, yelling "Mansei." They ran past us, waving flags, and disappeared. We thought no more of the incident, but a few minutes later four soldiers carrying rifles rushed up, followed by several policemen. They took hold of us and beat us, and kicked us mercilessly, refusing to hear of explanation, and started to take us to the police station. On the way I showed the policeman, who was dragging me about, my passport and police certificate issued by the Seoul police on the 17th inst., but instead of examining it, he threw it on the ground. I endeavored to pick it up, but was struck and beaten on the head and kicked, and one Japanese man from the crowd, which consisted of many Japanese and many Koreans looking on, hit me with a long heavy stick as thick as a man's arm. My two Korean helpers were beaten very cruelly, one of them being struck on the face, causing a wound from which blood flowed. On my arrival at the police station I saw the police again cuff and kick my Korean helpers. I was then taken to a room by myself. I remonstrated with a Korean who appeared to be a police officer, and asked that my passport might be found, and at 5.30 they brought it to me. Then the chief of police (a Japanese) came in, and I spoke to him through the Korean officer. He asked me a great many questions and then asked me to return to my hotel, saying he was sorry, which I refused to do, as the crowd was still outside. I told him I had nothing to do with the boys, who had only run past where I was standing. I heard the Korean officer say that the five boys had been examined and they said they did not even know that a foreigner was in the town.

At 8.15, after I had had some food from my bag, which had been brought to me from the hotel, the chief of police again said he was sorry and that they had made a mistake. He brought me two papers, written in Japanese, and asked me to sign them. I refused, not knowing what they were about. My Korean helpers, who had already signed the papers, came and asked me to sign, saying that if I did the police would let me go. I absolutely refused to sign, though they tried to persuade me to do so for about a quarter of an hour. Then, as the train left at 8.40, they sent for two rickshas, and escorted by two policemen we went to the railway station and caught the train for Taiden, where I stayed the night.

—

EXHIBIT VII.

STORIES OF WOUNDED KOREANS IN SEVERANCE HOSPITAL.

(Interviewed by ———.)

MARCH 29, 1919.

(1) Ri In Ok, a student, 19 years old, from Anju, was wounded in the left leg by a bullet. On March 2 he, with many other students, joined a crowd, perhaps 4,000 strong, and shouted the cry of independence, whereupon approaching the office of the gendarmes about seven Japanese gendarme officers came out and began firing at the crowd. Many shots were fired and 8 men were killed and 20 wounded among the Koreans. The rifle firing dispersed the crowd, who had shown no violence, carried no stones, sticks, or weapons. This young man went to the local Korean hospital, but after superficial treatment was advised to go to the Christian hospital in Seoul, where he could get satisfactory treatment and the bullet could be located. He arrived in Seoul on March 5 and was at once admitted and successfully operated on by the resident surgeons. No religious belief at all.

(2) No Chong Yun, aged 61, a farmer, living just outside Anju, was in the same crowd as above student, and his statement coincides with his, though questioned independently. This man was also shot in the leg, the right one. Asked why he did not go to the Pyengyang Hospital, he replied that he was afraid of the Japanese there, lest they would arrest and further illtreat him. This man also had no special religious belief and did not belong to any church, native or foreign. He came to the hospital on March 5 and was immediately treated by the doctors.

(3) Kim Nam San, aged 27, of Paiju: Went from his village on market day to the local market at Kong Ung with many of his neighbors. There a crowd of about 1,000 gathered, shouting the cry of independence. It was not long before the gendarme force appeared, comprising six Japanese and two Koreans; the former only carried rifles. As the crowd continued to shout, the Japanese fired many times, killing four and wounding three (as far as he knew). He, with others, were running away when a bullet struck him in the shoulder and he fell over. The Koreans used no violence and no weapons, sticks, or stones. This man has no religious belief and does not attend any church or society.

(4) Ko Myen Man, aged 25, lives in Whanghaido. He went to the magistrate's town on March 23, and, joining a crowd of several hundred, shouted the independence cry in front of the magistrate's office. Upon this, gendarmes and police came out with clubs, swords, and guns. They rushed upon the crowd, striking down many with clubs and swords, and also fired their rifles, killing at least 3 and wounding 20 or more. Upon this, the crowd ran away. This man refused to go to the Japanese hospital, but went to the Korean local hospital; but the doctor could do little for him. He recommended him to come up to Severance. He came on March 24 and was immediately attended to and is now recovering. He had a gunshot wound in the upper part of his leg. He has no religious belief and attends no church.

(5) Ri Tol Sa of Duksan, aged 23, said that in the evening about 300 or so villagers gathered and went around the neighborhood shouting the cry of independence. They came to the gendarme station and there, without any violence, stood shouting and waving the Korean flag. The officers of the gendarmes, through the Korean interpreters, asked them to go away. While this was going on motor cars arrived from Seoul (3 or 4 miles away) with a number of gendarmes. Then suddenly about 15 gendarmes came out and fired on the people. As far as he knows 1 was killed and 12 wounded. This man was wounded in the foot. He said that some Korean gendarmes had guns, but he did not know whether they fired or not. All of the crowd were of the working class. He came into the hospital and received immediate attention the next morning (Mar. 26). This man is not associated with any church or sect.

(6) Ri Kai Tong, aged 27, of above village, corroborated the above statement, though in a separate ward. This man was shot in the leg.

(7) Yum Tek Chang, of above village, aged 35, gave similar evidence. He was shot in arm and side. No religion.

(8) Song Yunk Pak, aged 21, of same place. Shot through upper lip. Also indorsed above statements. No religion.

(9) Kang Yong Ie, aged 36, terribly wounded by being shot at close quarters; leg smashed. Gave same account as above. No religion. He is from Duksan.

(10) A man terribly injured in head. Could not give any account of his accident. He is lying in semiconscious state.

(11) Cha Oh Kyun, aged 36, of Ko Yang, about 8 or 9 miles from Seoul, wounded in lower left arm. The stores in the village had closed in sympathy with the desire for independence, but were ordered by local gendarmes (Japanese) to reopen. They refused, and next day about 70 men and boys went up the hill behind the village and shouted the independence cry. The local gendarmes, a Japanese and a Korean, came out, and the Japanese fired. This man was shot and the others ran away. The Koreans used no violence, had no stones or sticks, only a Korean flag or two. This man said that the local gendarmes used to be fairly friendly. He did not belong to any church or sect, though once used to attend the Chundokyo meetings, but had not for some time. He came to the hospital on March 28 and promptly received attention.

(12) An Tong An, 54, of Ko Yang Koon, was struck on arm with a sword in its scabbard, and when down on the ground was beaten with clubs. He said that 500 or so gathered in the neighborhood and, after marching around, shouted the independence cry outside the gendarmes' office. A number of Japanese gendarmes (so he thought) were there in civilian clothes, and very soon 5 mounted policemen, 5 gendarmes with guns, and 20 civilians (private clothes policemen), rushed down on the crowd. This was after the gendarme officer told them to go, threatening them with his revolver, whereupon the crowd said they were not afraid of that. The Koreans used no violence and did not carry sticks or stones. He came to the hospital March 28 and had prompt attention. He has no religious beliefs.

(13) Kim Kwang Un, aged 72, of Anak, went to On Chang market, and, with others, perhaps 500 or 600, called "Mansei." The head gendarme exhorted them to go away, hit several, and insulted others with bad names. At this the crowd surged round and asked why he should strike the people, and as there were several arrested in the gendarme station they asked for their release. The crowd would not disperse, so two Japanese and two Korean gendarmes came out and fired, killing 3 and wounding many, perhaps 20. Then the Koreans, enraged, threw stones at the station, and the gendarmes continued to fire from behind the fence. This man was shot in the shoulder. He tried to get to Seoul, and was arrested at Chinnampo, hands tied, and he was beaten and insulted and questioned as to who told him to go to Severance. The same thing happened at Chai Ryung Ub, but after telling him to go to the Japanese hospital they found that he was not to be frightened and let him go. He came to Seoul and was given immediate help. He is a member of the Presbyterian Church.

(14) Song Yun Pok, of Duksan, aged 21. Shot in face. Broken half of bullet extracted from upper jawbone behind. Gave same evidence as other men from Duksan.

(15) Koo Nak Saw, admitted in frightfully mutilated condition. Died after two hours. Got no particulars from him.

(16) Ri Nam Kee, aged 22, of Paju, beaten with clubs so badly that we could get no information from him as to particulars of wounds. Admitted on Saturday, March 29, and died at 1, Sunday afternoon.

(Statements taken by ———.)

(17) Sung Yong, aged 16, lives near the river at Hyum Sung Li. On the evening of the 23d of March, at 10 p. m., this boy went out with a crowd of men and boys, shouting "Mansay." About 20 soldiers came to disperse them. Most of the crowd scattered. This lad dropped behind and was wounded by a bayonet in the hands of one soldier who ran ahead. Then a second soldier came up behind and thrust a bayonet into the lad's stomach. The cut was 4 or 5 inches in length on the right side of the abdomen. He was a third-year student of the Huun Sang School. He had a grandmother who had attended the Presbyterian Church. He himself had gone a few times only. His mother was not a believer.

(18) Yi Han Dom, aged 32. At See Ki Moon An, inside the little East Gate Seoul. About the 22d of March several hundred men went out without any stones or clubs and cried "Mansei." Soldiers came and fired on them. One shot him, and he will probably lose an eye.

(19) Mi Syun Myung, aged 33, a rice huller. At Tukum went out with a crowd of about 500 men, unarmed. Yelled "Mansei." Four gendarmes came on the scene, fired, killing one and wounding eight others, of whom he was one. Not a member of any church or of the Chundokyo. He was shot through both legs with one bullet.

(20) Chung Yung Heui, aged 34, lives in the county of Paiju. On March 28, at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, a crowd of 400, yelling "Mansei," were met by Japanese gendarmes, who fired. Eight men were killed. They had done no violence, and were not even armed with rocks. This man was shot through the neck.

(21) Yu Yung Kun, aged 42, a leader of the Sin San Lee Presbyterian Church in Paiju county, 65 li from Seoul. A crowd of probably 1,000 men went out with bare hands to cry "Mansei." He was shot by Japanese gendarmes, who followed, shooting as they ran. Three were killed and three wounded. This man was shot through the side of the neck.

(22) Koo Chun Myun, a farmer, aged 34, went out with a crowd of 500 or 600 at Kwang ju Ub on 27th of March at 1 p. m. The gendarmes fired, and this man was hit on the jaw and a large part of the jawbone shot away. Three were killed, and this man severely wounded.

—

EXHIBIT VIII.

(Interviewed by ———.)

APRIL 1–5, 1919.

(1) Song Si Ung, of Po Chun, aged 47, gave same evidence as previous man. (See No. 16, Series 1.) This man was shot in top of skull. Bullet extracted by Dr. Ludlow. No religion.

(2) Syung Myeng Ni, aged 32, of Duksan, was shot in leg and operated on by Dr. Ludlow. This man is not in normal senses, so can not investigate particulars. Took part in crowd shouting, as others above. No religion.

(3) San Syen Nan, aged 27, of Po Chun, San Myen, Syen Tai Li. Went to market at Solmoo Chang on market day, and, with about 200 others, called "Mansei." The gendarmes came out, warned the people not to enter the market calling out. But the crowd continued to come on. They had no sticks or stones and showed no violence. The Korean gendarmes fired into the air, but the Japanese gendarmes fired into the crowd. Nine were killed and many injured. This man

was shot in the leg, and managed by stealth to get up to Severance. No religion.

(4) Pak Yun Nak, aged 25, of Ko Yang Kun, Chi to Nyen, Totangki, a church member in Sa Myen Church, met with all his villagers and those of other villages at the end of March, and, without violence, paraded the village, calling "Mansei." Some mounted gendarmes came from Seoul after this and told the people to stop calling and parading and to go home. This they did, and that day there was no violence or trouble. Five days later a number of gendarmes from Seoul came down, and, going from house to house, inquired if the occupant had called "Mansei" on the previous occasion. This man replied "yes, but we stopped and went home when you told us to." This man and many others were arrested and taken to Seoul. At the governor general's (he said, not the prison) he and many others were taken out and flogged. I saw the bruises on his body. He received 60 strokes, 30 at 12 o'clock and 30 at 2 o'clock. Many others received like treatment. He is now in the hospital awaiting attention.

The following young men gave exactly the same evidence:

(5) Chung Hung Pong, aged 16.

(6) Ri Chun Sai, aged 21.

(7) Chang Oo Sang, aged 24.

(8) Pak Cha Kwo, aged 41, of E. Chun Ub, Ri Chung Moon, Umnai Myen, Pang Ko Ri, arrived in hospital April 3 with bad bullet wound through neck. Was attended to immediately and life saved. He, with others, shouted on market day. There was a big crowd but no violence shown. In the evening they were attacked by the Japanese gendarmes and many killed and wounded. This man's neck was in such bad condition that he could hardly speak and so could not give much evidence.

(9) Kim Kum Tung, a lad of 15 years (13 western count) of Choong Chong Do, was brought to the hospital on the back of his father. He was shot through the thigh and forearm. The father gave the following account: The little village, as arranged, went out on the evening of April 1, and shouted "Mansei." About midnight fires were lit on the hills, and shouts went up, but no violence was shown. Presently eight Japanese gendarmes appeared and fired on this band of 20 men and boys, with the result that one was killed and 13 wounded.

(10) Pang Choon Ho, 25 years, of above village, shot in leg, gave similar evidence as above. His younger brother, Pang Sin Sik, aged 21, was shot in many places on legs and arms, and his elder brother was killed.

(11) Pak Syung Koon, aged 44, of above village, gave a like account of the shooting affray. This man was shot with B. B. shot. He was struck in many places.

(12) Ri Pok Yun, aged 26, of Suwon, said that on the last of March he joined a crowd of from 300 to 350 villagers from the neighborhood. They paraded through the villages until they came to the Myen So (district local office). There the Myen Jang (village headman) joined them, and they went on to the police office. The Korean officer in charge came out and said, "Because I am a policeman in the Government employ and wearing a uniform I can not join you, but my heart is with you. Go on, call out 'Mansei,' and I hope we will get independence." Going a little farther they were suddenly approached by three Japanese soldiers, who fired, wounding two men, who fell. The other demonstrators ran away, but on seeing that two of their neighbors were wounded, 40 or 50 of them came back. These were at once arrested under threat, tied together, and taken to the Suwon police station. There they were kept for two days, searched, examined, and beaten from 50 to 90 strokes, and then sent home. The two wounded men were also sent home. In the meantime a Japanese doctor had looked at the wounded men and tied up this patient's leg, which had a bullet wound, with cotton wool. He came to Severance Hospital on April 4. The crowd did no violence, he asserts, simply waved the Korean flag and shouted the independence cry.

EXHIBIT IX.

DEATH OF A KOREAN YOUNG MAN BY NAME OF KOO NAK SOH.

On March 27, at about 9 p. m., a large body of young men gathered at Andong, Seoul, and shouted "Mansei." The shouting had continued for a few minutes when a large force of police gendarmes and soldiers arrived and dispersed them. The above-named young man, like the others, was peacefully going home and alone, was walking along a small street when suddenly some one pushed him violently in the back, causing him to stumble and fall. His assailant was a policeman, who had seen him in the crowd and followed him to the place where he thought fit to make the attack. After throwing him to the ground the policeman drew his sword and literally hacked at him "like a woodsman would attack a rough old oak." His skull was cut right through so that the brain was visible. This had been accomplished by at least three sword cuts falling in or near the same place. His hands were terribly cut; his left wrist was also cut through to the bone. Those who saw the corpse stated that there were 20 sword cuts, but the photograph only reveals 10.

After this brutal attack on this unarmed and defenseless young man the officer ran away, leaving him in his terrible agony to expire in a few minutes. Some Koreans, happening to pass by, carried him to the nearest native hospital (Kuck Chai Hospital), but little could be done, so they placed him on a stretcher and started out for the Severance Union Medical College, still thinking that his life might be saved. Waile hurrying to the Severance Hospital they were stopped by a policeman from the Honmachi police station, who spoke to them in a threatening way and did all he could to prevent the case being taken to a foreign hospital. They remonstrated, saying that the case was so serious that a delay in taking the man to the Japanese hospital, which was some distance away, would surely result fatally. The Japanese are naturally anxious that such cases should not be seen by foreigners. On arriving at the Severance Hospital, medical examination revealed the fact that the man was already dead. It is impossible to say just when he died. His dead body presented the most pitiful appearance. Numbers of sword cuts had mutilated his head and hands. His clothing was saturated with blood—indeed, a sight never to be forgotten.

During the following day his little cousin, a mission-school girl, stood watch over his body in the morgue; nothing would persuade her to leave the remains of the one she loved. Another life has been sacrificed for the cause of Korean liberty. "We hope that the great God who sees cur pitiful state will come ere long and judge in righteousness and justice."

(NOTE.—The deaths so far are estimated at about 1,000, while those in prison number about 6,000. The people have not one rifle or sword among them. They lift up their empty hands and call upon God and all those who knowing Him love righteousness and justice.)

EXHIBIT X.

STATEMENT CONCERNING REMOVAL OF WOUNDED MEN FROM SEVERANCE HOSPITAL, APRIL 10.

(By ———.)

During the forenoon of April 10 a gendarme sergeant named H. Inouye called at the office and stated that the police wished to examine certain of the wounded men at our hospital, and asked that these men be sent to the Yamadomachi gendarmes office for examination.

The request being reported to Dr. Avison, he said that the question of their removal would have to be determined by the surgeon, Dr. Ludlow, and suggested that the examination take place at the hospital rather than that the men be subjected to the dangers of a transfer. To this they agreed, requesting that a private room be arranged where the examination could be conducted privately. They thought it might take one hour for each man.

In the afternoon, Gendarme Sergt. H. Nagase, accompanied by nine gendarmes, came to the hospital and presented his card and a list of seven names of men who were to be examined. Dr. Ludlow was called in order that he might determine whether the cases could be removed from their beds to this room. Such as could be removed were examined in the room, while the others were examined at the bedside. The examination was completed in much less time than had been anticipated, so that they were through with it about 5.30 p. m., I think.

Sergt. Nagase then said he would take five men with him for further examination, leaving two with us, providing we would undertake to notify the police department 24 hours before their being ready for discharge. Dr. Avison called Dr. Ludlow and asked him to state whether these patients could be safely removed. Dr. Ludlow stated that none of them ought to be removed at this time. The officer said they had a doctor at the police department who would make the dressings and look after the treatment. Dr. Ludlow then objected in particular to the removal of three out of the five men, and after a time they consented to leaving one of those three. After further conversation they consented to leave another, taking with them three men, as follows:

Yum Myung Suk, gunshot wounds in abdomen and arm.

Song Yung Pok, gunshot wound in face—bullet extracted.

Yee Myung Keui, gunshot wounds in groin and thigh.

Four men were left in charge of the hospital superintendent, Miss Esteb, with directions that 24 hours previous to their being ready for discharge the police department should be notified. They are as follows:

Yi Kai Dong, gunshot wounds, right thigh and left knee.

Kang Yong Yi, gunshot wound, thigh, large portion torn away.

Kim Il Nam, gunshot wounds, both thighs and cheek.

Ryoo Soon Nyung, gunshot wounds, both thighs.

STORY OF TORTURE BY RELEASED MALE PRISONER.

On the 1st day of March, 1919, at 9 o'clock, a demonstration began, starting from the Nandaimon Station and proceeding toward and through the South Gate. The demonstrators were calling "Mansei" as they ran. I happened to be in the vicinity when the demonstrations started, and, impelled by patriotic impulses, I joined the crowd and proceeded with them for some distance. I then returned to the railway station district, and some policemen, noticing perspiration on my forehead and neck, arrested me as a demonstrator. Three Japanese gendarmes took me to police headquarters, where I spent the night in a cell.

About 10 o'clock the next morning I was called before a procurator and examined. I was asked: "Why did you shout 'Mansei'?" I replied, "I was so glad to hear about the independence of Chosen that I joined in the shout." "Who instructed you to do so?" "There was nobody who instructed me; I did it of my own accord." "In that case," he replied, "you have not only violated the peace, but are a real rioter. You shall be punished, you may be sure of that." I replied, "You may punish me according to law." "Are you a Christian?" he asked. "Yes; I am."

After this I was taken to an inner quarter and shut up for two days and nights. About 11 o'clock in the morning of the third day I was released, after being admonished.

Two days after I was released a friend called at my home, and I dined with him that evening. I talked to him about a letter I had received from a friend of mine in America. My friend asked if he could read the letter, and I showed it to him. He asked me to let him take it away with him, but I did not want him to take it. Then he said, "If you will let me have it, I can stir up the students in the Y. M. C. A. Industrial School. I can reach thousands of people. The students of that school are employed everywhere. I can also reach those employed in the tobacco factories. I can make this letter of use in helping the independence movement." I replied that I was sorry I could not let him have it. I bade him good-bye.

Next morning about 10 o'clock two gendarmes came to my home to arrest me. I went along with them, and was imprisoned in the police headquarters. About three hours after being locked up I was brought before an examiner. The procurator asked, "Do you know your crime?" I replied, "No; I do not know my crime." He said angrily, "You must tell about the communication between you and your friend in America. If you do not, you will be punished by torture." "I have had nothing to do with it at all," I replied. At this the gendarmes who were standing near me struck me on the face with their hands. This made me indignant, and I kicked them repeatedly. For this they beat me terribly. The procurator interrupted the mêlée, and I was put in solitary confinement. Torture apparatus was placed near me. Soon after I was put in a press in an upright posture, the sides of the press contracting as a wheel on the back was turned. I was then told to reveal the truth. But I continued to maintain my innocence. I kept on protesting, and said, "Kill me if you like." I was again put in the press, which was screwed so tightly I could scarcely breathe. Still I protested my innocence to the end. They said, "This man is a knave," and threatened to kill me.

After this they took the middle finger of my right hand, tied strong cord around it, passed the end of the cord over a board near the ceiling, and pulled on the cord until my whole body was hanging by the finger, only the tips of my toes touching the floor. I gradually became unconscious. When I awoke I found myself lying on the floor, and do not know how long I had been left suspended. I felt my forehead and found it wet with perspiration. Although I could scarcely move my body, I tried to make myself as comfortable as I could.

The following morning about 11 o'clock I was again brought out for examination, and after being admonished was released the second time. My home had been searched, and no evidence of any kind had been found.

My hand was in a swollen condition, and I went to a Korean doctor for treatment for several days. Not receiving much benefit, I came to the Severance Dispensary, where I received treatment in the surgical department.

EXHIBIT XI.

THE EXPERIENCE OF A KOREAN GIRL UNDER ARREST BY THE POLICE.

(Statement by ———.)

It was on the 5th of March that I with others, who for the liberty of our loved land formed into a procession at the South Gate, and as a token that we were ready to shed our blood for liberty wore red belts and red bands on our arms. We were marching from the station toward Chongno, cheering and shouting "Mansei!" As we were nearing the Dok-su Palace all of a sudden a Japanese policeman seized me from behind by my hair, and I was violently thrown to the ground. He kicked me several times with his merciless foot. At this I was rendered almost unconscious. He rushed me along by my hair, and I was led to the Chongno Police Department. At the entrance of the police office 20 or more Japanese policemen who stood in line sneered and kicked me and struck me with their swords and struck me in the face so many times that I became almost unconscious. The cruelty was so great that at times I did not realize whether they were beating me or some one else. This was really more than I was able to bear. My hands and legs were bleeding terribly. My body was black and blue from their blows.

I was led into a room, and here again I was handled brutally, as before. They dragged me on the floor, they struck me in the face, they struck me with their swords, they flung me to one corner of the room. At this point I must have been completely unconscious, as I do not remember what happened after that.

On recovering my senses I found myself in a room packed with young men and women. I saw some of them handled so brutally it almost broke my heart to see them beaten. After some time we were cross-examined by a police officer one by one. It is beyond my power to convey to another person how those cross-examinations were carried on. I was made to kneel down with my legs bound together, and each question and answer was accompanied alternately by blows in the face. They spit in my face. This with curses and invectives of the worst kind. He said, "You prostitute, you vile, pregnant girl!" I was ordered to expose my breasts, but refusing they tore my upper garment from me, and I was told all sorts of inhuman things which shocked me terribly. They tied my fingers together and jerked them violently. This made me feel as if my fingers were being torn from my hand. I shut my eyes and dropped down on the floor. Thereupon the examining officers uttered a loud, angry roar and ordered me to kneel down as before, then rushed at me, seizing me by the breast, and struck me violently. Is there anything to be compared with this inhuman treatment? He then said, "You want independence, eh? Preposterous thought. You will get independence when you are locked in jail. Your life will vanish with a stroke of the sword." He then shook me fiercely by the hair. He pulled me by the ear. But he was not satisfied even with this, so he beat me on the head with a stick without mercy. They made me extend my hand and hold up a heavy chair, which, if I let drop, he would strike my elbow with a stick. He made me kneel down near a window with the chair held up as before. If the chair was lowered or it touched the windowpane, he would come and strike me. An hour or so was passed in this manner, when I was told to go down the stairs. I found that I was completely exhausted. I could not walk. I crawled on the floor with much difficulty, even with the help of one of their professional spies, who followed me. I arose and attempted to go downstairs. As I made the first step down my strength gave out, and so I rolled down the whole length of the stairs. I was again unconscious.

On recovering my senses I was obliged to crawl into a room. The policeman in charge of the room was very much amused to see me crawling into the room. He laughed loudly at my misery. Then I prayed and seemed to see Jesus and was much comforted from on high. I thank the Lord for the comfort he gave me at this time.

I spent five days in all at the police station. Then I was sent to the West Gate penitentiary. There I was stripped naked and was looked at by the men. Then I was allowed to put on my dress and was led into a room. I was sneered at and cursed beyond my power to realize. In this room there were sixteen persons who were like myself. The room was not very large, and so we were densely packed together. The toilet arrangements are placed in the room just like the pig's shelter. The room was so filthy that it was not fit even for pigs. We were given beans and salt to eat. While we were eating now and then some one would look in and call us all sorts of names—"You dogs!" "You pigs!" etc.

On the second day a person called the police doctor and several others came in and weighed me stripped naked. They, too, sneered and spat upon me. Now and then I was told by the keeper there that I would be tried publicly. I looked forward to that with a great deal of consolation, as I thought I would have some chance to state my case without reserve, but, alas, I was let out one day without trial and without being told the nature of my offense, or indeed that there had been legal offense.

—

EXHIBIT XII.

STORY OF RELEASED GIRL PRISONER.

(Reported by ———.)

To-day, March 28, 1919, a girl, ———, about 21 years of age, came to our home and told the following: "I was arrested on the streets of Pyengyang the 3d of March and taken to the police station. There were many others, both men and women. They asked if we smoked, if we drank, and if we were Christians. Soon all were let out with little or no punishment, with the exception of 12 Methodist women, 2 Presbyterians, and 1 Chun Do Kyo woman. Three of the Methodist women were Bible women. They stripped all the women naked in the presence of many men. They found nothing against me, except that I had been on the street and had shouted 'Mansei.' They beat me until the perspiration stood out all over my body. Then they said, 'Oh, you are hot,' and threw cold water over my naked body. My arms were pulled tight behind my back and tied. Then they beat me again until my body was covered with perspiration, and then threw the cold water over me. Then, saying I was cold, they stuck me with the lighted end of their cigarettes. (Some were stuck with hot irons.) My offense was very little compared with those who made flags, took part in the independence, etc. Some were beaten until they were unconscious. One young woman was just at the time of her monthly sickness. She resisted having her clothes taken off. They tore off her clothing and beat her all the harder—but did not pour the cold water on her. After four days we were taken to the prison. Here we were packed in a room with men and women. One day an old man was beaten until he died. One of the Bible women was right next to him. She asked to be moved, but they compelled her to watch the dead body all night. One of the Bible women not only had her hands bound but had her feet put in stocks. They took our Bibles away and would not allow us to talk or pray. They made vile and indecent remarks to us. All this was done by the Japanese. Though there were Korean policemen in the room they took no part in the beating or in the vileness. The Japanese know the Bible and blaspheme the name of Christ, and asked us if there was not a man by the name of Saul who was put in prison. They asked us most of all as to what the foreigners had said, and were most vile and cruel to those who had been with the missionaries, or who had taught in the mission schools. Some of the girls were so changed that they did not look like persons."

Later, one of the above women died in the prison. (This not confirmed.)

—

EXHIBIT XIII.

BRUTALITIES AT TAIKU.

(Statement by ———.)

On March 8, when occurred the demonstration here and many arrests were made, a young man by name of Kim Yong Nai, the son of the elder helper of the Third City Church, and a regular member of the same, was seized by a Japanese officer, thrown to the ground, and, while prostrate, was kicked several times on the head and back of the neck. He was bleeding profusely when led into the police station. The above I have from an eyewitness.

He was kept in jail for two weeks. During this time, the eyewitness referred to, who was in the next cell and was released at the same time, testifies that he heard his friend cry out a number of times at the pain of punishment which was inflicted upon him in jail, which frequently took the form of beating one on the head with the iron key of the cell. When released, he still complained of his head. In a few days after his release he was taken sick, and complained that he suffered terrible pain in his head and that it "seemed as if all one side of his head was gone." He became delirious and died after an illness of about 10 days. The night he died he was protesting in his delirium that he was innocent and that his punishment was too severe. The doctor who attended him states that he died from blows on the head. I saw the body and the neck and the base of the skull was darkly discolored. He was a secretary to a Japanese lawyer and very widely known in the city. His father is still in jail and another member of the family is at the point of death.

Among the demonstrators at a magisterial town near here three men were shot dead and a number wounded and some 40 or 50 taken prisoners. Among the wounded I have seen one and have the following story direct from him: In the early evening there had been a demonstration and some arrests made. Late in the evening he and some 15 others were standing at an inn, where was a man who had been wounded. Three Japanese soldiers and eight policemen gathered and ordered the men to leave. My informant's brother asked what they meant by shooting down an innocent, unarmed man. Whereupon a soldier clubbed him with his gun. Upon seeing his brother thus treated, he objected, and was fired upon and shot in the side. While blood was streaming from this wound, he again complained against such treatment, and was answered again by another shot through the neck. This second shot was fired by a local Japanese merchant, although there were at least 10 regular officers of the law present and only some 15 men gathered. I understand that two Japanese civilians did all the shooting that day and boasted of the same.

I had another personal testimony from a released prisoner of the use of the key placed between the fingers and the fingers being tied at the ends; the key is turned until the arms become paralyzed. This is the second personal testimony from eyewitnesses to this form of torture.

The reports of deaths from shooting we hear are all understated, and no record of the death or burial is made.

I spent the entire day of April 11 at the court attending the trial of some seventy-odd Christians. Among them, and recommended for six months, were some who testified that they were simply in the crowd, but had called nothing. It seemed that everything was construed in the severest form.

April 14, 1919.

—

EXHIBIT XIV.

ARTICLE IN SEOUL PRESS EXONERATING MISSIONARIES, MARCH 14, 1919.

Rumors have been rife that foreign missionaries incited the disturbances, or, at least, showed sympathy with the rioters. These rumors owe their origin to the fact that among the leaders of the rioters there have been found Christian pastors and students of mission schools, so it is not to be wondered that they gained currency. But that they are entirely groundless has been established by the result of investigations into the matter conducted by the authorities. The authorities have carried out thorough and strict inquiries concerning it and are satisfied that there is no trace whatever that foreigners instigated the disturbances. Nor is there any evidence that they knew beforehand of the occurrence of the trouble or gave support to the rioters. It is wrong to harbor suspicion against foreigners without justifiable grounds. It is still more to be condemned to spread through the press false reports and baseless accusations against foreigners, fabricating such reports and accusations out of mere suspicion. Such acts will excite the ill feeling of foreigners against Japan and may cause trouble in international relations. Should any foreigners be found guilty of sedition or similar offense, the authorities will have no hesitation in prosecuting them; but, as none have been found to be responsible for the recent trouble, people at large should cast away whatever doubt they may still entertain against them.

—

EXHIBIT XV.

THE DEMONSTRATION AT TONG CHAING.

The village of Tong Chaing contains about 300 houses. The young men of the place had been wishing to make a demonstration for some time previous, but Mr. Han, an elder in the church, and other church officers discouraged it, as they feared that there might be violence on the part of the demonstrators, there being a body of 500 miners working in the mines not far away who might take this occasion to rise against the police.

But on March 29, this being market day and many people having come in from outside, a demonstration was started by some children. Others joined in until there were four or five hundred people marching through the town and shouting "Mansei." The demonstration was entirely peaceful, no stones were thrown, and no resistance was offered to the officers of the law. The police came out and arrested 17 persons, half or more of them being Christians. Among those arrested were five women. Later on other arrests were made. The people arrested were

all taken to the police station. From this point on this account will be confined largely to the experiences of three of these women:

—— is a widow living in Tong Chaing. She is 31 years of age (Korean count), and has one child. She was in the crowd calling "Mansei," and was arrested by a Japanese policeman. She was taken into the office and a policeman tore off the underclothes and she protested. As a result they struck her in the face with her hands till she was black and blue. She clung to her underwear, and they put a wooden paddle down between her body and the underclothes to pry them away. They beat her systematically on the arms and legs with a paddle. The beating continued for some time. The police then stopped the beating and sat down to drink tea and eat Japanese cakes, meanwhile making fun of the woman sitting there naked. There were many men in the room. After about an hour they allowed her to have some of her clothes, and sent her into an adjoining room where many of the arrested people were detained. About the time the lights were lighted in the evening she was called out again into the office and put in charge of an elderly man and his wife with instructions to be responsible for her and bring her back when summoned to do so. For a week afterwards she had to lie down most of the time and could not walk around.

—— is a widow, 34 years of age, and has two children. She also had a part in the demonstration. She was arrested by a policeman. On the way to the station, though not resisting, her arm was twisted to the point of dislocation. Taken into the office at the police station, the policeman struck her in the face with his hand, then forced her into a sitting position and kicked her in the head. She fell over here and he continued kicking her. Then he forced her to stand and ordered her to take off her clothing. She took off the outer clothes, but left on the underclothes. She was ordered to remove these, but did not do so. At this point in their treatment of her the proceedings were interrupted by another outburst in the cheering out on the street, and many of the policemen went out to make further arrests. She was allowed to put on some of her clothes and was sent into the next room where those arrested were detained. She was kept there all night and released the next morning with the woman whose account is given below.

Both of the above women belonged to the middle class of Korean women, not the coolie class, and are bright, intelligent women. Both have attended the Bible Institute for a number of terms.

—— is the wife of ——. He was a teacher for a time in the ——. She is a very bright, intelligent woman. She has one child 4 years of age and is probably two or three months advanced in her second pregnancy. She had taken a small part in the demonstration, and had gone to the house of Pyo Hak Sun to comfort Pyo Hak Sun's mother, who was distressed because her daughter had been arrested. As she came out of the house several police and soldiers came into the yard. They knew she was the school-teacher and had been searching for her at the school. They accused her of trying to hide, which she denied. Asked her if she had called "Mansei," said that she had. They ordered her to leave her child, which she was carrying on her back and come with them, and she obeyed. As she stood in front of the door of the police station a policeman kicked her forcibly from behind, and she fell forward into the room. As she lay, stunned, on the floor a policeman put his foot on her head. Then he forcibly raised her up and struck her many times over the head and face. He jerked at the strings that held on her clothing and ordered her to remove her clothes. She hesitating, he tore them off forcibly, meanwhile constantly kicking and striking her. He also beat her with a heavy stick and with a paddle. He tore off her underclothes and kicked her in the chest and beat her, accusing her of setting the minds of the Korean children against Japan, and said that he intended to beat her to death. She tried to cover her nakedness with the underclothes that had been stripped from her, but they were grabbed away. She tried to sit down, but was forced to rise by constant kicking and beating with a stick. She tried to turn away from the many men in the room, but was constantly forced to turn again so as to face the men. She tried to protect herself with her hands and arms, and one man twisted her arms behind her back and held them there while the beating and kicking continued. All parts of her body were beaten. She became benumbed and was losing consciousness of pain. Her face swelled and her body became discolored. She had to be held up and the ill-treatment continued. Finally they ceased and put her at one side of the room, leaving her there for a time. They then took the lunch mentioned in the statement concerning Chung Chung Yul. She was afterwards ordered to put on her clothes and was sent into the next room with the others. About 9 p. m. the three women mentioned above and the other two women who had been arrested were again called into the office. They were asked if they now realized that it was a wrong thing to call "Mansei" and if they would repeat the attempt. They released three of the women but kept Pyo Hak Sun and Yi Hyo Syung. These two women were sent back to the side room, where they spent the night as well as the other prisoners.

The next morning the examination of the prisoners began, some men being examined first. In the meantime the news of the way the women were being treated spread through the village and a crowd of about 500 people gathered in the morning. Some of them were for attacking the police station and taking revenge for the mistreatment of the women. But Elder Han advised against the use of violence or doing anything unlawful. Finally cooler counsels prevailed and it was decided to send in two representatives to make a protest. Two men were chosen, neither of them Christians, and one of them speaking Japanese, and these two went into into the police office, the crowd waiting outside. They protested against the stripping of the women as being unlawful. The chief of police said that they were mistaken; that it was permissible under Japanese law. Also said that they were searching for unlawful papers. The men then wanted to know why they stripped only the younger of the women and not the older, and why they were beaten after being stripped, and why only women and not men were stripped. The chief of police could not answer. There was considerable conversation. The delegates from the crowd were determined, and the crowd itself was getting more and more restless and noisy, many demanding that they, too, be imprisoned or that the prisoners all be released. The chief of the police was finally forced to yield, and he agreed to release all but four of the prisoners.

———, the widow mentioned above, had to be supported on either side as she came out. ——— had to be carried out on a man's back. As they saw the women being brought out in this condition a wave of pity swept over the whole crowd, and with one accord they all burst into tears and sobbed. Some of them cried out, "It is better to die than to live under such savages," and there was a strong sentiment in favor of attacking the police office with their naked hands, of capturing the chief of police and stripping him and beating him to death. But Elder Han and other wiser heads prevailed and kept the people from any act of violence, and finally got them to disperse.

A day or two later representatives of 600 miners from the mines not far away came to Elder Han and inquired the particulars of the affair from him. They said that it was impossible to bear with such savages, and that they were determined to make an attack on the police and take revenge. He argued with them for some time. One of them at least had been drinking, and he got out of patience with the elder and hit him in the groin. But the elder finally persuaded them to at least wait until the Christians then under detention in the police office were either released or sent to some other place, as the Christians did not wish to be implicated in any violence.

Later another demonstration was held here and at least two men were reported shot, but as it had no particular connection with the one partially described above there is no necessity of details being given here.

—

EXHIBIT XVI.

STATEMENT ON POLICE METHODS.

(Letter to Hon. ———.)

APRIL 7, 1919.

DEAR MR. ———: We planned for the opening of the new term of college and academy on April 4, after the vacation which began March 5, when the students had been dismissed earlier than expected, and diplomas were given without graduation exercises, because the night before the dormitories were visited after midnight by the firemen with clubs and some of the students dragged out and beaten. On April 2 and 3 there was a systematic canvass of the city houses and students from mission schools were arrested, some of them beaten, some soon dismissed, and others detained under arrest. Word from the chief of police to one of our Japanese professors was that students entering school for the new term must be sent to the police station, where they would be examined. As in the minds of all, such arrest was usually accompanied with beating and kicking and such mistreatment before any investigation or inquiry as to conduct it was impossible to expect any students to enroll. And, as for the academy, two students came, one former student and one new one, they disappearing, however, upon the appearance of the prefect and his interpreter with swords, who came to inquire as to the prospects of opening the school. At the college one student came, but left at once upon hearing what the chief of police had said. Whether this was intended to prevent the opening of schools I do not know, but it may account for the nonenrollment of students.

That afternoon, April 4, about 3.30 p. m., when most of the missionaries had gathered for a prayer meeting at Mrs. Holdcroft's home, a cordon of police and gendarmes was suddenly picketed all about our property and procurators and police and gendarmes began to search our residences. We were telephoned to from one of the houses. I immediately went to my house, found the compound gates shut and gendarmes on guard, about 20 police and gendarmes picketing the compound, and, upon going into the house, I found my wife and children watching some 16 to 20 gendarmes, police, and detectives, in charge of a procurator and his interpreter, already searching three rooms. I asked the head man if he had a search warrant, and he replied: "No; it is not necessary." I said: "I can not give my consent to the search." He then gave me his card, and I said: "Of course, you can forcibly search, but it will be without my consent." He said that that would be all right. (I judge that as he was a procurator he had the legal right to search, even without my consent.) They spread through the whole house, and in my study, and in Mrs. Moffet's bedroom made a most thorough search of desks, drawers, bureaus, papers, letters, etc., even going into my property deeds and the safe.

They were not rude nor disrespectful, and one said that he did not like the job but had to do as he was ordered. However, it was anything but pleasant to have to endure the indignity of having 20 officers, gendarmes, police, and detectives take possession of everything in order to find practically nothing. In my study, among my secretary's papers in the drawer of his desk, they found the following inconsequential things:

1. A copy of the program of the Prince Yi memorial service and the independence service of March 1, written in ink in Korean.
2. A small piece of paper with a statement in Korean of the number of men killed at Anju and the number of those who had taken part from the several villages at Anju in the demonstration.
3. An envelope directed to the theological seminary, coming through the mail with stamp and postmark on it, containing five copies of the independence newspaper. This had come when I was in Seoul, and was in the secretary's desk, where my Korean letters are placed.

None of the above had I ever seen before, and the procurator's interpreter afterwards told me that my secretary also denied knowledge of the first two.

After searching the house they searched the outbuildings, the guest house, and an empty Korean house in the lower part of my compound, where my Bible woman and her son, my secretary, had lived for years, and which they again had permission to occupy. As we were trying to open the front door of the guest house, my secretary came out of the back door, where apparently he had been sleeping for several nights. (I did not know he had occupied this room, although he had had my permission since February to reoccupy the Korean house where he had formerly lived; that is to say, this house in the lower part of the compound.) They seized him, tied him, and, according to the statement of my two sons, who saw it (I did not see it), they hit him, kicked him, punched him, his nose bleeding, and one man hit him across the cheek with a short whip. In the empty Korean house referred to they found two copies of a mimeographed notice in Korean—thin paper rolled up into a small ball and thrown away. The detective told me that a boy had confessed that several of them had taken my mimeograph from the study and printed notices in that empty house. I, of course, knew nothing of it, and if true it was probably done during my nine days' absence in Seoul, March 17 to 25.

While searching my house, the houses of Miss Snook, Mr. Mowry, Mr. Gillis, Mr. McMurtrie, Mr. Reiner, Dr. Baird, and the Foreign School dormitory were also searched. Miss Betts refused permission to search that house, as they had no warrant, and their supply of procurators being short, there was no procurator in that party of police, and they refrained from searching her house. At Miss Snook's house they arrested the matron, cook (a woman), and a young man, Miss Salmon's secretary, searching Miss Salmon's room very carefully. At Mr. Mowry's they arrested a teacher of the City Church School, who was leaving just as the police came, he having come to see Mr. Mowry,

the principal, about the opening of school that day; also a student who had just been released from jail and had come to tell Mr. Mowry about his release. I think another boy was taken there, and I understood they expressed disappointment at not finding Mr. Mowry's secretary. At Mr. Gillis's house they arrested a boy who had been working in his garden for two weeks, a theological student from the country who had come in, and a medical student from Seoul, formerly a student here. These three had hidden in the house before Mr. Gillis returned from prayer meeting. In Mr. Reiner's yard—who had been somewhere on the compound and who was trying to escape, gave himself up to the gendarmes, who proceeded to beat him, strike him on the head, and knocked him down, after which they kicked him on the head several times. At Dr. Baird's they arrested a college student who was acting as secretary to him.

So far as I know there was nothing wrong about any of these being on our places or in our houses, most of them having regular occupations. But as the whole population is fearful of unlawful beatings, some of them, when they saw the police coming, hid and tried to escape capture. They searched my cook, also, but did not arrest him. They marched off with their captives and went through the seminary dormitories, from which they took another mimeograph, and breaking two windows in the Southern Presbyterian Cottage for Professors, I am told, arrested a man who had gone in there. Three men came back and asked to take two mimeographs from my study, to which I consented, asking for a receipt, which they said I could get the next day at the police office. That night, between 7 and 8 o'clock, Mr. Mowry telephoned me that a messenger from the police office had come, asking him and me to go down. I met them at my gate, and we went down together. We were shown into a small room where were three police, and sat down, waiting for 35 minutes before Mr. Mowry was called out for examination. While waiting, we were talking together in English, when one of the policemen said, "You are not allowed to talk." Surprised, I replied, "What, are we under arrest?" He jumped up at once and said, "Wait a minute," went out, and came back shortly, saying, "Never mind, it is all right." I replied, "Of course it is," and we continued our conversation. After Mr. Mowry was called, I was kept waiting another hour, and was then called out for examination before the procurator and his interpreter who had searched my house, also a scribe, and for a part of the time another elderly official. They were very polite and very pointed in their questions, asking particularly about my knowledge of or connection with the independence meeting of March 1; about my secretary, his being on my place, and about the keys of the house in which he had been, and whether he could have had the use of the key without my knowledge; about the use of my mimeographs, whether with my consent and knowledge as to the use to which they had been put. They asked about the three papers found in my secretary's desk in my study, and about my absence in Seoul; about the salaries of my Bible woman and secretary and my own financial condition, saying that I was reputed to be very wealthy, owning much land. After an hour's questioning, in which they learned that I knew nothing, had consented to nothing, and was in no way a party to or knew anything which may have been done by my secretary or others on the place or with my mimeograph (the secretary always having full access to the mimeograph for secretarial work), that I had stayed in Seoul on account of medical work for my wife and child at the hospital, and that the land in my name was the property of the board of missions, of the church, and of schools, they finished the examination.

I then made request for a policeman to accompany me and Mr. Mowry home, as it was near midnight and a missionary had recently been stopped at night on the way to the railway station by two Japanese armed with clubs, and it was not safe for foreigners to be out at night. They said there was no danger, but I called their attention to the fact that the Japanese papers were publishing abusive articles about us and that the low-class Japanese had great hatred toward us. They consented to send a policeman, asking me to wait a little while, and I was shown into the main office of the police station, where I saw sitting on the floor at one end the group of students and secretaries who had been arrested that afternoon and Dr. Bayard's translator, who had been arrested the night before. I asked if I might speak to them, but was refused permission to do so. After waiting some 20 minutes the procurator and his interpreter came in and said that they would send a policeman home with me. I suggested that I wait for Mr. Mowry, but they said that his examination was not yet finished and that I had better go first. I then asked to see Mr. Mowry, to tell him that I was going out and would relieve his wife's anxiety by telling her that they would send a policeman with him a little later. One said, "He is now being examined, but I will tell him." I then went, accompanied by a Korean policeman, but could not waken Mrs. Mowry, so went home. I did not sleep well, and in the morning had a hard headache, so stayed in bed. About 7 o'clock Mrs. Mowry telephoned Mr. McMurtrie that Mr. Mowry had not come home and asked if I had. He came to see me, and I suggested that he get Mr. Bernheisel and at once go to the police station and ascertain the situation, and if Mr. Mowry were under arrest to ask the nature of the charges, telegraph you at once, and ask to see Mr. Mowry and send him food. Mr. Bernheisel will write you what followed. I hope that I have not written in too great detail, but it seems better to write some things which may seem of trivial import rather than leave out the very things you may wish to hear.

Saturday afternoon, April 5, five of those arrested were released—Miss Snook's matron cook, Miss Salmon's secretary, the city school teacher, Mr. Gillis's working boy, and Dr. Baird's secretary; and on Sunday morning Dr. Baird's translator was released, the translator reporting that while he was not beaten, the others had been shamefully beaten while being examined. Saturday afternoon Mr. Mowry's secretary, who graduated from the college in March, came to Mr. McMurtrie's and said that he thought it best to give himself up to the police and not to try to escape from arrest. We then arranged that Mr. Bernheisel should go to the police office, Dr. Moore taking him down in his auto, and report to the police that his secretary was ready to deliver himself up if they would send out a man for him. Dr. Moore brought the man, a detective who knows all the students, back in his auto, and Mr. Mowry's secretary, Yi Po Sik, came out from Mr. McMurtrie's and gave himself up. Mr. McMurtrie accompanied him and the detective in the auto to the police station, and we thus secured him immunity from beating on the way. The secretary did this on his own initiative. He asked me for advice, but I told him that he would have to decide for himself. When the police came on Friday he had hidden and escaped arrest.

This is all I need to report now. I shall write you later commenting on the situation. I would say, however, that personally I do not believe Mr. Mowry has done anything which renders him liable to the law.

EXHIBIT XVII.

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE REMOVAL OF WOUNDED MEN FROM SEVERANCE HOSPITAL.

(By Dr. O. R. Avison, president.)

During the forenoon of April 10 a gendarme sergeant named H. Inouye called at the office and stated that the police wished to examine certain of the wounded men in our hospital and asked that these men be sent to the Yamadomachi gendarmes office for this examination.

The request being reported to Dr. Avison, he said that the question of their removal would have to be determined by the surgeon, Dr. Ludlow, and suggested that the examination take place at the hospital rather than that the men be subjected to the dangers of transfer. To this they agreed, requesting that a private room be arranged where the examination could be conducted privately. They thought it might take one hour for each man.

In the afternoon Gerdarme Sergt. H. Nagase, accompanied by nine gendarmes, came to the hospital and presented his card and a list of seven names of men who were to be examined. Dr. Ludlow was called in order that he might determine whether the cases could be removed from their beds to this room. Such as could be removed were examined in the room, while the others were examined at the bedside. The examining was completed in much less time than had been anticipated, so that they were through with it about 5.30 p. m., I think.

Sergt. Nagase then said he would take five men with him for further examination, leaving two with us provided we would undertake to notify the police department 24 hours previous to their being ready for discharge. Dr. Avison called Dr. Ludlow and asked him to state whether these patients could be safely removed. Dr. Ludlow stated that none of them ought to be removed from the hospital at this time as they still needed treatment. The officer said they had a doctor at the police department who would make the dressings and look after their treatment. Dr. Ludlow then objected in particular to the removal of three out of the five men, and after a time they consented to leave one of those three. After further conversation they consented to leave another, taking with them three men, as follows:

Yum Myung Suk: Gunshot wound in abdomen and arm.
Song Yung Pok: Gunshot wound in face, bullet extracted.
Lee Myung Keui: Gunshot wounds, groin and thigh.

Four men were left in charge of the hospital superintendent, Miss Esteb, with directions that 24 hours previous to their being ready for discharge the police department should be notified. They are as follows:

Yi Kai Dong: Gunshot wounds, right thigh and left knee.
Kang Yong Yi: Gunshot wound, thigh, and large portion torn away.
Kim Il Nam: Gunshot wounds, both thighs and cheek.
Ryoo Soon Myung: Gunshot wounds, both thighs.

EXHIBIT XVIII.

STATEMENT BY A KOREAN STOREKEEPER.

"On April 1 a Japanese policeman and a detective came to my home and asked to see the owner. I replied that the master of the house had gone to the country. I was told to telegraph immediately for him, saying the police required to see him at once. The officers then told me that I must go with them to the provincial police bureau. I asked that they go first and I would follow right away. To this they replied, 'We must go together.'

"On arriving at a police box the policeman telephoned somewhere, stating that the master was away and that he was bringing one of the employees, and asked whether that was satisfactory. The reply was 'yes.' I was then escorted by these officers to the provincial police bureau, where on entering I found a large number of business men. We were spoken to and then given a notice which we were told to read carefully. We were further told that we had broken the law and had done very badly for a whole month by keeping our stores closed, but for that offense we would be forgiven. If, however, after this special forgiveness we again offended by not opening we would be punished severely by the law. We were then asked to sign the following guaranty: 'If you will please help and protect us we will open our shops immediately.' We were told that if we refused to sign this document we would not be released. As far as I know all signed.

"A spy then accompanied me to the store and threatened that if I did not open he would take me back to the police bureau. I opened reluctantly, and in a short time one Japanese and one Korean spy came and stayed around the store until closing time.

"April 2, 1919, I did not come down to the store until late in the morning. When I arrived I found that the lock had been wrenched and the staple broken, so that the doors could be opened. I had not been in the store long when a Korean policeman came and stated that I must report to the police box at Kurigai. I went along with the policeman, and the son of the proprietor accompanied us. We were asked why we had not opened early, to which I replied that owing to some special business it was impossible. A Japanese policeman slapped me on the face for this answer. The son of the storekeeper was also slapped quite frequently. I was struck only a few times. One of the officers in the police box wrote on a piece of paper: 'I promise to open the store at about 8 o'clock in the morning.' To this I had to put my seal.

"April 3. I came down to the store at 9 a. m. and opened up. Pretty soon a policeman came and said, 'Why did you not open up at 8 a. m. as you promised?' I made some excuse, so again I was told to go to the police box. Once more I was scolded, but not struck. The officer said that I must write another statement, in which I was allowed to open between 8 and 9 a. m., but not later.

"April 4. Opened between 8 and 9 a. m. and no trouble."

EXHIBIT XIX.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

(To a Canadian.)

APRIL 10, 1919.

DEAR MR. ———: I suppose you have heard of the Korean revolt. All of us are so exercised over it that it is hard to keep our noses to the grind or our hands from the big stick. We are forced to keep as free from entanglements as possible. The Japanese have followed their usual methods—terrorism and blustering. They have tried their best to shoulder the blame of it upon the missionaries, but, fortunately, the rising was as much a surprise to them as it was to the authorities, if I mistake not. However that may be, let me state my reason for writing. I have tried to get an honest grasp of the young Korean's mind, and have put the result of my investigation down in black and white. I am sending you a copy. I found that the outstanding thought

which remained with me was the failure of Japanese imperialism in Korea, so I have given the paper that pretentious title. Surely the proof of successful rule is a happy, thankful, and prosperous people. Korea can come under none of these heads. You saw something of it yourself. If traveling in Korea was so annoying to you, you can take it from me that it is a great deal more so now. ———, my old teacher, came back from Japan the day before yesterday. Every place he reached he found that his coming had been telegraphed ahead, and that he was expected. Some system, eh? He was arrested twice, and though they could find nothing against him and let him go, it was not before he got his tale of stripes. One numskull of a Japanese gendarme tried to force him to sign a paper saying that he would not continue his studies in theology but take up farming. Men are being arrested here every day, and even before a question is asked them are flogged with a 2-inch square rod. Doctor and I saw two men to-day who came from the local consulate a few days ago. One fellow had left his house to-day for the first time since his release four days ago, he was so badly battered and bruised. Their shoulders were a horrible sight. Torture of the most primitive kind is used and some finer touches added. For example, one of our Christian school-teachers told me yesterday that after his flogging failed to elicit the information the Japanese wanted, they bound his two first fingers together and gauged a pen through between. Try it and see how it feels. The devilishness that finds the nerves that give excruciating pain and yet does not mutilate is—what shall I call it—Germanic? The offense of these fellows was one of having waved a Korean flag and having shouted "Mansei! Long live Korea!" I could tell you of dozens of such stories, and you would scarcely credit them. Here is one, for example: Four young fellows arrived in ——— the first day of the demonstration and took no part in it. They were theological students and were found in the college dormitories by Japanese soldiers. Tied to a wooden cross, they were given 39 strokes with a paddle, and told that as Christ suffered on the cross, it was fitting that they should do the same, and told them they must be bad fellows since they were Christians.

Well, I have written a whole paragraph, with what continuity of thought I don't know, but the idea that runs through it is clear enough. I want you to know what is happening. You will have heard from other missionaries, but you can't hear too much. Japan is proving the Hun of the East—the big bully that strikes where no retaliation can forthcome. Koreans have been remarkably restrained. But read the article. If you think you can get it published without implicating the mission, do so. It is only right that Canada should know, as well as other lands, what Japan is at home. Talk about "No race discrimination." Let her begin at home. If you should publish it, let it be under the name of ———, or no name at all. If you can't get it published in the papers, at least try to get the facts of the poor Koreans' plight before Canada some way. I know that we should try to keep as free as possible from political affairs. But you need to see things for yourself, and then ask whether our religion must be denied the right to throw its white light into the dark corners. We can do nothing but publish the facts, but that is all they expect of us. And we in ——— have a better chance than our men in Korea. I am sending this by Chinese post.

—

EXHIBIT XX.

FIRST ACCOUNT OF MASSACRES AND BURNING OF VILLAGES.

Statement of H. H. Underwood as to trip to neighborhood of Pal Tan Market, town in county of Suwon, Kyongki Province, April 16:

Party left Seoul about 9.30 a. m., by writer's auto, and proceeded to Pal Tan by way of Suwon and Osan, a distance of slightly over 46 miles in all. About 2 miles before reaching Pal Tan a large cloud of smoke was seen rising from behind a low hill beyond the market town. The car was stopped for lunch here, and the writer strolled over to a near-by cluster of houses and finding a farmer engaged him in conversation. After a little preliminary talk:

H. H. Underwood. What is that smoke?

Farmer. That is a village that has been burned.

H. H. U. When was it burned?

F. Yesterday.

H. H. U. How was it burned?

F. (glancing around fearfully). By the soldiers.

H. H. U. Why? Did the people riot or shout for independence?

F. No; but that is a Christian village.

H. H. U. Has there been no cheering for independence here?

F. Sometime ago there was in the market town on market day.

H. H. U. But not in that village?

F. I do not think so. Why would they shout all by themselves without any gathering of people?

H. H. U. Have the soldiers been here to this village? Are you Christians?

F. Oh, no; there are no Christians here.

H. H. U. What is the name of that village?

F. Chay Amm Ni (Cheamni).

I then found another man in the same village, and the same questions brought the same answers, with the added information that there were few or no travelers, and that it was difficult to know what was happening, and that the people had not been allowed to gather for market on the last market day.

After lunch we drove down to the town and left the car, as it was impossible to cross the stream at the entrance to the town. We walked past the police station, which is situated where the two main roads entering the town meet. A file of soldiers of the Seventy-eighth Regiment was standing outside the station. As we were passing a Japanese policeman came out and demanded where we were going and ordered us into the station. We entered as two Japanese officers got up and left. We all noticed their shoulder straps, which were red with three stars. This, I am told, is the badge of first sergeant. The policeman who had called us into the station shouldered a carbine and followed the officers, and in a moment we saw them setting off on the road to Namyang, with the policeman in the lead.

Mr. Curtice now presented his card to the officer and conversed with him in Japanese. I do not speak Japanese, but knew a little, and followed a large part of the conversation. After chatting about the roads, bridges, mutual acquaintances in Seoul, etc., Mr. Curtice casually asked about the fire. The chief said that there had been a small fire but that it was now out and did not amount to much. Asked about the disturbances, he said that there had been a little disturbance in that part of the country, but that it was now over.

After some more general conversation Mr. Curtice asked if rickshas could be procured in the town, as we would like to make a little excursion and see the fire. The chief asked, "Which fire?" Mr. Curtice said the near-by one, but that we would probably like to take a little ride for three or four miles in the country. The chief seemed a little surprised, but said "Yes," and sent a policeman with us to the ricksha stand, where we hired three rickshas and set out. The village from which the smoke was rising was not more than a mile from the town, and after a short ride we left the rickshas and walked around the foot of the hill, on the sides of which was the village we had seen.

Our estimate and the statements of the Koreans agreed that the village consisted of about 40 houses, all of which had been burned down except four or five which were left standing. The rest were heaps of smoking ashes with flames still visible here or there. We saw groups of women, children, and old men sitting on the hillside above the village watching the ruins in dumb despair.

We walked the entire length of the village, and about halfway up we saw a corpse of a young man, horribly burned, lying just outside of a building, which we learned later had been the church. This body was photographed where it lay. After going the length of the village we came back along the hillside and called to a man sitting in one of the groups mentioned. He came and I questioned him, but found that fear and shock had numbed him. He held his head in his hand and said that everything he had and all the results of years of hard work had gone. I condoled with him and asked when the fire had occurred. He said, "About this time, yesterday" (2 p. m.).

H. H. Underwood. How did it start?

Korean. By the soldiers.

H. H. U. Were many people burned or hurt?

K. The soldiers killed all the Christians who were in the church.

H. H. U. What were they in the church on a Tuesday afternoon for?

K. Why, the soldiers came and ordered all the Christian men to gather in the church.

H. H. U. Were there women in the church too?

K. No; the women were told not to come.

H. H. U. Well, after the Christians gathered in the church what happened?

K. The soldiers fired on them and also used their "knives" (swords and bayonets) and then set fire to the church.

H. H. U. How did the other houses catch?

K. Some caught from the church and others, on the other side, where the wind did not carry the flames, were set on fire by the soldiers.

H. H. U. How is it you are alive?

K. I am not a Christian, and only the Christians were ordered to gather.

H. H. U. Your house also was burned?

K. Yes; there are the ruins (pointing).

H. H. U. But there are a few houses left; how about those?

K. Those stood by themselves.

H. H. U. About how many were killed in the church?

K. About 30.

I then left this man and walked over to another group. Here there were several young women with babies at the breast and old women and a young boy about 19 or 20.

These people were Christians and knew Dr. Noble of the N. Methodist Mission, in whose district this church was. I asked the same or nearly the same questions, and got the same answers, as to time, method, number of killed, the setting of the fire, etc., etc. I asked the young man how he happened to be alive, and he replied that he had been away gathering wood on the hills and had returned at night to find all his friends and male relations dead and buried under the flaming ruins of the church. These people showed us where the church had stood, and we went down and found another corpse, which was also photographed. The other bodies were still under the ruins of the church.

The people were absolutely destitute, here and there a few household goods had been snatched from the flames, but none of the little groups seemed to have more than a very small bowl of rice or grain for all the survivors, and they said that most of them had lost their grain, seeds for the coming year, and everything, including domestic animals, on which they are very dependent. We bid good-by to this group after taking their picture, and walked through the village to one of the houses that was still standing. Here our owner was a very old man who said that his house stood alone and had not caught and had not been set because he was not a Christian. His account of the event tallied in every way with that of the others. He also did not know how many had been killed, but also put the number at about 30.

After taking a few more photos, we returned to the rickshas and started back to the town. The ricksha coolies offered to take us to another place, about 3 miles farther on, Suchone, where the same thing had happened a few days before. They volunteered that about 15 places had been burned, in most cases Christian centers. The tallied with other stories, and with reports brought up to Seoul to the missionaries in charge of the district. The soldiers had been brought in by auto about 2 weeks or 10 days before and the first villages had been burned at that time. The chief of police had reported that the trouble had been over some time, and we heard no accusations that there had been any violence on the part of the Koreans in this village which we visited. The police claim that violence had been committed in other places. We bade good-by to the police and returned to Seoul by auto as we had come, reaching Seoul about 5.30 p. m.

It will be understood that as I was born in this country I can be absolutely sure as to the conversations with the Koreans, and, of course, of the things which I saw. The Japanese conversation, however, I only followed by words here and there, such as "fire, riot, small, no, yes, bridge, road, auto," etc.

—

EXHIBIT XXI.

ADMISSION BY GOV. GEN. HASEGAWA.

[Japan Advertiser, Apr. 27, 1919.]

(Special to the Japan Advertiser.)

SEOUL, *April 25.*

The governor general of Korea denounces the harsh measures taken by some of his subordinates, and some of these, guilty of one of the worst atrocities reported, have already been subjected to appropriate punishment.

The governor general yesterday received a delegation of prominent missionaries who had visited certain Korean villages which had been burned by soldiers this month. After listening carefully to their description of their investigation he replied that their statements of what had occurred were true, and that it was to be deplored.

MUST NOT BE REPEATED.

The ones responsible had been punished, and strict orders had been sent throughout the peninsula forbidding further acts of this kind. His hearers might rest assured, he declared, and might assure other foreigners, that there would be no recurrence of such happenings.

The governor general added that at any time that the missionaries had anything important to discuss they could lay it before him personally.

The governor general's assurance that these harsh repressive measures by subordinate officers were not countenanced and would not be tolerated by the Government is most gratifying.

AID FOR SUFFERERS.

A committee appointed by a representative meeting of the foreign community waited on Gov. Matsunaga to ascertain if they could assist in relieving the sufferers from the late trouble. The governor outlined what the Government was doing and said that private Japanese had also contributed. He was willing to receive foreign contributions, which he would distribute and personally give account for. After thanking the governor, the committee withdrew to report to the central committee.

ATROCITY OF FIRST MAGNITUDE.

The facts reported to the governor general and referred to in the above special cable to the Japan Advertiser from its Seoul correspondent deal with an atrocity of the first magnitude, the particulars of which have reached Tokyo.

The missionaries who investigated were in a party of 10, who visited several villages which had been burned by the Japanese gendarmes and soldiers, the villagers being driven out of their homes and not permitted to take with them anything whatever of value. All they owned was destroyed, and the villagers, young infants and old men and women, have been hiding in the hills, afraid to return to the site of their former homes, and without shelter, food, or covering for their bodies at night. Among these refugees in the hills are some wounded ones, whose wounds have perforce gone untended, with many cases of blood poisoning setting in.

GATHERED VICTIMS TOGETHER.

In the course of their investigation, the searchers for facts reached one village where the little church had been destroyed by fire. The gendarmes and soldiers, marching into this village, had summoned the men of the village to attend a meeting in the church, where they were told certain orders would be read to them. They gathered in the building, some 50 or more.

As soon as the men had all been gathered together, the soldiery opened fire upon them through the open windows, after having surrounded the building. Volley after volley was poured into the gathering, until the floor was covered with heaps of dead and moaning wounded men.

To complete their work, the surviving women of the village told the missionaries, the soldiery entered the building and bayoneted all the men whom the bullets had not killed, while two women who had approached the building to learn the fate of their husbands were likewise bayoneted and their bodies thrown among those of the men. Then kerosene was poured upon the dead, and the bodies and the church building consumed by fire.

When the advance guard of the investigating party reached this place, there were two bodies still left in the smoking ruins, the others having been raked out and disposed of out of sight.

This is the report, in part, the missionary party has made to the governor general.

—

EXHIBIT XXII.

THE MASSACRE AND BURNING OF VILLAGES.

[Correspondence in the Japan Advertiser, Apr. 29, 1919.]

The Advertiser correspondent, under date of April 20, says:

THE BURNING OF CHEAMNI.

"For some time past I have been hearing persistent rumors of the burning of entire villages and the more or less complete wiping out of the inhabitants. Latterly these reports came from a district lying 15 or 20 miles west of the large town of Suigen, on the Seoul-Fusan Railroad. It was difficult to obtain the exact name of the places said to be burned, but finally word was received from people coming from the district that the village of Soo Chon had been wiped out by soldiers.

"Mr. Curtice, of the American consulate, asked me if I was willing to make one of a party which would attempt to go through by automobile, and find, if possible, the truth regarding the rumor, and the village of Soo Chon in particular. Mr. Underwood, who was born in the country, and as a missionary has made a very careful study of the language and speaks it with great fluency, was engaged with his car to drive us there and act as interpreter for the party. As a mechanic and assistant in case of accidents, we also took a Chinese chauffeur.

"We left the consulate on Wednesday, April 16. Our route was along the main highway from Seoul to Suwon (Suigen), which parallels the railway. Passing through this ancient walled city, we continued on the old highway, which in historical interest and appearance can be compared to the Tokaido of Japan, until we came to the town of Uoan (Ooan), on the railroad line, and here we turned sharply from our southerly course to one due west.

"The road, which was marked on the map as third class, in no way exceeded our expectations, and the 15 miles that we covered before abandoning the car for rickshas was full of incidents connected with narrow, rotten bridges, good driving, and lucky escapes.

SMOKE STILL RISING.

"About noon we drew up on the slope of a hill, at the foot of which lay a large town, which, according to our reckoning, should be the market town of Parang-Chang, from which our destination, Soo Chon, lay distant 3 miles farther. Mr. Underwood went to a group of farm houses near where we had stopped to learn whether our supposition was correct and whether the people could give us any confirmation of the burning of Soo Chon. The farmers said that the town before us was Perang-Chang, where the police office was, and that Soo Chon, which was 3 miles farther on, had been burned. Pointing to a cloud of thin smoke rising from behind a hill about a mile distant from the market town, we asked what it meant.

"'That,' was the reply, 'is a village called Cheamni, which the soldiers burned yesterday at a little after midday.'

"A question as to the reason of its being burned elicited the statement that there was a Christian church in the village and many Christians. To a question the farmer replied that he was not a Christian and told us what was told him, but that he and the people thereabout kept very close to their houses lest they should be suspected of sympathizing with the sufferers.

"After a brief lunch we drove down to the market town, where we found the only bridge entering the place would not bear the car, so we started on foot past the police station, which was just on the other side, and in front of which was drawn up a squad of about 16 soldiers of the Seventy-eighth Regiment, under command of noncoms. They allowed us to pass by without comment, but shortly came running after us and took us to the police station.

ALL QUIET AT PRESENT.

"Here the police officer in charge received Mr. Curtice's card and asked us to be seated. Mr. Curtice talked to the officer in charge, starting with the formal conversation usual in such cases, and leading up to the question of our desire to obtain rickshas and continue our journey on to Soo Chon. The question was asked him if there was any trouble in the district, and he replied by saying all was quiet at present, though there had been a demonstration in the market town of Parang-Chang some time before. Asked what the smoke over the hill was, he replied that it was a small fire that occurred yesterday.

"The probability of our visiting the place, which lay on the way to Soo Chon, was mentioned, and no objection was raised, only surprise that we should trouble about visiting the scene of a small fire, the implication being of greater ones farther on. A Korean policeman was sent into the market with us, and we took the rickshas he secured and went out on the road about a mile to where a small trail led over to the smoking hamlet. Here we left the rickshas and proceeded on foot.

"When we got to the place, which had been a village of about 40 houses, just under the lee of a low hill, we found only 4 or 5 standing. All the rest were smoking ruins. We passed along the path, which ran along the front of the village lengthwise, and in about the middle we came on a compound surrounded by burned poplars, which was filled with glowing ashes. It was here that we found a body frightfully burned and twisted, either of a young man or a woman. This place we found later was the Christian church, and on coming down from another direction on our return I found a second body, evidently that of a man, also badly burned, lying just outside the church compound. The odor of burned flesh in the vicinity of the church was sickening.

"We proceeded to the end of the village and climbed the hill, where we found several groups of people huddled under little straw shelters, with a few of their pitiful belongings about them. They were mostly women, some old, others young mothers with babes at breast, but all sunk in the dull apathy of abject misery and despair.

GATHER CHRISTIANS FOR MASSACRE.

"Talking to them in their own language and with sympathy, Mr. Underwood soon won the confidence of several and got the story of what happened from different groups, and in every case these stories tallied in the essential facts. The day before we arrived soldiers came to the village, some time in the early afternoon, and ordered all the male Christians to gather in the church. When they had so gathered, to a number estimated to be 30 by our informers, the soldiers opened fire on them with rifles and then proceeded into the church and finished them off with sword and bayonets. After this they set fire to the church, but as the direction of the wind and the central position of the church prevented the upper houses catching, soldiers fired these houses individually and after a time left.

"As we passed down the ruined village returning to our rickshas we came on the last house of the village, which was standing intact, and entered in conversation with the owner, a very old man. He attributed the safety of his house to its being slightly removed and to a vagary of the wind. He was alive because he was not a Christian and had not been called into the church. The details of his story of the occurrence tallied exactly with the others as to what had happened.

"We found that our ricksha men had followed us, leaving their vehicles on the main road. Their surliness and reserve was gone, and they volunteered the information that, while they were only ricksha men living in the market town, yet they would confirm what the people had told us. Further, they could take us in rickshas to the town of Soo Chon, only a short 10 li (3 miles) away. It undoubtedly had been burned, as we could see for ourselves; many more towns had been burned, they said, in that district, 15 in all that they knew of.

AFRAID TO BURY THEIR DEAD.

"We had seen, heard, and smelled enough to confirm all of the reports that have been trickling into Seoul from native sources in this district; and as we had a perilous road to travel before we reached safety for our heavy car on the main highway, we turned back to the market town, sad and sick at the thought of the miserable people camped on the hillside, afraid even to go to their dead. We were met outside the police station by the officer we had seen on entrance; and, telling that as the rikishas were poor, the road bad, and the afternoon waning, we would return to Seoul at once.

"This particular police office is not connected by telephone or telegraph, and the road is little used, so the surprise of our sudden appearance from Seoul in a large car, coupled with Mr. Curtice's diplomacy, was what gained us the privilege of seeing the result of the military method of repression and of talking to the people without interference. A remarkable fact was that on the journey coming and going to the main highway we met only a couple of natives traveling and very little work in the fields, except in immediate proximity to the houses, the more remote fields lying deserted, which was unusual at this time of the year and at variance with conditions along the main highway."

VISIT OF BRITISH CONSUL.

Under date of April 24, the same correspondent writes:

"The British consul had an interview with the Government after the first trip to Cheamni and mentioned the result of our investigation, at the same time expressing a desire to go down himself with certain of his nationals who were interested in mission work.

"The party in the motor car consisted of Mr. Royds, the British consul; Dr. Hardy, of the Canadian mission; Dr. Gale; myself; and extra chauffeur. In addition to the motor car two motorcycles accompanied us (with side cars) carrying Dr. Noble, who is superintendent of the work in that district; Rev. Cable; Rev. Mr. Billings; Rev. Mr. Beck; and Rev. Mr. Herron Smith, who is in charge of the Japanese work in Korea for the Methodist Church.

"We took a different route, where the bridges were in better condition, and arrived at the market town of Parang-Chang about noon, and parked our machines in front of the police station and proceeded at once through the market town toward Cheamni. There were a number of police in front of the station, but they said nothing to us, but fell in behind and followed us to the burned village, evidently having been warned of our coming.

CLEARING AWAY THE DÉBRIS.

"Here we found a large gang of collies cleaning away the ruins preparatory to having the houses rebuilt. All the burnt bodies had been removed and great haste was being made in cleaning the place

up, which was in decided contrast to villages we visited later and which had been destroyed early in the month.

"We photographed freely without interference, but whenever we started to talk to the natives a policeman would saunter up and the Korean would freeze up. Nothing was said to them in our presence, but they were in wholesome fear of what might happen later if they were seen talking to us. However, our party was a large one and we divided up and went in different directions, and those familiar with the language obtained many interviews, and everything confirmed the first report sent you as to the hour and method of assembling the men in the church and exterminating them and then setting fire to the village.

"Careful questioning of some women in a house removed from this village gave the number of Christian men killed as 12, whose names were secured, in addition to which 2 women who went to find out what was happening to their husbands were killed, one a woman over 40 and the other 19. These may have been the bodies we saw outside the church on the first day, this supposition being possible as they were outside the ruins. The remainder of the men killed in the church were members of the Chyong Do Kio and were said to be 25 in number.

OCCUPIED HOUSE FIRED.

"We next started walking to the village of Soo Chon, 3 miles away, which had been the objective of my first visit. We found that this village had been burnt either on the night of the 5th or the morning of the 6th. The story told to our party was that on that night the people were awakened by finding their houses on fire. As soon as they ran out they were struck with swords or bayoneted or shot—none were killed but several wounded, and we found one man whose arm had been laid open with a sword, and who, from lack of attention, would probably die of infection. The British consul afterward obtained a promise from the police in the market town that he should be sent to the hospital at Suigen. In this village a church and about 30 houses had been burnt, but no attempt had been made to clean it up, though it occurred early in the month. We then proceeded to a very small hamlet just over the hill where four or five houses had been burnt.

"As we returned along the road homeward I was somewhat in the rear and a Korean appeared suddenly from a bypath and asked me to go to the village of Kei Rong Kohl, 5 li (1½ miles) away, where 17 out of 19 houses had been burned. This I was unable to do, as it was growing late and our party was well ahead. I overtook a Korean who had been following our party as a spy for the police. He denied knowing of such a place, but finding I knew all about it and could speak the vernacular, he admitted it and confirmed what we had been told regarding Cheamni, particularly the hour, which is very important, for there had been a report among the Japanese of a town being burned through the upsetting of a lamp by Koreans wishing to avoid arrest during the night.

"We were told of a certain place in this district where nine burned villages can be seen from an elevation nearby. We had seen enough to confirm the reports previously received and returned to Seoul.

"The officials in the Government expressed to the consular officials the greatest indignation and surprise at these outrages and promised immediate relief to sufferers.

"A meeting of foreigners was held to see if relief work could be undertaken, and a committee appointed to wait on the officials. Appreciation was expressed by them and the matter is going through official routine. Many officials have visited the district, particularly Cheamni, and in that point I believe active steps for relief are being taken. I think the exposure of what happened at Cheamni will put a stop to this sort of repression."

—

EXHIBIT XXIII.

AN INCIDENT IN NORTH KOREA.

On Sunday afternoon, April 20, 1919, the following occurred at the village of Nong Tuk, Sinkai County, Shanghai Province. The Myen Chang (town magistrate), a Japanese, with two Korean police officers, came to the village from the Myen, about 5 li distant. They went to the house of Song Chang Sik, a local preacher in charge of this circuit, but he and his wife had gone to another church on the circuit for the Easter services. The officers beat his old mother, frightened the seven children, broke the water jars, dishes, and furniture, and destroyed his books. The local leader of this church is a fine young man from a well-to-do family, who had been to the Bible School in Seoul. He had been arrested at another place the 1st of March. The officers went now to his house and beat his old grandfather, cutting a gash in his head. They also beat the teacher of the day school, and smashed up things in other Christian homes. They broke every window in the church, with the lamps and stoves, and took the pulpit, the Bibles, and the hymn books into the church yard, where they burned them. They said such low-down people as the Christians had no right to live, and would all be run out of that region.

There has been no demonstration in this village. None of the Christians here took part in any demonstrations for independence in other places. Some days before, at the Myen (township headquarters), where there are no Christians, there had been a demonstration by the non-Christians, of whom six had been shot to death on the spot and many others wounded.

—

EXHIBIT XXIV.

STORY OF GOVERNMENT SCHOOL GIRL WHO WAS SABERED.

On March 1, 1919, at 2 o'clock, we started at Pagoda Park, going up to the Taihan Gate, where we shouted "Mansei" with all our might. From there we came to Kangwha Gate and shouted again, going out the West Gate to the French consulate and the American consulate, where we once more shouted "Mansei."

Coming in through the little west gate we again went to the Taihan gate, from thence we went to Pan Chung Tong (where there is a police station). There came out mounted gendarmes trying to stop our course, but we pressed forward to the Government general offices, and there the kotang koan (high official) came out with his sword, beating all in his way, and he struck me with his sword on the back, making a wound three inches long. The force of the blow threw me down, after which he stamped on my head with his foot, leaving me senseless for about 20 minutes.

When I came to I arose, to find my tooth broken, nose and lips bruised and cut, and blood everywhere. My shoulder had a 3-inch cut, and my leg, which had been struck several times, was black and blue.

EXHIBIT XXV.

KWAK SAN AND TYUNGJU.

The Kwak San Church was burned yesterday morning (April 25, 1919) and the Christians prevented from going in to put it out. The atrocious tortures of the prisoners in Tyungju are worthy of African savages and barbarians.

—

EXHIBIT XXVI.

PART OF AN EXTENDED REPORT.

A.—Methods of suppression.

APRIL 24, 1919.

The following paragraph can only be a summary of the methods which have been used in the suppression of nationalistic demonstrations. Every statement is supported by signed affidavits deposited with representatives of the United States Government. This must of necessity be a generalization, since conditions varied somewhat in different parts of the country, and the course of events was not always the same.

It must be borne in mind that the demonstrations began without violence of any kind on the part of the Koreans. The movement, as announced, was to be one of peaceful and orderly expression of national opinion, and in the initial public meetings violence was specifically forbidden, and later special notices were circulated cautioning against the use of violence. The demonstrations, involving as they did thousands of people, were remarkable exhibitions of self-control. It is not to be wondered at that later on, when the crowds were enraged by violence of the police and soldiers, there should be retaliation of some sort in a few cases.

At the first outbreak the police seemed nonplussed at the apparently senseless audacity of the cheering demonstrators. It is said that on the first day in some places the police even joked with the crowd. But when the people refused to be permanently dispersed the mood of the officials changed to irritation and anger, and they entered upon a campaign of enraged brutality, police, gendarmes, soldiers, and firemen (armed with pole hooks) kicking, striking, and beating men, women, and children indiscriminately; using gun butts, swords (in the scabbard at first but later bare and bloody), clubs, and freight hooks (inflicting ghastly wounds). As the demonstration continued, swords and bayonets were freely used, and after the first day, as the wave of demonstration spread out through the country districts, soldiers and gendarmes fired on crowds without warning, shooting indiscriminately in the direction of the cheering whenever the cry of "Mansei" was raised, killing and wounding at random. It was inevitable that there should be retaliation. Gendarmerie windows have been broken and gendarmes have been killed. A notable instance was at Morak, where the gendarmes fired into a crowded market, killing several. The crowd pursued the gendarmes and killed four.

In this connection Col. Mayeda, who is second in command of the gendarmes in Chosen, claims that up to March 30 the police reports indicated 38 places in which police and gendarmes had used arms, and that in all these cases the Koreans began violence; that the police and gendarmes were few in number, usually only three or four against hundreds and even thousands of Koreans, and that it was necessary to protect themselves and Government property from destruction. It was his representation that no more violence was used than was necessary. The sufficient answer to this is that in all cases which have come under foreign observation the Korean demonstrators refrained from violence until angered by the wanton cruelty of the police, and that so far from violent measures becoming increasingly necessary recent acts of wholesale slaughter and burning of villages have taken place even after Korean demonstrations had ceased and the crowd dispersed. The police may regard this as punitive; it can not be justified under the plea of necessity or self-defense. Moreover, in every instance where police and foreigners both report on the same cases the police reports are invariably falsified and unreliable. We can therefore place no reliance upon their statements in regard to the course of events elsewhere.

Evidence that the police excuse of Korean attack upon the police station is invalid is found in the fact that in at least one instance the dead Koreans lay in all parts of the city where they fell, none near the gendarmerie, but on the spot where they had been cheering in unresisting groups when fired upon by the gendarmes. There are photographs to substantiate this in the case of Andong, where the dead were reported to be 30, and where a missionary himself counted 7 left lying by the roadside in widely separated parts of the city 14 hours after the shooting.

Official records from March 1 to April 11 show that 9 police and gendarmes have been killed and 109 wounded, while among the Koreans 361 have been killed and 860 wounded. The report of police casualties is doubtless accurate; that of the Korean casualties falls far short of the true figures and only takes cognizance of those officially known to be dead and wounded and does not include those killed and wounded by indiscriminate shooting in the dark down village streets. Individual cases reported in the Government press have totaled more than 600 killed, and these do not include more recent shootings.

The process of arrest at any time of excitements and disturbances is apt to be accompanied with more or less violence. It has been the gratuitous and unjustifiable brutality of officials which has most impressed itself upon observers here. It is not merely the roughing and beating of those who are being arrested, but the actions of those who, without making any attempt at arrest, desperately beat any whom they meet in the road without explanation or inquiry in a general campaign of terrorism. Complaint or remonstrance on the part of Koreans means more severe treatment and even shooting. Japanese civilians have taken part in this work as well, with the encouragement of the police.

A peculiarly revolting feature of police methods is their treatment of women. Their laying violent hands on women is the thing that most often arouses the anger of the Koreans, whose term of execration "barbarians" is called forth by these actions. Women have been stripped and beaten both before and during police examination in police stations, in their own homes, and in the open, usually wantonly subjected to insult and indignity, simply to indulge the brutal propensities of the police or soldiers. The treatment to which educated young women have been subjected appears in appended documents.

Since the coming in of fresh troops and the inauguration of more severe methods of repression, as announced by the Government, increasing numbers of reports come in regarding the violation of women by soldiers. The absence of this form of violence in the past, the sudden appearance of such reports, coincident to the new orders issued, give verisimilitude to the reports, aside from the fact that they come from trustworthy sources. Complaint made to the police in regard to this

has been met with beating and with the statement that such charges must not be brought against servants of the Government.

Treatment of the wounded has been most cruel. In many cases they have not been allowed to go to hospitals. Those brought to mission hospitals have often been smuggled in secretly by their friends. Our physicians can testify to the fact that wounded men have been taken out of hospitals and beaten, and that others have been taken out of hospitals to prison before being discharged by the doctors as cured.

At the Mission Hospital in Pyeng Yang the doctors were told that they must not report patients as having died of gunshot wounds, but that they must say they died a natural death.

The jails, of course, overflowed from the first day. Prisoners in most cases received brutal treatment, though there were notable exceptions. Wholesale arrests have followed from the first outbreak. Examinations have been made as rapidly as possible, and considerable numbers have been discharged after detention ranging from one day to six weeks. In some cases girls and women have received considerate treatment in prison, in others quite the reverse; the girls arrested in Seoul complain uniformly of the brutality of the women jailers and police officials. The whole number reported under arrest varies from 10,000 to 40,000.

Trials according to Japanese law have been proceeding throughout the past weeks, the Koreans for the most part making no defense, but asserting their innocence of any other act than an expression of their desire for independence, which they do not disavow. Sentences have been imposed, ranging from six months to three years at hard labor, while in numerous cases flogging (which can not be administered legally to Japanese) has been administered with from 15 to 90 blows.

As was indicated above, firemen armed with clubs and polehooks were in many places given free hand to do what they wished to beat, scatter, and terrorize the crowds; in other places civilians apparently (possibly the reservists) were armed with clubs and hooks and turned loose upon the Koreans. It must be constantly borne in mind that these Korean crowds were unarmed, the people having been disarmed nine years ago.

The police paraded bodies of armed thugs (Japanese in Korean clothing) through the streets to indicate what might be expected. Rumor freely circulated that missionaries were to be beaten by them. Government officials told a newspaper correspondent and an American official that if they carried lighted cigarettes at night they would be safe from molestation, since they would not be mistaken for missionaries, while a missionary was warned by friendly officials to keep off the streets at night. These thugs have since been withdrawn, owing, it is said, to a protest by the American Consul General.

The Korean demonstrations continued for over a month and have now almost entirely ceased. The soldiers in the country districts, however, are increasingly violent, using fire and sword and terrifying the populace.

B.—*Government attitude toward the Christian Church in suppressing the revolt.*

In speaking of the "Government attitude" we are using an inferential phrase. Officially the Government attitude toward the church is that of religious toleration, and Christians are presumably to receive the same treatment as other citizens involved in the same disturbance. As a matter of fact, however, the Government's real attitude must normally be inferred from the action of the Government's officers and agents, the police, gendarmes, and soldiers.

Ever since Japan first came into control in the peninsula the existence of the Protestant Christian Church has offered a problem to the Government. The reasons are not far to seek; it is primarily the problem which the church from its very beginning offered to autocratic governments. It existed in the days of Rome. It stands out in particular prominence here in Chosen, because here we have an instance where the church is the strongest organization among the people whom the invading nation is seeking to control and denationalize and assimilate.

Dr. A. J. Brown, in his pamphlet on the "Conspiracy case" of 1912 (p. 7), makes the following statement: "The Japanese desire to control everything within their dominions, as foreign business men have learned to their cost. This is particularly true in Korea, where they deem it necessary to their plans to be absolute masters. Now the Japanese see in the Korean Church numerous and powerful organizations which they do not control."

There is a natural solidarity of Christians (especially under our form of church polity) which they themselves have come to appreciate, and which has been an obvious source of anxiety to the Government. The whole attitude of the Government toward the church in this present crisis is largely conditioned by a recognition of this solidarity and unity. A military government without experimental knowledge of Christianity, not appreciating fully its primary spiritual aim nor able to estimate properly the strength of the spiritual forces and factor involved, but fearing them, would naturally view with concern the fact that the largest and most thoroughly organized member of the body politic embraced at the same time the most enlightened and progressive portions of the populations.

Admiral Mahan, in a letter to Dr. Brown, quoted in the pamphlet referred to above, says ("Conspiracy case," p. 21):

"The suspicion excited by Christian gatherings is not only natural but has been characteristic of non-Christian governments from the time of Rome. Sometimes it is well grounded, as in the case of the English Roman Catholics in the days of Elizabeth and James the First. Men bound together by close sympathies of vital religion are in a state very favorable to combination for other objects, as, for instance, patriotic * * *."

The Government apprehension of the power of church organization is clearly witnessed by the encouragement given to the propagation of Christianity by the Congregational Church, which has a form of polity devoid of unity and integration, and therefore easier to control. It is under purely Japanese control.

Presbyterian organization, with its self-government and unity, and Methodist organization, with its unity and its added relation to a foreign ecclesiastical body of great power, are both obnoxious to the Government.

Another reason for the Government's suspicion of the church in Chosen is the fact that foreign influence exercises great power there. (It must be admitted that, while technically autonomous, the native church was dominated for a long period by foreign influence. But the church has rapidly come into its own, in its assemblies being able and ready on occasion to outvote the foreigners, and this very year marked a movement initiated by missionaries, for their actual withdrawal from any other than advisory participation in church assemblies.) The existence of this foreign influence has, beyond question, been an added irritation to the authorities, who felt that it was an obstacle in the way of the Japanization they wished to effect. A former governor general is reported to have said, "We can't have the missionaries here trying to make little Americans out of the Koreans." The remark was not justified, but it indicated sufficiently the official thought.

The immediate effect of the present disturbance, therefore, a disturbance in which Christians have taken a prominent part, has been to confirm and strengthen the suspicion which already existed against Christianity. The fact that it has been in no sense a purely Christian uprising, and the further fact that it was not purely Christian in origin, will not offset the consideration that Christianity has apparently proved itself to be hostile to the Government. This interpretation of Christianity on the part of the Government must be borne in mind as an explanation of the present treatment of the church. Naturally the Government has issued no statement to this effect, but actions of officials speak louder than Government proclamations. The vice governor of Choong Chung Province, a Japanese, and, therefore, the real executive of the Province, called in prominent Koreans, including some Christians, and in a public meeting advised people to have nothing to do with Christianity, which was a Western religion, and not adapted to Orientals. Police officials are urging the same thing everywhere. The procurator, in making his case against Mr. Mowry at the public trial, said: "It is impossible not to suspect Christianity in the matter."

From the very first day of the demonstrations the officials have paid more attention to Christian participation than to that of any other class. Arrests of those actually taking part in demonstrations and made upon the spot were naturally made without discrimination, but in the campaign of general arrests which followed throughout the country, Christians have been singled out for marked discrimination, even before demonstrations have taken place, in many instances.

Throughout the country the police immediately began to arrest pastors, elders, and other church officers. Some of these have been released after weeks of imprisonment and examination. Sentences against others are being daily announced, even in the case of men who took no part in the demonstrations, ranging from six months to three years of penal servitude. Of course no apology is intended for those who took part in the uprising deliberately and expecting the consequences. We are emphasizing the fact of the wholesale arrest and beating of Christians simply because they are Christians. In some places the men and women of the village were called together, all those who admitted they were Christians were maltreated or arrested and the others sent away. Wayfarers met by soldiers and gendarmes are asked whether they are Christians, and beaten and abused on the admission of the fact. Korean Christians remaining in the villages are given all sorts of announcements by local police and gendarmes. They are told that Christianity is to be exterminated, that all Christians are to be shot, that meetings are to be forbidden. It has been stated that Chunt Kyo is to be completely abolished because it is a native religion, but that Christianity, because of its foreign affiliations, while not being abolished, will be reduced by legislative restrictions to half its present size. There is of course no uniformity in these announcements, but they are all evidently part of a campaign of intimidation. That they are not groundless statements is evidenced by the fact that 19 churches have been partly or wholly wrecked by soldiers; bells, furniture, Bibles, and hymn books being smashed or burned. Seven other churches have been burned to the ground. We have no record of churches of other missions involved except as noted below.

The effect of this treatment varies in different localities. In some places worship is entirely suspended, church officers not under arrest are in hiding, and the congregations are scattered. In some places church meetings have been forbidden; in others the services are continued, but with reduced attendance and with police detectives and spies present; in still others the disturbances have had no effect on the congregational gatherings, and many new inquiries are present attracted doubtless by the reputation for patriotism which Christians have acquired. It may be said that the local officials are always ready with some absurd explanation of the distruction of church property such as that the Christians burn their own churches to show their abandonment of Christianity or that non-Christians burn them in hostility to Christians.

Since the bringing in of additional troops from Japan things have grown incredibly worse. These troops were brought in with the avowed purpose of "using severe measures," and interprated in the light of facts this means a campaign of fire and sword and devastation, the burning of whole villages accompanied in some instances with the massacre of inhabitants in the most approved style of Hun and Turk. At present writing attention is centered in a group of villages less than 50 miles from the capital. Two weeks after the first reports of village burning reached Seoul, investigation was made by foreigners. A party went to find the burned villages, and came on one still smoking. It had been burned the day before. At this village, called Chey Am Ni, the soldiers called the village men together in the Methodist Church, about 30 men in a village of 40 houses. Both Christians and non-Christians were present. The soldiers then fired on those present to kill all possible and then burned the church building over the heads of dead and wounded. Six men broke through the wall of the burning building and tried to escape, but were bayoneted outside. Two women who had joined their husbands were shot with the others. The village was then burned to the ground.

The facts are personally attested by representatives from the British and American consulates, members of the Red Cross Society, and of the Patriotic League of Britons Overseas. Photographs were taken of ruins and burned and bayoneted bodies. These outrages had been going on for a period of two weeks and continued in that district till the very day of the unexpected investigation by foreigners. Four other devastated villages in the district have been visited and reports from 11 others have been received. The same thing is being reported from other parts of Korea, and though the reports might have been received with incredulity under other circumstances, nothing is now too horrible to be believed. In all instances the hostility of the soldiers and gendarmes and police is directed against Christians. Christians in districts adjoining the devastated region have been told that the same thing would happen to them, and over large areas the people are sleeping out in the hills without shelter at night because they dare not stay in their villages, which may be burned over their heads at midnight and the inhabitants massacred.

In one village the Christians were ordered to tear down the church building and told that unless they signed an agreement not to be Christians they would be arrested as insurgents. Profession of Chris-

tianity is regarded as equivalent to confession of revolutionary purpose.

In a recent issue of an American church magazine is a statement to the effect that "the Japanese have a feeling of respect for Americans akin to worship"! The author of that article should spend a few months in the presence of the servants of the government of Chosen and learn their opinion of everything American and Christian.

In parts of the country where the reign of terror is being maintained people dare not walk from one village to another for fear of being shot, and the men dare not work in the fields. Frightfulness of another kind is employed. Inhabitants of villages are lined up to be shot and then sent away till another day, when the process is repeated. Even though not actually shot, on these occasions the people have the instances of massacre and devastation before their eyes and never know when the threat will be carried into effect. And always the animus is directed against the Christians.

As a result of the publicity given to these nearest outrages, the Government is taking relief measures for the people of these four villages and promises help and farm implements and seed. They are not able to restore the dead farmers to life, however, and nothing would have been done if the foreigners had not raised a storm of indignation. Nothing had been done in the case of villages similarly devastated two weeks before. The Japanese excuse is that the people were called together for instructions and in their efforts to escape kicked ouer a lamp and started the conflagration! Which leaves the massacres unexplained, but is a sample of the average police explanation accepted by the Japanese.

We can not go into further details in this report. The accompanying documents may be examined. But it can not be doubted that a persistent campaign is being carried on against Christianity under the plea of suppressing revolt.

Villifying, beating old men and little children, breaking up meetings by armed officers and men, wholesale arrests, brutal treatment of those under arrest, threats and intimidation, and massacre are all being employed to break the spirit of Christians and to prevent the spread of Christianity. These statements are supported by photographs, signed statements, and narratives on file.

THE OUTLOOK.

APRIL 24, 1919.

The uncertainty as to the outcome of the present disturbances is increased by the fact that the government of Chosen finds critics of the administration in the ranks of its own civil officials and in the Liberal parties in the Imperial Government. Investigators are not slow to criticize what they characterize as the stupid policy of the military régime, while the leading journals of Japan are to the extent of their meager information joining in a protest. The Peninsular Magazine, a monthly published in Seoul by a Japanese but for the Koreans and in the Korean language, had its April number confiscated, further publication prohibited, and the editor arrested because it published a long editorial criticizing the governor general's handling of the situation.

Except for rumors to the effect that the student class in Japan are beginning to favor Korean liberty, there is, of course, no one among the Japanese who favors independence for the Koreans, though the more advanced, like Viscount Kato, have come out in favor of autonomy; but many of them feel that the military administration ought to give place to the civil in the future, and that the military administration has made a failure in their colonial policy. As intimated above, right-minded Japanese in Japan proper do not approve of the Government's extreme methods in Chosen and are asking for a change.

It is possible that government reform may take place. A recent statement of Mr. Yamagata, the administrator general, is to the effect that "the agitation is deplorable, coming as it does just on the eve of government reforms" (the bold face is ours). But all officials seem to agree that the present uprising must be crushed before any reforms can be instituted, while the interpellations in the Diet in regard to the Korean situation seem to be a criticism of the administration for failing to keep order in the peninsula rather than a suggestion that the underlying causes of the disturbance be discovered and removed.

We must recognize that democratic tendencies are manifest in the Japanese Empire as well as in the rest of the world, and momentous events may occur at any time, even before this report reaches the board. Only the day before yesterday two automobile loads of Japanese rushed through the streets of Seoul shouting "Democracy banzai." Some 60 arrests have been made in connection with the demonstration. Many and conflicting forces are at work to-day in Japan as well as Korea; but we must not forget the most obvious fact that unless there is some marked change in Government policy or in the character of the administration, or both, mission work in Chosen faces a period of great limitation and difficulty. There are grave problems ahead.

The administrator general has just recently returned from a trip to Tokyo. It had been hoped that his return would mark the announcement of conciliatory measures; but, on the contrary, the official announcement is to the effect that the "lenient" measures employed in the past will be exchanged for utmost rigor, and a new law has been promulgated by the governor general making "any disturbance of the peace with a view to effecting a change of government" an offense punishable with 10 years of penal servitude, and significantly and specifically including foreigners in the ruling.

The effect of the administration's Rehoboam policy at this time can only be conjectured, but there are those who feel justified in quoting a trite proverb to the effect that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad."

—

EXHIBIT XXVII.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

MY DEAR MR. ———: I hardly know what to write. Things terribly upset these days. The country is still in the throes of revolution. The missionaries and Christians are suffering much. The Japanese as a nation do not like Christianity—it is too democratic. One of our missionaries is in jail. Things are in bad shape. I myself am on the "black list" because of an article to the ——— Press. The editor nearly had his paper suppressed over it, and the Government said they might need him later on. You see all papers in Japan and Korea are under Government control.

The poor Koreans are suffering terribly. I suppose fully 6,000 have been killed and thousands beaten—60 to 90 cuts with a brutal rod. All they have done is to shout "Long live Korea!" In some places there has been violence, throwing of stones, etc., but not at first. The Government up to the present has not done a thing but shoot and maim them. Of course it has told them to stop, but in no way has it come in touch with the leaders to see what could be done to stop this awful affair. I am in disfavor because I have told Government officials (and my article) that I believed in advanced reforms. I do not believe in immediate independence.

I am sending this letter via Shanghai. Nothing can get out like this these days. Remember the trouble is we are under the heel of a militaristic Government, exactly like the German. I was caught by some soldiers on Sunday. They soon let me go. I was going to see a man who had been badly beaten by the police. It is all your life's worth to go into the country these days. Oh, Japan is cruel! Even the best Japanese Christians, of course, back their Empire. I know Japan now. Nationally aggressive, obtaining her ends at all costs; if Christianity and love suit her, they are used; if the foulest methods of Machiavelli are required, they are employed, and all is covered with a smiling lie. I know her, but it took me two years.

—

EXHIBIT XXVIII.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

APRIL 30, 1919.

DEAR MR. ———: Things are quiet in ———, but there are still disturbances elsewhere. Nearly every day we see batches of prisoners from the country being brought to ——— for examination. Numerous churches have been burned by the military. The northern Presbyterians report at least seven church structures and a large school destroyed in this way, and we know that the southern Methodist and other missions have had similar losses. The students in the higher schools have not returned to study so far. A number of our students in both colleges with which I am connected are still imprisoned.

A terrible thing happened at ——— about ——— miles from ———. In a village there the men were ordered by the soldiers to go to the church on a Tuesday afternoon. About a dozen Christians and some twenty members of the Chundokyo responded. When they were in the church the soldiers fired through the windows, killing and wounding the party. Then the church was set on fire. The flames set one-half of the village on fire, and the soldiers then set fire to the other half. All but three houses were destroyed. It is claimed that this was done in retaliation for the killing of a gendarme, but so far as we can find out the gendarme was killed at quite a distance from this particular settlement. We have heard that the authorities have called the perpetrators to task, and have started in to rebuild the village as reparation.

—

EXHIBIT XXIX.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

TOKYO, *April 23, 1919.*

DEAR MR. ———: Mr. Mowry was arrested on April 4, and was detained in prison until the 19th instant, when he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment at hard labor, but was released on bail, pending the hearing of the appeal trial. The charge against Mr. Mowry was that of sheltering five Korean "criminals," and of allowing them to prepare seditious literature on his or on Dr. Moffett's premises. One of these Koreans was Mr. Mowry's secretary, and all the others, I think, were student friends, one of them being a son of Rev. Kil Sun Choo, of Pyengyang, who was one of the signers of the independence manifesto. At the trial Mr. Mowry admitted that these five men had each of them slept in his home on certain nights, but denied that he knew that the police were searching for them or that he knew that they were fleeing from the police, although he said he suspected it in regard to some of them. It might be said that Mr. Mowry has for years been in the habit of entertaining Korean friends—students and others—in his home in this way, and had entertained some of these men before. Mowry stated, however, that the police had not notified anyone that they were searching for these men, and that he did not think it was wrong or would have been wrong unless he had known that the police did want them. Also it should be borne in mind that the mere fact that a man is a Christian Korean is sufficient these days to lead the police to desire to arrest and investigate him.

The trial came off on April 15, no notice having been given either Mr. Mowry or Dr. Moffett, who was endeavoring to keep in touch with the case, until 2 p. m. of the 14th, when it was too late to secure a lawyer, as the nearest available lawyer lives in Seoul, and the trial was to take place at 10 a. m. on the 15th. So the case went to trial without a lawyer. The public procurator asked for a sentence as above—the law allowing up to two years' imprisonment or a fine of yen 200. The judge took the case under advisement until the 19th and then pronounced judgment as asked by the procurator. By this time Dr. Moffett had engaged a Mr. Okobo to represent Mr. Mowry, and an appeal was filed and granted, and Mr. Mowry was released on yen 300 bail.

In the meantime, over here in Japan, Mr. ——— and I had been trying to engage Dr. F. Usawa, who was in charge of "the Conspiracy Case" with Dr. Hanai. On April 10 Mr. ——— left Tokyo for Nagasaki, where Dr. Usawa was engaged on a case, and there made a tentative arrangement with him. These two lawyers are said to be the best criminal lawyers in Japan, and Dr. Usawa, as you know, is a Christian, a member of Mr. Uemura's church. Dr. Usawa returned to Tokyo on the 15th, and I met him on that day and again on the 22d, yesterday, on his return from another case. At this second interview I, acting on instructions from Chosen, definitely engaged Dr. Usawa to take charge of the case—in company with Mr. Okobo. Dr. Usawa thinks that he will be able to go to Chosen before the middle of May, and yesterday telegraphed to Mr. Okobo to try to get the case fixed for May 12. I also urged Dr. Usawa to go as soon as possible and stay as long as he could, because he ought to see for himself the conditions in the country. I had a very frank talk with him and told him some of the happenings we had witnessed personally. He said he would go to Chosen with an open mind and see all he could.

Mr. ———, after he met Dr. Usawa in Nagasaki, crossed over to Chosen. I, however, because it was necessary for some one to stay to perfect arrangements with Dr. Usawa, and also because Mr. F. L. Brown is due here soon to make arrangements for the Tokyo World's Sunday School Convention, stayed on. At first it seemed that every avenue of approach to influential Japanese was blocked. However, within the last week a good many facts as to the real condition of affairs in Korea have begun to come out even in Japan, as the inclosed clipping from the Japan Advertiser will indicate. This has led to a suspicion on the part of many influential Japanese that the censorship has prevented the real state of affairs from being known; and it having been reported that missionaries from Korea are in Tokyo, I am beginning to receive invitations from a number of such men to meet them and tell them what the situation is from our viewpoint. This I am doing, because it is the only means we have of bettering the terrible situation

now obtaining. Already the Federated Council of Churches had decided to send two men to Chosen, one of whom is Mr. ——; the other is not decided. Also ——— and Dr. ——— have asked me to meet them on the 25th to talk over the situation, and they say that they too will probably send over a delegation, some of whom will be members of the Diet. There are a good many encouraging signs that a change in public opinion in Japan, which has been fed with falsified reports, may be brought about.

APRIL 26, 1919.

Yesterday, as indicated above, I met Baron ——— and Dr. ———. There were present also Mr. ———, of the Japan Peace Society, and Mr. ———. We talked about two hours, and I told them very frankly just what is occurring in Chosen. They were interested to the end and said that they felt that a delegation of prominent Japanese outside of Government circles should be sent over. Mr. ——— and I urged them to send this delegation as soon as possible. These two gentlemen were absolutely in ignorance of what is being done in Korea, and I think the conference did good. This morning I met Mr. ——— and talked with him for about an hour. His sympathies are wholly with the Koreans in their desire for greater liberties. He urged three things: First, that we should give the facts to the world. He said the Government would probably resent the publication of the facts, but that it was the only way to remedy the situation. Second, in connection with the publication of these facts, let the newspapers of New York, Paris, and London point out that this situation has been brought about by the military régime, and let them urge Japan to change it. Third, that, if possible, the American and British Governments ought to be approached to get them to bring pressure on Japan to change her policy in this respect. He urged me to speak to ———. In all these conferences we have declined to speak about the political side of the question and have tried to make very plain that we are not taking any part in that, but also we try to make very plain that we feel that we do have a right to speak of the humanitarian side.

I feel repaid for coming for another reason also—I have met so many just and fair-minded Japanese that I am forming a juster estimate of their character as a whole. If Japan could only throw off militarism, there would be great hope for her.

APRIL 30, 1919.

Since writing you on the 23d and 26th, events have taken place rapidly. The first is the admission by Count Hasegawa that atrocities have occurred in Chosen. I send you among other things two extracts from the Japan Advertiser, one under date of April 27 and one under date of April 29, which will be self-explanatory. All I would say in addition to the information that these articles contain is that such happenings have occurred in many other places in Chosen, according to reports which have been brought to us by trustworthy Koreans. I inclose an account of one that is said to have occurred in the town of Maingsan, which is about 110 miles north of Pyengyang—we have a Christian church there, and the report was brought to us by a Bible woman whom we know well and who is trustworthy. These are but examples, though the worst ones of which we know. On a smaller scale, however, the same thing has happened in numberless villages.

I have made some progress in the way of meeting influential Japanese and laying before them the true situation in Chosen. And I am greatly encouraged to find that they are as indignant and as horrified as anyone else when they do know the facts.

KOBE, *May 17, 1919.*

Our interview with an important member of the Government was at once more interesting and satisfactory. His attitude was most cordial and receptive, and though, of course, his official position made it impossible for him to give detailed statements regarding the Government's policy, he indicated with great clearness what that policy was regarding Chosen. The interview began by a statement on our part of our reasons for the belief that in suppressing the agitation in Korea a disproportionate amount of repression was being directed against Christianity; to a statement of what appeared to us to be some of the underlying reasons why Christians had taken part in the movement and a statement of our apprehension regarding the future of Christian work in Korea, Mr. ——— replied to the effect that the Government had no intention of discriminating between Christians and non-Christians, but while there was some reason to believe that Christians had been particularly involved, there were misunderstandings on both sides. He said the Government had been on the point of making reforms when the trouble broke out in Korea, and therefore there was nothing else to do but suppress it, after which the Government proposed to make definite reforms, which he was not at liberty to state in detail. He said the Government has no anti-Christian bias, but that lower officials often fail to convey the Government's ideas and to carry out orders in the proper manner. After quiet is restored mistaken and overzealous officials will be punished. He said that Koreans must be treated in every way as equals, with all rights accorded Japanese in the home country, but that this ideal could not be realized in "one jump." Korea is not like Egypt and India. There the British are governing aliens. Here Koreans and Japanese are of one stock originally, and must ultimately be accorded similarity of treatment. There is racial discrimination all over the world, even in Paris. It can not be wiped out at one sweep. He said furthermore that there must be no difference in education between Japanese and Koreans. Perhaps his most important and significant statement, the bearing of which upon our troublesome educational problem of the past few years you will at once recognize, was to the effect that private schools in Chosen ought to have as complete liberty to teach religion and the Bible as they do in Japan proper. He is, therefore, evidently opposed to the policy of the Korean administration, against which our mission has been holding out consistently since the new educational ordinances were promulgated. He said in conclusion that religion should be as free in Korea as in Japan proper, and authorized us to tell the Koreans that real reforms would be made. We regretfully pointed out to him that the Koreans would not credit the statement, even coming from us, and did not commit ourselves to any course of action. As in the case of ——— (another important member of the Government), we expressed our earnest hope that the degree of liberty which he evidently favored might soon be realized, and we left with him a copy of the document outlining some of the reasons of the present agitation, a copy of which was forwarded to you in my last letter.

You will be interested to know that the council of federated churches of Japan is sending two Japanese pastors in company with Mr. Gilbert Bowles, of the Friends' mission, to Korea to get some first-hand information. These gentlemen expect to arrive in Seoul about the 21st of May.

Since arriving in Kobe we have learned that in spite of Gov. Gen. Hasagawa's assurance on April 27 that atrocities would stop, and also in spite of the above statement that the Government has no anti-Christian bias, the burning of churches still continues. Whether or not the Government has an anti-Christian bias we are convinced that the acts of its servants show a distinct and vicious bias against Christianity.

—

EXHIBIT XXX.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

APRIL 30, 1919.

DEAR FATHER: I want to send you a sort of estimate of the situation, which may help you to correct any opinions that have been wrong. The telegraphic news from ——— has not always been reliable, and it may be that many wild rumors have gone out.

In regard to missionaries participating in the independence uprising there is not the slightest truth. We have not even known what was being done till after the events were pulled off in most cases. We have had a great many men come to us for advice as to how they should act as church officers under such a situation, and all that we have done has been to talk frankly of our nonparticipation in the matter, of the danger of the destruction of the church in the movement, and of the large chance that there is very small hope that their appeal for independence will ever accomplish anything but loss of life and the tightening of the oppression. The fact that the pastors so largely went into the movement as leaders looks to the officials as though we were back of it somehow, but that simply illustrates the well-organized channels of influence that we have created in the machinery and life of the Christian community. This church organization was not at all used officially, as far as I have heard. I have not heard of a single case where the officers of the church have used their office or the regular meetings of the church for political propaganda. None the less, the mutual confidence and acquaintance of Christians all over the country have offered the strongest and most effective channel of political effort after the independence movement won the confidence of the Christian leaders. The names of Pastor ———, of———, and of ———, of ———, of the original manifesto, did more to turn the hearts of the Christians all over the country to the movement than anything else. Their influence is ignored by the officials and missionary influence is suspected instead. It is a Korean movement in method, in spirit, and in management.

That the Christian church is right in the midst of the movement no one will deny. The fact that a very large number of our most influential pastors, elders, students, and prominent Christians are in prison now is clear proof that they have been making their influence felt. It is evident that the Christians are the only ones sufficiently in touch with the international situation to realize that the principle of the self-determination of small nations could be applied to their case at this strategic time. The idea that appeal and protest and noise are as powerful as guns would never have swept the country if the Christians were not what they are. The Christians are the only ones who have not been intimidated to the extermination of all hope. Our Christians have felt that our presence was an influence which would compel justice. The Christian community contains men able to do things on a large scale and ready to go forward if the way is opened. The church is strongest along the Manchurian border Provinces, and thus most quickly reached by the influences of the political agitators who have taken refuge in China. So all these things have combined to put Christian leaders in the lead in this independence movement. But they have gone into it without the knowledge of the mission body, even their nearest individual missionary coworkers being left in the dark till after the demonstrations were under way. No missionary would have had the faith or foolhardiness to attack one of the strongest military powers in the world without a sword or a gun or any financial backing, or trustworthy political friends. The Koreans have evidently made up their minds that they would rather die than go on as they are, and so they are committing suicide on Japan's doorstep in protest, in proper oriental fashion. "Self-determination or self-extermination" is the spirit of the movement.

As to the extent of the movement there are two possible views. The uprisings have occurred day and night. Market days, especially where there were thousands of people assembled and arrest was most difficult, were especially used. Schoolboys all over the land have struck, and only those whom the police can lay absolute hands on have been induced to return to their books, and then their work has been largely pretense. Great sections of farmers have refused to sow crops. Merchants have refused to open their shops till forced to do so day after day at the point of the bayonet. As communications are cut off we can not be sure as to what is going on now, but the streams of prisoners that come in day by day now, after two months of incessant uprisings would indicate that every little hamlet is involved more or less. Usually the method has been for the villages of a township to send in all their younger men to a central market on a day fixed, and there, all together, they have gone to the official offices and shouted their throats sore, saying "Mansay for Korea." Every Province and most of the large market places throughout the whole land have had their demonstration. High and low, rich and poor, Christian, Buddhist, and Confucian, church schools and Japanese public schools without distinction, have gone into the demonstrations, willingly facing death or imprisonment, or beating, sheltering neither themselves nor their families—all in hopes that somehow the voice of the oppressed would reach the ear of a merciful God and gain the help of a world newly dedicated to the cause of liberty and justice.

The means used to suppress the revolt have been unmerciful. In fact, the movement has probably reached its present proportions largely because of cruel methods of officials in their attempt to crush it. "Frightfulness" is the proper word to describe much that has taken place. Arrests have been made, with beating with clubs, swords, guns, fists, and whips. Where the crowds seemed too threatening they have been dispersed by shooting promiscuously into the crowds without reference to guilt or nonguilt. After arrest the treatment has been cruel. Trials have been run so nominally and official beating administered with little care as to whether the men beaten were the men who were in the demonstrations or not. All were in sympathy, no doubt, and it has been on this supposition that this indiscriminate punishment has been so freely administered, but it is not just to punish a man for what he has not done. Old men have been laid hold on and beaten in substitution for their sons and grandsons and for neighbors who were leaders but fled and have avoided arrest. Wives have been thus beaten and cast into prison to compel them to produce their husbands. Many farmers have been told that they would be beaten and released, so

that they could go back to their farming. But they have often been given 90 strokes with such cruelty that they have had to be carried home in stretchers. Tales of rape are now coming in frequently. Torture to extract information seems common. How many have been killed outright no one can estimate. There have been many in this district. Most of our Christian leaders seem to have been imprisoned before the shooting was resorted to. The only Christian killed here in this city was killed by kicks on the back of the neck during the process of arrest. His funeral was the biggest that this city has ever seen and the non-Christian community joined with the Christians in singing gospel songs as they went along, guarded by a heavy military escort. None of our churches in this Province have been burned, but there are undeniable testimonies of the burning of large churches in various districts of the north of here. One well authenticated case of barbarism was in ———, where 20 or 25 Christians were shut up in their church, shot down first, and then burned up in their building. This was done, it is claimed, by the new soldiers who have recently arrived. A Korean woman would rather die than expose her naked body in ways not conformable to local custom. But it seems to be the common delight of official depravity just now to humiliate our Christian women by stripping them and beating them while naked. This may be claimed to be merely a process of searching their persons, but the effect is maddening on the Korean masses.

The evident attempt on the part of some officials and most of the semiofficial press to put the blame for this trouble on the missionaries has taken various forms and had several results. The arrest of Mr. ——— has aroused sympathy all over the country. The most reserved sections of the old ——— communities have been touched by this as perhaps by nothing that has ever happened. They know what missionaries do, and such persecution in connection with their patriotic movement for independence has given an open door where we have never had welcome. Missionaries have been beaten and treated in humiliating ways frequently. The press is full of ridicule because of what they pretend to think has been the gross mistake of the American missionaries in leading the Koreans into this strife and bloodshed when even a fool would have had better sense. But, as might be expected, such articles don't fool the men who are putting the demonstrations through. The true position of the missionaries is probably more of a matter of discussion over the nation than ever before and all to the good of the cause we represent. It looks now as though the biggest kind of a landslide were headed toward the church. Of course, this is largely political, but the nation knows now what Christianity and the church are, and most of those who are coming in are ready for both the patriotic leadership of their Christian brethren and also for the full religious life which they have for years known to be the only true way of life, but have refused for various reasons. Reports of church attendance doubling in various places are more and more frequent right in the midst of the most distressing police surveillance. Some churches, where all the leaders are in prison, are practically closed, but in general the work of the Gospel is going right on, even though it has been impossible for missionaries to go to them. In one place a policeman was intrusted with the task of searching the churches of a district. He went about instructing the population that now is the time that all should become Christians. Another story which came yesterday, also, is that at one of the near-by demonstrations where a policeman, Korean, was given a gun by a Japanese gendarme and ordered to shoot, he shot into the air until ordered to use the gun as a club. He rushed madly toward a defenseless and harmless old grandmother with uplifted gun and brought it down with a crash on the stone wall at her side. The gunstock was splintered and the gun a wreck.

The question as to whether the uprising is justifiable or not may be questioned by some. All agree that the Japanese have given the Koreans such an awakening in the last 10 years as they would not have attained in a hundred all by themselves. A reliable, clean government, better commercial enterprises, railways, and auto roads, mail service and telegraph, newspapers and public schools, courts of justice and reliable laws, have been given Korea in a day by Japan. But the missionary enterprise and the Japanese invasion have united in awakening the nation, and now the time comes when they refuse taxation without representation, object to search of their homes and persons by any common police, protest against being beaten without trial, having their lands seized by the Government without compensation for the building of good roads, resent having the so-called reliable, clean Government break down wherever Japanese interests are involved; they abominate the system of public prosecution forced upon their every community by the semiofficial organization that is undermining the chastity of the nation. Their mail is searched and seized at any small pretense. Commercial enterprise is flourishing, but under such conditions as to render Koreans hopelessly the commercial slaves of the Japanese overlords. Competition on a fair basis seems impossible. Public schools are very few. They have changed textbooks so that Korean children are taught history which lauds Japan and ignores the ancient glories of Korea. Fathers clench their fists as they complain that they are compelled to send their children to Japanese schools to learn in a hated language things that they hold to be lies. Christian and non-Christian schools have been crushed, and the Bible ordered out of mission schools even. Newspapers are filled with stuff that has been concocted and censored by the Government till one wonders that manhood could so desert an editor. How can any intelligent human being so garble facts in their papers, while admitting that they do so at the order of the powers that be? New roads are good, but the Koreans, who have built them without proper remuneration at the point of a sword in great gangs of forced labor, do not appreciate them.

Koreans justly feel outraged that Japan limits their right to have good schools of higher than high-school grade, and then refuses to let their best sons go abroad to get an education, except a limited number who are kept under Japanese tutelage in Tokyo. Japanese salaries for men in the same work throughout the whole Government system are twice what Koreans get. And yet it is the Koreans who pay the taxes. The progress is fine and the ship rides high on the wave, but it has become unbearable to the galley slaves in the hold.

—

EXHIBIT XXXI.

A PERSONAL LETTER.

APRIL 30, 1919.

MY DEAR DR. ———: No new village burnings in this locality recently, and the Government is doing some relief work for the worst cases here now. A committee representing all westerners living in Seoul met yesterday, and has called a mass meeting of all foreigners for to-morrow at the United States consulate general to plan for supplementing the Government aid. They have rice, and not a spoon with which to eat it, or a dish in which to cook it; no bedding, no clothes but those in which they stood when the massacre took place, and they fled from the burning houses as they were. It makes your blood boil! The church at ——— (better not give the name), in north P. Y., was burned the other night, and the Christians were not allowed to try to put out the fire. Ten thousand dollars would not replace it. "How long, O Lord, how long?"

No school for us this spring, but I have enough to do. More soldiers here in Seoul, garrisoning the city itself, though there has been no violence or even shouting here for weeks.

To-day's Seoul Press reports that a Korean was sentenced to five years' penal servitude for leading a band of agitators and throwing stones at a police box on March 26. That means that the new law imposing imprisonment for 10 years for disturbing public order, a copy of which you have, is retroactive. When the new law was promulgated on April 15 no date was given from which it took effect. But it was stated then that under the existing laws the maximum penalty was two years, so we conclude that it is the plan to apply the new law to cases that are now in the courts.

The Korean Church is standing up well. A famous old chap, Mr. ———, was being examined the other day, and when they asked him what should be done to make things peaceful, he said: "All you Japanese should begin by becoming Christians; then get a new start." I will not soil my paper with their answer, but he went back to his cell in the jail happy because he had spoken "a good word for Jesus Christ." They are not beating him, I am glad to say, but he is a rare exception.

Hastily,

———.

—

EXHIBIT XXXII.

THE FAILURE OF JAPANESE IMPERIALISM IN KOREA.

(By a Britisher.)

On March 1 of this year there was initiated in Korea a remarkable revolution; remarkable not only because of its severe indictment of Japanese imperial rule, but also because of the nature and methods of the revolution itself. Despite the superinquisitiveness of the Japanese police this people of 20,000,000 souls rose spontaneously within a few days, and took the Japanese officials unawares. Their "independence manifesto" was circulated in the near-by districts by carriers, but in outlying places was posted Japanese mail and on hand for the day of the demonstration. The method followed was that of passive resistance. No violence was resorted to. Throughout the length and breadth of the land the people contented themselves with speeches in favor of independence, with waving of Korean flags of the old régime, and with shouts of "Mansai."

The 33 men whose signatures were affixed to the manifesto gathered in Seoul on the 1st, read their manifesto, and, after celebrating the event by a dinner, calmly telephoned the Japanese police and offered themselves for arrest. The police, marveling, assented, but soon found that they had a heavier task ahead of them, as reports were flashed by wire from the Provinces, telling of demonstrations in all the large centers. The avowed aim of the demonstration was to protest against Japanese rule and acquaint the world at large of the Korean nation-wide desire for political independence. The Japanese authorities, taken absolutely by surprise, could think of no method of suppression than military force, and for several days the soldiery ran amuck, creating great havoc. But the Koreans, true to their prearranged plan, bore it all with stoic fortitude and only in very exceptional circumstances retaliated in kind. The rancor which such uncalled-for severity engendered in the minds of the Koreans was not likely to be softened by the governor general's proclamation, in which he declared that "Japan and Korea are perfectly united into one great power—a power which constitutes one of the principal factors in the league of nations," and in which he appealed to all Koreans to "exert themselves for the harmonious unification and coordination of the two in order to participate in the great work of humanity and righteousness as one of the leading powers of the world."

Here, then, is a new thing under the sun—a passive revolution—remarkable enough for thinking men to take notice of. At this time, when the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples are standing together for the principles of liberty and nationalism, for treaty obligations, and the rights of small nations safeguarded therein, for a pacific as against a military rule, 20,000,000 Koreans make their sober appeal on these very points, and especially to these two nations. Their independent national life was throttled by Japan 10 years ago, despite the fact that it had been guaranteed by treaty. During 10 years they have been under the heel of a military government, which has destroyed all initiative, and which her well-wishers feared has almost driven out all hope of her ever regaining a place in the sun. The Japanese had excuse for believing that their policy of military rule and imperial education had finally succeeded in crushing all national aspiration. But surely not even the most sanguine of Japanese statesmen could deceive himself into believing that "Japan and Korea are perfectly united into one great nation." Union is a matter of soul, and the soulless administration of the Japanese in Korea has only forced Korea to keep her soul apart in sullen unforgetfulness.

Korea can not forget her history. She can not forget that for nearly 4,000 years she has been a self-governing State. It is true that she was long tributary to China, and received most of her civilization from this great center of eastern culture. But she prides herself that throughout it all she maintained her autonomy. She cherishes the memory of those generals who succeeded in defeating great China, and does not forget the progress in art and science which she made independently before her devotion to Chinese culture stultified her own native genius. It is natural enough, too, for her to remember that Japan received much of her civilization from the common Chinese source through the medium of Korea. It was a Korean scholar who first taught Japan the Chinese classics. Korean priests carried to Japan her national Buddhist religion. It is believed, too, that the Japanese official dress was fashioned upon Korean models. And there is no question that the skill of the Japanese potter was directly borrowed from old Korea.

For several centuries Korea had lagged behind her two great neighbors. Her officials were selfish despots, who crushed the people, and by their system of suppression and extortion put a premium on ignorance and incompetence. The young Korean refers to this period with a keen sense of shame, but also with suppressed resentment that the sins of a past age should be added upon him. His resentment is the more unfeigned when he considers that the autonomy she maintained through 4,000 years—an autonomy that even great China respected—should at last have been wrested from her by the nation that drew much of its ancient civilization through her medium and whose modernism is only a few decades in advance of her own.

The events that led to annexation are well known. The Chino-Japanese War left Japan mistress of the East, and for her own safety she demanded that Korea should maintain absolute neutrality and be relieved of her annual tribute to China. Danger arose, however, from another source, for Russia pushed her political influence too far south for Japan's peace of mind. The result was the Russo-Japanese War for the avowed purpose of maintaining Korean independence. The outcome, however, was a Japanese protectorate over Korea, with the transfer to Japan of Korea's foreign relations. A secret protest against Japanese interference made by the Emperor of Korea to The Hague Conference in 1907 led to the dethronement of the reigning monarch and the tightening of the chain about Korea. The assassination of Prince Ito in Harbin by a Korean and repeated revolts in the peninsula finally gave Japan the excuse for annexation in 1910. It was done on a plea of necessity. Korea was the eastern core of contention, and so long as she remained independent and so ill fitted to govern herself, the peace of the East was threatened. So Japan, in the flush of her victory over a European power, became the guardian of the peace of the East and inaugurated her assumption of the new rôle by the annexation of Korea. During the 10 years that have intervened she has successfully preserved the peace, but only, to use a homely simile, as a housewife preserves her summer fruit. She plucks it from its living stem and, adding enough sugar to keep it sweet throughout its captivity, corks it firmly down to keep it from external influences. It looks good enough and promised well enough for the prospective consumer, but once the top is off the ferment begins. Japan made no mean showing in the bottling-up process, nor did she stint the sugar. But there was never a shadow of doubt who the ultimate consumer should be. And now that the lid has sprung for a season, the ferment has already begun.

The administration of Japan in Korea has much to its credit. She has been jealous of the world's approval, and for nine years the governor general has issued a well-got-up annual report in English on reforms and progress in Korea. Each year there has been found material for publication. Japan has instituted and carried out very successfully a progressive program of improvement. Highways, railways, harbors, and communications, these have increaseed in number and efficiency sufficient to merit the gratitude of the native and the praise of the outsider. Abuses in the local administration, in the collection of taxes, and in the law courts have been remedied. Agriculture, trade, and industry have been encouraged. The number of hospitals has been increased and the police hygienic regulations have improved sanitary conditions. The educational system has been extended and made uniform. Finance has been placed on a more stable basis and abuses in the currency rectified. These and such like reforms have compelled the Korean to thankfully acknowledge his debt to Japan.

But there are other aspects of the Japanese administration that tempt the patriotic Korean to greater thankfulness, inasmuch as they have forced Korea to still nurture beneath a mask of political indifference a hatred of Japan and a national aspiration which has burst forth at the first shadow of an opportunity. Military occupation and military government and the evident purpose of the administration to exploit Korea for the benefit of Japan and the Japanese settler—these rankle in the sensitive Korean mind and force him to fix his hope upon "the day" when his "national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction." The military rule has not left him even the vestige of liberty. Every man's movements are under the inquisitorial scrutiny of police and gendarme. All public meetings and society organizations are governed by law. A meeting to discuss world events is an impossibility; a democratic remark would inevitably mean a clash with officialdom. Free speech is unknown. Two years ago three students of the Pyengyang Union Christian College were arrested for making some liberal remarks in a valedictory address, and the literary society of that college was forced to discontinue. It goes without saying that the press is muzzled. No progressive young Korean can find a medium for the expression of his ideas. One of the brightest of young Koreans, Mr. ———, is credited with having edited no less than five magazines, one after the other of which have been suppressed. He is now in prison on the charge of having written the recent independence manifesto. Of magazines run by Koreans, there are no more than one or two in Korea proper, and some four or five issued by college students in Japan. Newspapers in Korea are all edited by Japanese, and even in the case of Christian Messenger, the Korean editor is forbidden to publish paragraphs on world events.

Religious freedom is guaranteed by the Japanese constitution and secured for Korea by the treaty of annexation. It is perhaps only due to the faults inherent in a military system that subordinate officials tend to interfere even here. But interfere they do, particularly in the country districts. The administration encourages Buddhism as the national religion, and the outcry against Christians and the Christian missionaries which followed the present revolt is symptomatic of a deep-seated prejudice. At the present time all Christians are under suspicion, and non-Christians recognize that a profession of Christianity is tantamount to courting official disfavor.

The self-interestedness of the Imperial Japanese rule in Korea is well exemplified in the educational system. A study of it discovers three determining principles: (1) Koreans shall be converted into Japanese, (2) emphasis shall be laid upon a technical education, but (3) Koreans shall not be intrusted with a liberal higher education. In order to accomplish the first of those aims, the chief subject of study in the common-school curriculum is the Japanese language. Not only is there more time given to this subject than to any other two subjects together, but every other subject is taught through the medium of this language except the Korean script. This subject is given no more than two periods every second day, so that if the Korean child still understands his native tongue it is despite his education. Korean history is banned. In its place is a history of Japan with Korean history interspersed here and there, much as colonial history is mentioned in a school history of England. Japanese patriotic songs are meant to cultivate the national spirit. A sense of Japan's military prowess is duly impressed upon the youthful minds by the full regalia—even to the sword—of his Japanese teachers. The second aim of laying emphasis upon a technical education can, of itself, do no harm. The Koreans sorely need to be taught the dignity of labor. But standing, as it does, as the sole purely educational aim, it inevitably gives the Korean the idea that Japan wishes to make him the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. To win unqualified praise such education must go hand in hand with a higher grade general education. But it is just here that the educational system of Korea is chiefly defective. It is in the interest of the Japanese imperial idea that Korea should be kept ignorant of modern events, and the authorities are afraid of a thoroughgoing liberal education. Other than the three special colleges, one each of law, medicine, and technical, there are neither academies, colleges, nor a university provided by the government in Korea. The academies that existed before annexation have been abolished and replaced by "higher common schools" of a much lower standard.

Not only is it in the system of education that the Koreans criticize the administration but in the inadequacy of the number of schools provided for the population, and especially in view of the discrimination in this respect made in favor of the Japanese residents in Korea. The following table will show the statistics for the year 1916 as published in the governor general's annual report, together with a comparative statement of Protestant mission schools:

Comparative statistics of schools in Korea for Koreans and Japanese (with statistics of mission schools).

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS FOR KOREANS.

Kind of school.	Number.	Scholars.	Applications.
Elementary public school	447	67,629	.....
High elementary school	3	537	2,651
Girls' high school	2	164	187
College	3	277	844

GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS FOR JAPANESE.

Kind of school.	Number.	Scholars.
Elementary school	324	34,100
Middle school	3	375
Girls' high school	9	526
College	2	91

CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

Kind of school.	Number.	Scholars.
Elementary school	601	22,542
Middle school	17	2,125
Girls' high school	14	1,352
College	4	250

Government schools for Koreans:	
Government subsidies	Y.602,888
Population	17,500,000
Government schools for Japanese:	
Government subsidies	Y.339,660
Population	300,000
Christian schools:	
Government subsidies	None.
Population	300,000

The above table shows that for a Korean population of 17,500,000 the Government has provided no more than 447 schools, capable of receiving no more than 67,629 scholars, or about one three-hundredths of the population. Compared with this there has been provided for the 300,000 Japanese residents 324 schools, capable of receiving 34,100 scholars, or one-ninth of the population. This does not mean that the Koreans are unwilling to educate their boys. The governor general reports the existence of no fewer than 21,800 old-type village schools, which must provide the elements of education to some 500,000 boys. To this must be added the 22,542 children attending Christian schools. But it is the higher-grade school system that receives most criticism from the Korean. Not only do the Japanese boys and girls in Korea get a higher standard of education than the native Korean, but more ample provision is made for their numbers. Including the three colleges, there are only seven schools for Koreans above the common public-school grade, capable of admitting no more than 978 scholars, whereas the Japanese children have 14 schools, with a capacity for receiving 992 scholars. Surely this leaves the administration open to the charge of discrimination and to the further charge of refusing the Korean the benefits of higher education. Here again the excuse can not be made that Koreans are indifferent to higher education, for in 1916 there were 3,682 applicants for the 978 places. The much suspected and maligned Christian church has stepped into the breach and, with its 31 academies and 4 colleges, receives yearly almost 4,000 students. If it be argued that the Government encourages young Koreans to take their higher education in Japan, the answer is that for most young men the cost is prohibitive, and that what applies to the Korean youth should apply equally to the sons of Japanese settlers. Not until the Government makes a fair provision from public funds for the native Koreans as she does for the Japanese colonists will she free herself from the stigma of "race discrimination" within her own empire.

Another example of this "race discrimination" is to be found in her system of official appointments. This is the natural outgrowth of her military policy, and depends upon the educational system for an excuse for its continuance. The ignorance and incapacity of the Korean officials of the former régime was made the excuse for the wholesale employment of Japanese in the higher official service. It was fondly hoped by Koreans that as the years went by and their stronger men acquired more experience and were educated under the Japanese administration the higher official positions would be thrown open to them. The opposite has been the policy and practice of the Japanese. In 1910, 6 out of 13 provincial governors were Korean, now there are only three. At that time all district magistracies were held by Koreans, now at least one-seventh of the largest districts are governed by Japanese magistrates, and even in some places the village provostship has been transferred to Japanese hands. The number of judgeships that have gone to the Koreans is very small, and all school principals are Japanese. The story is the same in every public department. But it is not only in the filling of offices that the discrimination appears but also in the dignity and remuneration attaching thereto. The Japanese officials of the same rank receive 40 per cent higher salaries than the Koreans, and in addition allowances for colonial service. This may happen in the case of men who graduate from the same school. One need not labor to point that the Japanese regard themselves as the superior race. It appears no less among the educated than among the

lower classes. The most dignified Korean official, if met by a Japanese stranger, would invariably be conscious of the other's sense of superiority, and in the same business office the overbearing manner of the Japanese to their Korean assistants is evident enough even to the passer-by.

Look at the administration from whatever point you will, the aim of the Japanese to make Korea a preserve for Japanese officialdom and exploit her for the benefit of Japan and Japanese colonists stands out as clear as day. Visit the large harbors and you will find that the land adjoining the docks is monopolized by the Japanese, and the Koreans denied building rights within the Japanese section. The Crown lands that have been held in perpetual lease by generations of Korean farmers have been sold by the Government, almost exclusively to Japanese settlers. For this reason the immigration to Manchuria has been increasing year by year. The banking system of the peninsula has been greatly extended and improved and is increasingly proving a boon to the natives. But it is surely unfortunate that, with the possible exception of the Kanjo Bank, all the managers and nine-tenths of the clerks are Japanese. It is this wholesale handicapping of the Korean youth that engenders the disaffection which has recently shown itself. This coming as it does from a people who are so strongly urging their policy of "no race discrimination" is, to say the least, an aspersion on Japanese sincerity. Discrimination runs through their whole imperial policy, is applied in their private business enterprises, and is perpetuated by their school system. For not only are Japanese and Korean children separated in their schools, but the standard of education is higher for the Japanese than it is for the Korean.

The origin of the present demonstration in favor of independence has to be sought, then, in the persevering spirit, in the Korean's sense of humiliation, and in a due appreciation of the evils and deficiencies of the present administration. It has an immediate cause which will be noted below, but the movement is by no means "a sporadic revival of patriotism, based upon false reports and instigated by a few individuals." There are three classes principally involved, but a fourth followed spontaneously and swept all Korea into the movement.

(A) The Japanese lay the chief blame upon a sect called "The Church of the Heavenly Way." Their creed is a simple one of two lines, which, however, may not be as colorless as it looks:

Who waits on God shall wield God's might;
Who ne'er forgets all things come right.

Forgets what? To the initiated this may hold more than a religious meaning. Be that as it may, it is worth nothing that this sect has been in existence, under this name, since annexation. Its membership exceeds a million. On three gala days enormous crowds gather in the capital and throughout the country, ostensibly to worship, but in reality to perpetuate the spirit of patriotism and incidentally to provide the organization for a united effort when "the day" should arrive. The sect is avowedly politico-religious, and their prominence in the recent demonstrations is easily accounted for.

(B) The same can not be said of the native Christian church. For many years the Korean Christians have been without hope in this world. So lacking has been their interest in political affairs that the chief tenet of their faith has been the second coming of Christ. The Japanese themselves have been severe in their criticism of the "other worldliness" of the Christian community. It was a surprise, therefore, to the officials and to the missionaries no less, when the church threw off its cloak of indifference and unanimously began to tackle the political problem of the country. The Japanese interpretation of this phenomena is a comment upon the official mind. They refuse to think that the Korean people could have conceived or carried through such a movement without the aid of foreign missionaries. They have despised the ability of the Korean, and have made it their policy to crush all initiative. Hence, too, their mad rage against the Christians. Profession of faith is a heinous crime and a proof that the believer is in league with the foreigner against Japan. The Korean is denied the credit of being able to think or act independently. The prominent part played by the Christians in the revolt is only a proof that the more enlightened and more sensitive natures are to be found in the church. And who but a prig would deny that political wisdom might be expected even from a Christian?

(C) The third class involved consists of Koreans abroad. Students and business men in Japan, China, Russia, and America can not fail to be influenced by the present world movements. The problems of the peace conference are their problems. Most of them have left Korea as a protest against Japanese rule, and it is inevitable that correspondence with friends in Korea should have nourished the patient but persistent anticipations of "the day."

(D) The educated Koreans are to be found in one or the other of the above classes, or in the Buddhist faith. Little mention has been made of the part played by the Buddhists in the rising, but two of their leading priests signed the declaration of independence and demonstrations took place in many of their monasteries. But it was not from the educated classes alone that the protest came. Despite the censorship of the Japanese press, which left many places completely isolated, the country people spontaneously rose throughout the whole land. This can only be explained by the assumption that it needed only a rumor to rouse the national spirit from its seeming lethargy. Old men and ignorant peasants joined in the demonstration. Forbidden oracles and prophecies were brought from the recesses of the past and discussed. "Wai Wang Sam Nyunm Ka Jung Pal Nyun," a 500-year-old prophecy, is now interpreted as meaning "a Japanese king for three years" (referring to the protectorate 1907–1910), "Eight years' rule by 'Ka'" (Kain being the name of the present reigning Emperor, and this the eighth year of his reign). Such like oracles are the common possession of the peasant class and the Bible of the old men. Omens and portents are eagerly sought. During these days the hills around ——— resounded to shouts of "Mansai" by an unseen host. Strange maneuvers of Japanese and of old Korean flags have been reported and taken as good omens. We may laugh at the superstition, but we are forced to note the fact that a nation-wide revolution could be evoked on such slim evidence. The merest semblance of an opportunity was eagerly grasped which might bring relief from their oppressive rule.

The immediate reason for the revolt is the idea that Korea may share in the application of the principle of national self-determination. Koreans feel that at last the world is going to be offered another opportunity to revive just national ideas. Times have changed since Japan took over Korea. They feel that it is no longer either justifiable or possible to maintain the peace of the East by a form of government that crushes every legitimate aspiration of a people of 20,000,000 souls. It was in the hope that the world might learn the true state of affairs in Korea, in the hope that even the statesmen gathered in Paris might learn it, that the present movement was launched.

The revolution was organized by a committee of 33 leaders, who issued a manifesto calling upon Koreans everywhere to unite, stating their aims, and counseling peaceful methods. The three main clauses read as follows:

(1) What we as a nation desire is justice, human rights, a fair chance to life, and scope for legitimate ideals.

(2) We pledge ourselves to the last man and the last hour to see that a fair statement of our people's mind is given to the world.

(3) Let us look to conduct that we do all things orderly, molesting no one, and respecting property.

In pursuance of this policy the Korean demonstrators have instituted a passive revolution. With empty hands, save for the carrying of a small Korean flag, with nothing but shouts of "Mansei—long live Korea!"—the movement has been remarkable for its freedom from violence on the part of the Koreans. They possess no arms and would have been at the mercy of the Japanese military had they resorted to force. The marvel is that they were able to endure to the end and refuse to retaliate against the brutal methods which the administration has taken to subdue the disturbances. The Japanese soldiery were let loose in many places and played havoc among the most innocent. Churches have been wrecked and men hurried to jail on the merest pretext. The usual brutal methods of police investigation have been adopted, and men have come out of the police stations so bruised and battered as to be unfit for work for days. A strike or two in the capital, the refusal of the storekeepers to open their doors, the closing of schools, and frequent demonstrations in favor of independence—that has been the extent of the revolt. Thousands are in jail, and thousands more are carrying on the work which their organizers began. There seems to be no disposition to give up until some promise of reform is given. The Japanese have, unfortunately, made up their minds to suppress the revolt by force and intimidation. It remains to be seen who will win out.

The question of the fitness of the Korean people to govern themselves has been much to the fore. Fears have been expressed that if Japan left Korea alone to-day, the result would be anarchy and Bolshevism. That there would be factions no one will deny—is there any country in this old world where there are not? But that Koreans would go to extremes no one who knows their peace-loving character will grant. It is manifestly unfair to saddle upon new Korea the faults of a former autocratic régime. Times have changed. Koreans of good standing and ability have received their education in Japan and America. They have received American ideals through American missionaries. The Japanese system has not tended to produce big men, but despite it capable men are to be found. The government of a church differs greatly from the administration of a country, but the fundamental faculty is the same. If the ability shown by the Korean Christians in their church courts is any criterion, one might even hope for their successful administration of national affairs. The very efficiency and courage which they have shown in their present revolt is no mean proof of their ability, and the unanimity with which all classes throughout the entire land followed the lead of their committees show a remarkable power of organization and a wonderful willingness to be led. The Koreans are divided in their political aims. Some desire a form of self-government under the suzerainty of Japan along the lines of Britain's self-governing dominions. Others maintain that as Korea and Japan are two distinct races with different national spirit, absolute autonomy alone will provide the necessary opportunity for national progress. Koreans feel confident that they could make as good a showing as Japan. Korean students in Japan, of whom there are 800 this year, claim that they more than hold their own with Japanese students, despite the handicap of the Japanese language. Be that as it may, one thing stands clear—things can never go along as they did before the revolt. Whatever may result the Koreans must be given a greater opportunity to develop along their own national lines. Their national history must be held inviolate, their national language respected. Military rule with its system of gendarmerie must go, and the common rights of man be secured for all. The educational system must give the Korean youth the best possible chance to make good, and the offer of promotion to higher offices must prove the incentive. Ultimately there should be no office in the State which a Korean boy may not one day aspire to. Whether this will mean that Japan must withdraw from the peninsula or not one can not predict. It remains to be seen whether Japan, in the present instance, will respond to the reasonable and restrained protest of this people in the spirit of the times. There are not wanting signs that Japan is mustering courage to defy the enemy within her own gates. The world, and little Korea, will await the outcome. In the meantime we content ourselves with knowing that imperial military rule in Korea stands condemned, and that instead of the two nations being perfectly united they are further apart to-day than ever.

—

EXHIBIT XXXIII.

COPIES OF DOCUMENTS PRESENTED TO IMPORTANT JAPANESE IN TOKYO BY A COMMITTEE FROM KOREA—SOME REASONS UNDERLYING THE PRESENT AGITATION IN CHOSEN.

MAY 10, 1919.

The following paper is a condensed statement of what appear to be the most important of the underlying causes of the present agitation in Korea. All of the reasons given have appeared in some form or other in declarations, petitions, and bulletins issued by the Koreans, and so may be taken as an expression of Korean opinion. The statement contains only what seem to some friends of Japan and Korea to be the most important of the causes involved.

It should be said also that it does not embody the immediate causes of this outbreak such as the rumors in connection with the work of the peace conference, prevalent ideas of "self-determination," the activities of Koreans abroad, and the death of the ex-Emperor of Korea.

I.—*The desire for independence.*

It must be remembered that the assimilation of an alien race is a difficult task at best and that in this case it is made more difficult by the fact that the Koreans as a people have never in their hearts been reconciled to annexation.

II.—*The rigor of the military administration.*

Koreans do not know what it would be like to be under a civil administration. Their whole idea of the Imperial Government is drawn from their experience of military rule.

1. The fact that the police have gendarmes and soldiers associated with them in the administration of law leads the Korean to fear the police and to regard them not as civil servants and protectors but as oppressors.

2. This impression is deepened by the harsh and indiscriminate manner in which laws are administered. In the report issued by the government general in July, 1918 (covering the year 1916–17), it is stated that out of 82,121 offenders dealt with in "police summary judgment," 952 were pardoned, 81,139 were sentenced, and only 30 were able to prove their innocence. The unavoidable result of such a system is that a naturally peaceful and gentle-minded people are living in a state of constant terror.

3. The spy system has added to the terrorization of the people. Spies, usually low-class Koreans, are everywhere. No one knows when nor in what form the most harmless acts or words may be reported to the authorities.

4. The treatment of those arrested adds to the fear and hatred of the police.

5. The show of force on all occasions adds to the irritation. Civil officials, even primary school-teachers, wear swords.

6. This system has brought the people to believe that the administration has no idea of leading them, but only of compelling obedience.

III.—*Denationalization.*

1. The Koreans are a different race, with different history, traditions, ideals, ethics, and customs. The present administration seems to aim at the elimination of many things traditionally Korean and the substitution of things new and strange. There seems to be no systematic attempt to win the Korean's loyalty for Japan but to make over the Korean into a Japanese.

2. The exclusion of the Korean language from schools, courts, and legal documents is a great source of irritation. It is recognized that the question of language presents a problem to the Government, but the effect of the present policy on the mind of the Korean can not be minimized.

3. The elimination of Korean history from school curricula is another source of irritation. The Koreans feel that the presentation of the subject of Korean history is neither as full nor as accurate as its importance would warrant.

IV.—*The Koreans have no real share in their government, either legislative or executive, and no hope of securing this has been held out to them.*

1. Some Koreans do hold office, but usually minor ones, and in the case of those holding an important office they can usually be overruled by Japanese officials of lower rank.

2. The inferior education given to the Korean students deprives them of the hope of securing positions by competitive merit in the future.

V.—*Discrimination against Koreans.*

1. There is discrimination in salaries for the same services in government institutions, in business houses, and in labor.

2. In government schools the curriculum is different for Japanese and Koreans. The latter have from two to three years shorter course than the former. In the matter of English also, which all desire to learn, the Japanese have four days a week for five years while the Koreans have only two hours a week for two years. Such differences in educational facilities may be accounted for by the government's inability to provide full courses as yet, but it works an evident hardship and is resented by the Koreans.

3. Corporal punishment can be legally administered only to Koreans.

4. There is discrimination in many apparently minor but really significant matters. For instance, Koreans are rarely employed as train boys or akabos, and Japanese rickisha men are given the best positions at railway stations.

VI.—*No liberty of speech, press, or assembly.*

(Christian Koreans were arrested who were heard praying for a spiritual revival, the authorities insisting that this meant a political revival.)

VII.—*Limited religious liberty.*

1. Religion can not be taught in private schools according to the government revised educational ordinances, which recognize no difference between government and private schools.

2. In the case of Christianity, the Bible can not be taught in private schools opened since March, 1915, or in any schools after 1925.

3. Ceremonies are required which seem to be a violation of conscience to Koreans.

4. Local officials constantly intimidate Christians and those intending to become Christians, in what appears to be an effort to discourage Christianity.

VIII.—*Practical prohibition of Korean study and travel abroad.*

1. Koreans know that Japan's progress is largely traceable to foreign studies at the beginning of the Meiji Era and since, and desire the same opportunity for improvement. With the exception of certain specially favored cases, Koreans are not permitted to go abroad, and those who have received their education abroad are not permitted to return.

2. Even Koreans who have been educated in Japan are so constantly watched by the police on their return to Korea that they can make no proper use of their education.

IX.—*Expropriation of crown lands.*

In many sections of Korea crown lands have been occupied and farmed by the Koreans for generations on the basis of a moderate rental. In many cases the leasehold of these lands had acquired a value almost equal to that of land held in full possession. These lands, however, were in many cases turned over to the Oriental Development Co., and the former occupants required to pay greatly increased rents, which compelled them to abandon the land in favor of government-assisted Japanese settlers.

X.—*Demoralizing influences newly introduced.*

1. Licensed prostitution in all cities and towns has made this form of immorality more open and accessible, and hence has had a more demoralizing effect as well as a more widespread influence upon the young men of the country.

2. The persistent sale of the morphine needle has been unrestricted in many sections.

XI.—*Forced migration to Manchuria.*

The extensive migration of Japanese farmers into central and southern Korea and their occupation of often unjustly secured lands has forced the migration of thousands of Koreans into the less desirable and undeveloped sections of Manchuria.

XII.—*Many improvements benefit Japanese more than Koreans.*

1. Industrial, e. g.: The lumber industry, although extensively developed, brings no additional benefit to the Koreans. In fact, lumber costs more than formerly.

2. Commercial: The Korean merchants lack modern business training and experience, which makes it difficult for them to withstand the unrestricted competition of Japanese merchants.

3. In many cases licensed monopolies work great hardship to the Koreans and cause resentment, e. g., the cotton monopoly and the fertilizer monopoly in Sen Sen.

EXHIBIT XXXIV.

BRUTALITIES IN SYENCHUN IN MAY.

(Statement by Rev. ———.)

MAY 25, 1919.

Eleven Kangkei boys came here from ———. All the 11 were beaten 90 stripes—30 each day for three days, May 16, 17, and 18, and let out May 18. Nine came here May 22, and two more May 24.

Tak Chank Kuk died about noon, May 23.

Kim Myungha died this evening.

Kim Hyungsun is very sick.

Kim Chungsun and Song Taksam are able to walk, but are badly broken.

Kim Oosik seemed very doubtful, but afterwards improved.

Choi Tungwon, Kim Changook, Kim Sungkil, and Ko Pongsu are able to be about, though the two have broken flesh.

Kim Syungha rode from ——— on his bicycle and reached here about an hour before his brother died. The first six who came into the hospital were in a dreadful fix, four days after the beating. No dressing or anything had been done for them. Dr. Sharrocks just told me that he feels doubtful about some of the others since Myungha died. It is gangrene. One of these boys is a Chun Kyoin, and another is not a Christian, but the rest are all Christians.

Mr. Lampe has photographs. The stripes were laid on to the buttocks and the flesh pounded into a pulp.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask leave to have included in the RECORD an editorial from the National Inquirer, of Indianapolis, Ind., of July 10, 1919. The editorial deals with article 10 of the league of nations covenant and describes the character, need, and effect of the same.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

ARTICLE 10.

"Article 10 of the league of nations covenant, sought to be eliminated through reservations to be made by the Senate in the resolution of ratification, is of the essence of the covenant—its foundation, without which the covenant would be as a house built in the air.

"Its elimination would be, in effect, rejection of the covenant, for it would constitute a fundamental and vital change, such as would lead other nations, now signatory to it, to refuse to accept the covenant so mutilated.

"There is no doubt of the power of the Senate to make the reservation. It has the constitutional right to do its will with the treaty—covenant and all. It can reject it in toto, it can rewrite it, it can strike out clauses and sections, and add others, and make such interpretations as to the provisions of any clause, section, or article as it may desire. All of that is admitted.

"But if the Senate changes the terms and conditions of the treaty by elimination, addition, or interpretation, or by qualification of its acceptance through reservation as to any article, section, or clause, which, in the judgment of other nations signatory thereto, affects the meaning, purpose, or terms in manner or degree unsatisfactory to them, thereby making the treaty, in purpose, meaning, or terms different from that which they signed, such nations can file their refusal to accept the treaty as changed, modified, or interpreted, and refuse to be bound thereby, and the treaty at that instant would, as to any and all of such protesting nations, become null and void, and be thereafter, as to them, as though the United States had rejected the treaty, or as if it had never been.

"If article 10 is, as we believe it to be, the foundation stone of the covenant, it is essential to its vitality and its life, and its elimination would be such a change as to justify and all but inevitably lead to rejection by the other signatory nations.

"Upon our ratification of the treaty, emasculated by the elimination of this section, the other signatory nations, and especially Great Britain, France, and Italy, and perhaps Japan, would promptly file protests and renunciations, as they would have a right to do, and then as to us, there would be not only no league of nations covenant and no league of nations but no treaty at all.

"In that event the protesting nations could continue the treaty among themselves with the United States excluded, and form a league of nations without us; or they could summons the members of the peace council into session and conference again and begin an effort to formulate a new treaty by new negotiations

in the hope that, after months of labor, something mutually acceptable and which could subsequently be ratified could be obtained.

"Neither of these alternatives, it seems to us, is to be seriously thought of, much less desired. To create the necessity or likelihood of either, under the perilous conditions now existent throughout the world, and especially in Europe, would be to incur a responsibility which we as a Nation ought not to assume.

"Having joined in the overthrow of old conditions, we are in duty bound to remain in at the settlement and share with our associates the responsibility of rehabilitation.

"It will not be a sufficient answer for our withdrawal from such responsibility to say: 'We prefer the isolation and aloofness we enjoyed before the cataclysm engulfed us and involved us in the fateful struggle.' The matter of the abandonment of our isolation was a thing to have been thought of and determined before we abandoned it by becoming a participant in the war or sending our armies to Europe, or even declaring war.

"There were conditions which we believed compelled the abandonment of our traditions and our isolation and coerced us into entrance into the war. Confronted with these conditions, we abandoned traditions and isolation and entered the war. The momentous decision, which the opponents of the league covenant seem now so much to dread, was made then, and made irretrievably, and is not now to be made. It is stare decisis—a thing done; an accomplished fact.

"Through that decision and the things we did in making it effective we changed the conditions of peoples and the status of nations. Governments were overthrown, old institutions dissolved, new governments created, and new institutions put in process of establishment. By that decision then made and our subsequent acts, joined with the acts of the Allies, we changed the weights and balances of the whole world, and can not now recede from the consequences and leave them unredressed, without giving all the world lasting cause for grievance and just ground for censure. We can not now recede from the decision then made. After the decision and our acts under it, we can not change our mind without injury and offense not only to other peoples but to ourselves.

"This grave and indisputable fact leads us, therefore, as a matter of good faith to others and to ourselves, to examine with open minds the character, the need, and the effect of the article in the covenant we propose to eliminate, that we may be sure the gravity and peril of its acceptance are such as to justify striking it out of the covenant, and our breach of faith as to the decision we made when we entered the war, and as to the acts we did in giving our decision effect, and as to the changed conditions which have come upon the world in consequence of our acts. This much, we think, is of necessity demanded of us. We must be sure of justification before recession from that decision and the betrayal of the responsibility consequent upon our acts thereunder. And we can not find justification in invective or vituperation or in charging the article in question to be what it plainly and clearly is not, nor in strained constructions or forced and unwarranted interpretations.

"Justification for so grave an act of recession and so profound a breach of good faith on the part of a nation sensitive of its honor and alive to its duties in the world of nations, and its obligations to mankind, can not be found in passion, in personal animosity, in party desire for advantage, or in the selfish ambition of men. It must be found, if at all, in fact and in fair intendment—found within the actual letter of the article or in the indubitable spirit of it.

"From this conclusion, it seems to us, there is no escape.

"This brings us, therefore, to the inquiry: What is the character and the need of article 10 of the league covenant, and if accepted by us what would be its effect upon us as a Nation and upon our institutions?

"These questions we mean to consider elsewhere in these columns.

"HANLY."

CHARACTER OF ARTICLE 10.

"What is article 10? For what does it provide? What are its terms? Are they such as to warrant the things said of them by some of the Members of the Senate of the United States?

"Such things as these:

"'A monstrosity; obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations; oppressive of weak nations and peoples; destructive of human progress and liberty; hideous monstrosity; makes us the guarantors forever of the territories of 32 separate governments specifically named in the covenant and of at least 13 other governments to be added thereafter; under the covenant we would underwrite forever the status quo of the whole world; this league means that American boys shall police the world; that all the tottering nations of the earth shall be upheld by our blood and bone; that we, with our glorious past, shall guarantee the territorial integrity of every country on earth and the bondage of every suffering people in anguish begging for freedom; it means the halting and betrayal of New World liberalism, the triumph of cynical Old World diplomacy; the humiliation and end of American idealism.'

"The best answer to these charges, it seems to us, can be found in the text of the article itself. We have quoted it before in other editorials appearing in these columns, but we submit it again:

"'The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.'

"We pass over the suggestion which involuntarily occurs to every candid, open mind, that the language in which the opponents of the league have characterized this section, and which we have quoted above, and which might be extended over an entire page of this paper without exhausting the epithets that have been hurled against it and the vituperation laid upon it, is the language of men who are about to betray a great and solemn trust and who seek justification for their perfidy by vituperation and denunciation in advance of their acts, and go directly to the question of the provisions and meaning of the article itself.

"Article 10, it must be remembered, does not stand alone. It is:

"'The preliminary assertion of solidarity upon which articles 11 to 17 are based, and each in a way encompasses them. It establishes a principle; they define its application. It is a mistake to consider article 10 as something that stands alone. Nor is it less a part of the two articles which precede it, those relating to disarmament. In itself it calls for no action by the league or the members of the league unless some extraordinary emergency arises for which no other provision is made in the covenant. In that remote exigency the council is directed to advise upon the means by which the obligations under it may be fulfilled. The council can only advise. It rests upon the respective Governments themselves to decide how they will fulfill their obligations under it. The advice of the council must be by unanimous agreement of its members, and the United States will be a member. No advice as to the course of action will, therefore, be given that would be considered unjust to the United States by the representative of our Government. Probably no advice will be given by the council until after consultation with the respective Governments represented in the council. This consultation would seem to be essential in important matters, for this is a league of nations, not a superstate, and the members of the council are primarily but representatives of the nations that are given the predominating influence. Inasmuch as these nations have the greatest power, both in themselves and in the league, their responsibilities will be the greater, and they will endeavor to reach an agreement among themselves as to what action should be taken in case of such an extraordinary emergency as would fall upon article 10 alone. Each Government must be its own judge as to the manner in which it will fulfill its obligation, and the character and extent of its support will depend upon the circumstances of the case, the greatness of the emergency, and the degree of its own danger. That danger would be measured to a large extent by proximity, and it is reasonable to assume that the countries nearest the seat of trouble would be first to go to the aid of the one attacked. But somehow all would help, if the help of all were seen to be necessary, and it is this assurance that is required to give cohesion and stability to the association, and which alone can provide the moral influence, which may become compulsory, that must be provided for in the absence of a permanent international police force.

"'To summarize, article 10 is the necessary binding of the nations into a unified and potential force for mutual respect and protection. The fulfillment of all ordinary obligations in the pledge it involves is provided for in other articles. It is only in exceptional circumstances not otherwise provided for that action under it specifically would be appealed for. The occurrence of such circumstances is highly improbable, but if they should develop each nation would be the judge of its obligations under the article. Good faith would require the support it pledges, but whether that support would be economic alone or both economic and military would depend upon the nature of the case and the understanding reached by the respective Governments.'

"As suggested in the editorial immediately preceding, article 10 is the basic section of the league, the preliminary assurance of mutual support against external aggression threatening territorial integrity or loss of sovereignty. It is an agreement and a pledge, an agreement that the members of the league will not only themselves respect the sovereignty and the territorial rights of one another but a pledge that they will protect them from aggression by others.

"There is no effort made by this section or elsewhere in the covenant to commit the league to the maintenance of the status quo as to the territorial limits of its members against domestic insurrection or internal revolution—not a word, a syllable, or a letter providing for it or requiring it by any just intendment or justifying such an interpretation. It is a straw man, manufactured by the league's enemies. The agreement by the members to respect the territorial rights of one another of necessity relates to external aggression, and the pledge to preserve the territorial integrity of the respective members by express language is limited to 'external aggression' and 'political independence.' As has well been said, this qualification alone answers most of the arguments directed against the article.

"Former President Taft makes conclusive refutation of the contention that article 10 is not a covenant against revolution by 'oppressed peoples struggling for freedom' in one of his letters in behalf of the covenant:

"'It is objected to article 10 that it is too rigid; that progress of the world may need rearrangement of boundaries, an enlargement of one country and a reduction of another, or the creation of new States. Article 10 does not forbid changes in boundaries or the enlargement or reduction of States or the establishment of new States. All that it forbids is the taking of territory by force from a member of the league or overthrowing its Government by violence. Article 10 does not protect any nation against internal disturbance, rebellion, or revolution. It does not prevent the division of States by these means. The objection assumes that war by one existing nation upon another is necessary to the progress of the world to secure useful changes in boundary. We need not deny that a war of aggression may achieve a useful end; but the basis upon which the league rests is that such advantages are outweighed by the suffering in modern war and the possibility that a small war may lead to a general war and an enormous damage to civilization. The effort in the formulation of the present treaty is to make just boundaries, and the effect of article 10 will, doubtless, be to maintain those boundaries, in so far as to prevent foreign aggression from affecting them.'

"The opponents of the league seize upon article 10 and declare it to be what it is not and to intend what it does not intend and give, as we have seen, forced and unwarranted interpretations to its language that they may have a basis for the denunciation and epithets and vituperation they hurl against it.

"It is incredible that the President and an ex-President of the United States, members of different political parties, holding diametrically opposed views in regard to the domestic questions which divide their parties, and having nothing in common except their Americanism and their love of country, should both be asking the people of the United States to accept an instrument 'destructive of human progress and liberty,' requiring us to 'guarantee the bondage of every suffering people in anguish begging for freedom,' and binding us to the betrayel of 'New World liberalism.'

"This suggestion is so unworthy as to be undebatable.

"HANLY."

THE NEED OF ARTICLE 10.

"Armies and armaments have cursed the world for centuries, wrecked its cities, devastated its fields, killed its people, and drenched its soil with blood.

"They are not guarantors of peace, but instruments of war. The verity of this statement is beyond dispute. The history of all times, all lands, and all peoples confirms it. If there was ever doubt concerning it, the Great War just closed and the causes which produced and led to it would of themselves establish it.

"Knowing this, and with the red horror of the last five years fresh in their memories, and the wreck and ruin it inflicted spread before their eyes, the representatives of the nations convening at Paris to formulate a treaty, calculated to conserve the fruits of the victory won by the allied and associated nations, sought to provide for the dismantling of armaments and the demobilization of arms, and to prohibit their subsequent creation, beyond police necessity.

"With that purpose the peoples of the earth are in accord.

"But when they attempted to provide for the disarmament of nations, they were confronted with the fact that there would be some nations who would not willingly join in disarmament, but would insist upon building navies and forts and arsenals and mustering and maintaining great standing armies. Europe had just been all but crushed by such a nation and would have been utterly so but for our intervention. Twice in half a century France had been wounded all but unto death by such a nation. For more than a century her people lived in the dread of invasion, and in the presence of the peril that twice in a generation had fallen upon her.

"Under such conditions peaceable nations feared to disarm lest they be left to the mercy of armed aggressors.

"To meet that fear, born of dread experience and kept alive by the present menace, it has been proposed that the nations who disarm shall form themselves into a league which shall not only respect the sovereignty and national independence and the territories of one another, but which shall bind all of them in a pledge of common defense against external aggression threatening the independence or the territories of any of them.

"Here is the need of article 10 of the league covenant and the reason why it is formulated and why it should be accepted and confirmed.

"To strike down article 10 would be to destroy the foundation of the league and to make futile all effort toward disarmament.

"The manner in which the member nations are to be protected in their independence and their territories against external aggression is not provided for in this section, but it is in other sections, and it is so carefully guarded that no nation can justly hesitate to accept the covenant because of it.

"Article 10 is:

"'First of all, the fundamental agreement of mutual support in case of attack from without. It is the foundation upon which the other articles relating to international disputes is laid. There would be no league without it, for many of the nations concerned would not enter into an association that called for disarmament unless some such pledge were made, just as a man whose life is threatened is unwilling to give up his arms unless assured that he will be protected in other ways. If the plans of disarmament are carried out to the satisfaction of the countries and made universal, the time will come when such an agreement as this will be superfluous, for the fear which demands it now will be removed. But under present conditions, and the terror of Germany's sudden and prodigious attack still in the minds of the world, such an understanding is an essential basis for a peace that can be felt to be secure. This is particularly true because of the new countries that are being created as a result of the war and whose integrity and sovereignty are in special need of exterior support. The respect of sovereignty is another important feature. All nations are jealous of their sovereign rights as nations, particularly their right to conduct their own affairs, and this is a proper agreement to respect those rights.'

"The need here disclosed is too essential and imperative to be explained away by vituperation or denunciation. To strike out of the covenant this clause would be to rip out its heart and leave it a mangled, lifeless thing, which the other nations signatory to it will at once reject, preferring to arm themselves and stand in their own might rather than assent to disarmament with nothing to protect them or assure their defense against their neighbors who do not disarm.

"If this article falls through our rejection of it the league covenant falls, for it is as to the covenant an elemental thing, and if the covenant falls the treaty of peace falls, for it is the basis and the corner stone of the treaty.

"It is important that the American people understand the reason for the article, the essential place it holds in the league pact and in the treaty, and that they instruct their representatives in the Senate of the United States as to their will concerning it.

"HANLY."

THE EFFECT OF ARTICLE 10.

"The effect of article 10 will not be, as contended by its enemies, to involve the United States in constant conflict and world-distant war, or 'that American boys shall police the world,' or that 'the tottering nations of the earth shall be upheld by our blood and bone.'

"Quite the contrary. It will mean that the conscience of the world, centralized and personified in a single world entity, having back of it the will, the purpose, and the ability, economic and military, of the member nations of that entity, will be far more potent and effectual in preventing attacks upon the sovereignty, independence, or territory of the member nations than all the navies that can be built or armies that can be mustered.

It will marshal the spiritual verities, the imponderables, which more than armaments or navies and armies control, in the last analysis, the affairs of men and put them in the scales against the aggressor who seeks to challenge the sovereignty or question the independence or invade the territory of the member nations.

"Its effect will be to create a greater deterrent of aggression than men have hitherto known.

"The result will not be, as its foes so wildly proclaim, the maintenance of the status quo of the internal affairs of its members against revolution waged by misgoverned, oppressed, or distraught peoples.

"On the contrary, it will create an entity the influence of which will ever and always powerfully plead for justice and fair dealing not only as between nations, but as between governments and their own peoples. It will create, foster, and diffuse among men a spirit of conciliation and of recognition of the great fundamental human rights upon which all just government is founded and make for the liberation of peoples and a wider freedom.

"Nor does it follow that in the event of war between distant peoples that the United States would be called upon by the league to send a single soldier to the scene of the conflict. The league would express its power if armed intervention became necessary through the military forces situated nearest to the seat of the trouble. Save in case of international strife here in the New World, or in that of one in the Old, of such proportions and vitalness as to imperil the world, there is scarcely a remote possibility that a single drop of American blood will be shed because of our undertaking to aid in the preservation of the 'territorial integrity' and existing 'political independence' of the members of the league against 'external aggression.'

"In answer to the claim that the effect will be to prevent the territorial development of nations or the emancipation of peoples struggling for freedom, let it be said:

"'The United States is living evidence that war is not essential to territorial expansion and development. We added Florida and Louisiana Purchase and Alaska to our domain by peaceable means. There is nothing in article 10 to prevent such territorial changes. Nor is there anything to prevent changes in form or character of any government. It proposes no interference with peoples in their internal affairs. If a part of a nation should desire to separate from the rest and set up an independent government, there is nothing in this article or elsewhere in the covenant calling for hostile action by the league or any of its members. The possibility that we, for example, might be prevented from going to the rescue of a people seeking their independence is not a persuasive objection. We have had many opportunities in the past, but only once in all history have we taken up arms in such a cause, and there is not the slightest probability of another case similar to Cuba arising in this hemisphere. All the people in the Western World are now free. Although we have had profound sympathy for the struggles for freedom occurring from time to time in the Eastern Hemisphere, we have never once even thought of going to war for them. As to the claim set up by one or two objectors that this would constitute an impious limitation of the Almighty, we are disposed to believe that no association of men can in any way limit His power.'

"The purpose of article 10 is to prevent, if possible, wars of aggression, and failing in that, to minimize the frequency of their recurrence and to localize them and terminate them quickly when they do recur, and will, we believe, if retained and the covenant is accepted, fulfill its purpose.

"HANLY."

YES, "FALSE AND FRAUDULENT."

"In a recent editorial in Harvey's Weekly, article 21 of the league of nations covenant is denounced as 'both foolish and fraudulent,' a title far more applicable to the argument made against it than to the article itself.

"This article has been quoted before in these columns, but we submit it again, that the reader may have it before him.

"'Article 21. Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.'

"It is insisted in the editorial in question that the purpose of the article is not the exemption of the Monroe doctrine from the jurisdiction of the league of nations, but its commitment to that jurisdiction. It is said:

"'Had the Paris conference wished to except it from the league of nations jurisdiction, all it had to do was to say so. How easy it would have been to say so is impressively shown by striking out of article 21 the gross errors of definition by implication as follows: "Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of * * * the Monroe doctrine."

"'That would have been the straightforward, the honorable way to do it. The way not to do it was by adopting the evasive language, flatly false in its every inference and implication, which makes of article 21 as it stands nothing more nor less than a contemptuous insult to American intelligence. It is a fraud on its face, a fraud and, worse than that, a blunder, and a blunder all but Teutonic in its clumsy stupidity.'

"The words which, if omitted, leave article 21 as the author of the editorial insists it should have been are: 'International engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like * * *.'

"The answer is that, in so far as article 21 relates to the Monroe doctrine, that is precisely what has been done. The article is, and was intended to be, broader than the Monroe doctrine. It saves from the jurisdiction of the league 'international engagements such as treaties of arbitration,' as well as the Monroe doctrine. Everyone knows—including Mr. Harvey, the author of the editorial in question, that there are many existing treaties of arbitration between many of the nations that are to become signatories to the league covenant. These treaties are not to be abrogated and are not to be brought within the league's jurisdiction. Their validity is not to be affected by the league covenant. It is intended to, and does, exclude them as well as the Monroe doctrine, from the league's jurisdiction.

"It is insisted that the words 'regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine' are intended to, and do, leave the Monroe doctrine within the jurisdiction of the league and destroy its validity, notwithstanding the declaration that: 'Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of * * * the Monroe doctrine.' This contention is based upon the assumption that the Monroe doctrine 'is not regional' and 'is not an understanding,' and that being referred to as something which it is not, it is not excluded from the jurisdiction of the league.

"The reasoning is fallacious; even if it be granted that the Monroe doctrine is not 'a regional understanding' and that reference to it as such is a misnomer, it does not follow that the effort to exempt it from the jurisdiction of the league would fail because of the error in its classification, since it is specifically mentioned by name.

"It is also insisted that the Monroe doctrine 'is not for securing the maintenance of peace.' If it is not for that, then what, we ask, is it for? The truth is, it is exactly for that. It was announced by President Monroe and has been maintained from then till now, for the very reason that its application to the Western Hemisphere makes for the peace of this hemisphere. The very basis of its enunciation in the first instance was the belief that the subjugation of the South American republics and Old World colonization on American soil would bring monarchial institutions, inimical in their very nature to democratic institutions like ours, in such close proximity to us that they would multiply the danger of wars and lead to the disturbance of our own peace by conflicts of aggression waged by governments whose principles were irreconcilable with ours.

"That the announcement of the doctrine and its maintenance might possibly lead to a conflict, may be admitted without impairing in the slightest degree the soundness of the point we are seeking to make. That it might some time lead to conflict was, of course foreseen, but it was believed by the statesmen who conceived and proclaimed it, that such conflicts would be far less frequent and far less disastrous to us, than the conflicts which would be certain to follow from the proximity of monarchical institutions planted upon American soil and fostered to aggression by ambition.

"The doctrine was conceived and announced on this belief, and nearly a century of peace for the Western Hemisphere and of immunity from Old World aggression has resulted from its announcement and maintenance.

"It is true that it has stood throughout all this time as an American doctrine; that it has never been reduced to the terms of an international agreement and bears no signature of any government other than our own. But, having been announced and maintained by us now for nearly a century, and having been acquiesced in by the nations of the earth for all that period, it has become, we submit, 'a regional understanding,' so broad and so inclusive as to cover the region of the New World.

"By expressly reserving the Monroe doctrine from the jurisdiction of the league, the nations signatory to the league covenant make solemn record of their recognition and acceptance of it.

"And we having maintained it, to the New World's peace and benefit, and to the peace and benefit of the whole world—the Old and New—we ought to rejoice in the formal recognition

and acceptance of it by the 14 nations who are entering with us the league of nations and signing its covenant.

"The editorial and not the covenant 'is a fraud on its face—a fraud, and, worse than that, a blunder, and a blunder all but Teutonic in its clumsy stupidity.'

"The caustic terms of Mr. Harvey fit exactly—fit his editorial, and not article 21 of the covenant.

"The history of American journalism affords no more mendacious assault upon a man or a great public document than that which is being made by Col. Harvey upon the President of the United States and the covenant of the league.

"His intolerance and bigotry are only exceeded by his personal hatred.

"HANLY."

JAPANESE CONTROL OF SHANTUNG.

Mr. COLT obtained the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he will yield for me to ask for the consideration of a resolution which went over from the last session of the Senate under the objection of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]?

Mr. COLT. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the consideration of the resolution, if there is going to be no debate upon it. If there is, of course, I will defer it until the Senator from Rhode Island gets through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 116, relative to the action of members of the American Peace Commission regarding Shantung, and also as to attempts by Japan or her peace delegates to control the Chinese peace delegation by intimidation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the amendment reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations will be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, after the words "American Peace Commission," insert "or of any officials attached thereto," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate a copy of any letter or written protest by any member or members of the American Peace Commission or of any officials attached thereto against the disposition or adjustment which was made with reference to Shantung, and particularly a copy of a letter written by Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, member of the Peace Commission, on behalf of himself, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, and Hon. Henry White, members of the Peace Commission, protesting against the provisions of the treaty with reference to Shantung.

Any memoranda or other information in the possession of the American Peace Commission or any member thereof with reference to the attempt of Japan or her peace delegates to intimidate the Chinese peace delegates, and to control the action of said Chinese delegates through and by means of intimidation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, as the peace treaty has now been submitted to the Senate, I wish briefly to discuss one aspect of it upon which public attention is mainly directed at this time.

The league of nations in its essence is simply an association of free nations. Its object is to prevent war through international cooperation. Broadly speaking, it covers three basic principles—obligatory conferences when war is threatened, compulsory submission of every international dispute to some form of arbitration or investigation and report before resorting to war, and reduction of armaments.

The principle of international cooperation as the means by which international peace can be made secure has never been tried before. All other means of preventing war have failed. International law, Hague peace conferences, alliances, arbitration treaties, the balance of power in Europe, and the Monroe doctrine in America have proved entirely inadequate to prevent the most terrible war in the history of mankind. Seven millions lie dead upon the fields of Europe and twenty millions are disabled through wounds or disease. Another such war would destroy civilization. And the danger of another such war is apparent when we consider that civilized nations are so united in every way except politically that a war anywhere is likely to spread into another world conflagration. The age of neutrality is passed forever.

There is no other conceivable solution of this great problem of preventing war except along the lines of a closer union of the family of nations based upon the principle of cooperation or federation. Not to try this experiment would leave the world in the same condition of international anarchy as it was before the war—a world divided into jealous and competing national units, fully armed and dominated by the spirit of an aggressive nationalism. It is this form of nationalism which leads to war, and the only way to overcome this obstacle to peace and to install the reign of law among nations is through international cooperation. This does not mean the surrender of true nationalism. There is no antagonism between true nationalism and an internationalism which would substitute the reign of law for the reign of force.

The league of nations presents itself in a double aspect. First, the league is absolutely necessary to secure the present peace of the world by the enforcement of the terms of peace, and, second, having accomplished this momentous task, it is also necessary to maintain the future peace of the world. For the present, however, we must address ourselves to the immediate problem of meeting world conditions created by the war and whether in order to accomplish this purpose America must not become a member of the league.

The question whether America should become a member of the league in order to meet present world conditions turns primarily upon the question whether we shall become jointly responsible for the enforcement of the terms of peace or whether we shall follow our traditional policy of nonintervention in the affairs of Europe and notify the Allies, as we did the European nations upon signing the treaty of Algeciras in 1906, that we can assume no obligation or responsibility for the enforcement of the terms of peace. If, however, we believe that it would be dishonorable to withdraw from Europe at this time, to desert France, England, and Italy in this critical hour when the whole world is in a turmoil, then the United States should certainly remain in the league during this world settlement and until peace and order are restored. And if it should be found that this association of free nations is not accompanied by all the terrible consequences which its enemies predict, and that it really is a preventive of war, we could then decide to continue our membership in the league. To my mind we must at least see through to the end the great undertaking upon which we embarked in entering the war, and as a part of this undertaking we must help to reestablish a new world order by the enforcement of the terms of peace, which can only be done by our becoming a member of the league of nations.

Mr. President, in the consideration of the league of nations much depends upon the attitude of mind with which the subject is approached. There are those who approach the subject with a strong feeling of dissent at the method the President has pursued at the Paris conference with respect to the whole peace treaty. Whatever may be the right of the President under the Constitution to negotiate ordinary treaties, they believe that he should have remained at home and should have consulted the Senate, and also should have ascertained the public sentiment of the country before negotiating a treaty which, to their minds, is subversive of our traditional policy and which binds America to a new world order. However just this criticism may be, and however much it may tend to prejudice the minds of many, it really has no bearing on the question of the merits of the league as part of the treaty or its ratification by the Senate.

There are others who approach the consideration of the league from the standpoint of our traditional policy of nonintervention by America in the affairs of Europe and nonintervention by Europe in the affairs of the American continents. Starting with this basic principle in mind, they are opposed to any league which impairs this traditional policy. With respect to the war, they declare that we went to war because Germany violated our rights upon the high seas; that the object of the war was the destruction of Prussian militarism because it was a menace to America; that we did not go to war to save France or England, or to "make the world safe for democracy," or to save civilization, but solely for our own self-preservation; that the German armies having been crushed, we have now accomplished the object of the war; and that upon the signing of the treaty of peace we should retire from Europe, leaving the Allies to execute the terms of peace, with possibly this understanding, that if there is another world war which endangers American institutions we will again intervene. They insist that we are under no obligation to the Allies to enforce the terms of peace, and any assumption of such an obligation or any form of league would, in their minds, be a violation of our traditional policy and would involve us in "entangling alliances" in Europe. Hence they are utterly opposed to any league of nations. The war is ended; leave America to look out for her own affairs and Europe to look out for her own affairs is their immovable position.

Then there are others, Mr. President, comprising, I believe, the great mass of the American people, who are convinced that something must be done to prevent future wars, that something must be done to prevent a recurrence of the frightful horrors of the past five years. They want something done. They do not want to leave the world in its old condition, and they favor the league of nations, based upon international cooperation, as the best solution of the problem.

As to whether the league should be ratified in its present form, some are in favor of making no changes, others are in favor of making some reservations, while very many want more light before reaching any conclusion.

Mr. President, the great international problem which confronts the world is the substitution of the reign of law for the reign of force in international disputes. This alone will prevent war. I have always believed that this could be brought about only through an association of nations working together on the principle of cooperation. I am, therefore, in favor of the principles embodied in the league of nations. This does not mean that I have reached a decision that the league should be ratified in the precise form in which it is now presented. This whole subject is one of vast magnitude and of supreme importance to our country, and there are several provisions in the league covenant which call for a full discussion and a most careful consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, there has been much controversy over the question whether the league should not be separated from the peace treaty and considered at some future time, and this separation has been regarded by many as of vital importance. As for myself, I have always believed the league to be inseparable from the peace treaty, because the treaty can not be enforced except through the league. The treaty declares a basis of settlement. It actually settles little or nothing. It only provides a method of settlement which will take years to carry into effect. Germany is held in bondage for a generation. Austria and Turkey will be stripped of all but fragments of their former territory. New nations have been created from the ruins of great empires. The peace treaty leaves the world on fire, with national aspirations unsatisfied, territorial limits undefined, racial conflicts impending, and with incipient wars already started. This has been a war of continents, and in the enforcement of the terms of peace the whole of Africa and most of Europe, Asia, and the American Continent are affected. It is manifest, therefore, that the league of nations can not be divorced from the execution of the terms of peace. This was a World War, and this situation necessitates a world settlement through the league of nations. America can not divorce the league from the peace treaty. There are only two courses open to us: We can remain in the league and become responsible for the enforcement of the terms of peace or we can quit Europe and notify the Allies that our responsibility is at an end. But if it is unthinkable for us to desert England, France, and Italy when the world is in chaos, we must become a member of the league as providing the only machinery for the restoration of peace and order.

Mr. President, the broad lines of this league are simple. It is well known, as pointed out by ex-Senator Root, that European conferences have several times averted a general European war, as, for instance, the conference of Algeciras in 1906 and the conference of London in 1912. The trouble, however, was that these conferences were voluntary, that no nation was obliged to call one, and no nation was obliged to attend one when called. Now the league makes these conferences obligatory. I regard this as the fundamental feature in the prevention of war. This whole scheme of averting war finally rests upon the good understanding and the exercise of good faith among the nations, and nothing will contribute more to these ends than conferences when the peace of the world is threatened.

So with regard to the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. Everything done heretofore in this line has been on the voluntary principle. No doubt many disputes have been adjusted by arbitration, and America has taken the lead of other nations in this peaceful method of settling international differences and in entering into arbitration treaties. Still no method has hitherto prevailed which compelled nations to submit their disputes to some form of arbitration or investigation and report before going to war. This method at least causes delay and gives time for discussion and the cooling down of the passions. The provisions of the league with respect to arbitration or investigation and report have been criticized as not strong enough, but they clearly will tend to prevent war. No member of the league is likely to violate these provisions and suffer the penalty of an economic boycott or possible armed intervention by the other members of the league.

As to disarmament, the machinery provided by the league will undoubtedly bring about such a reduction of armaments that they will no longer prove a menace to international peace. As I have already said, I consider obligatory conferences, compulsory arbitration or investigation and report before commencing war, and reduction of armaments the three great features of the league which will tend to prevent war.

As to the general objection that the league creates a superstate and hence is destructive of our independence and sovereignty, I am unable to see the force of the arguments in support of this proposition. A superstate can not be formed when every material power that is exercised by the league requires the unanimous consent of the executive council or of the delegates. By reason of this provision and the provision of retirement from the league upon giving two years' notice, the league is more in the nature of a voluntary association. And in this connection it should not be forgotten that in a world composed of a family of nations there is no such thing as absolute sovereignty.

Nor am I impressed with the constitutional objections. The Supreme Court has never held a treaty unconstitutional. The treaty-making power under the Constitution is of the broadest character and it includes everything that is properly covered by the term "treaty" and is not in conflict with some express provision of the Constitution. The Constitution says that—

> all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

It thus recognizes all treaties then in existence as well as all subsequent treaties made under the authority of the United States. When the Constitution mentions that Congress is given certain powers, it is dealing with the distribution of powers between the General Government and the States. This, however, does not exclude the treaty-making power from exercising many of the powers conferred on Congress. Take, for example, the power conferred on Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations. This does not exclude the treaty-making power from entering into treaties which regulate commerce. There are scores of such treaties. And so with the power of Congress to levy duties; there are many treaties which regulate duties. While the treaty-making power has never been extended to embrace a declaration of war, it has been extended to guarantee the independence of a foreign State such as Panama, which means intervention or war on the part of the United States in case the independence of such foreign State is threatened. Treaties can not, of course, take away the powers vested in Congress under the Constitution, though they may impose obligations on Congress to carry them out. Some treaties are self-executing and require no action by Congress, while others require some action, as, for example, if a treaty called for the payment of a certain sum of money. A treaty is a contract between sovereign States, and it has the force of a statute. From these observations it is manifest that any provisions of the league which may call for an economic boycott or possibly armed intervention by the United States would require the action of Congress before they could be carried into effect.

Mr. President, there has been much discussion concerning the league of nations, and the controversy seems to have settled down to the proposition whether the covenant shall be ratified in its present form or with certain reservations. I believe the popular sentiment is universal, and I certainly share it, that the Monroe doctrine should be clearly safeguarded. This is purely an American doctrine, and it differentiates the New World from the Old. I also believe that domestic questions, like immigration, which in some of their aspects may be international, should be properly safeguarded. The storm center of these reservations seems to be article 10. As to the retention of this article much may be said on both sides. It may be argued that the United States ought not to bind itself for all time to guarantee the territorial integrity and political independence of the members of the league against external aggression, and yet that argument might not apply with the same force to protecting the territorial settlements made by the peace conference until this new world order is fully established and the present peace of the world made secure. There is a wide distinction between a temporary and a permanent retention of article 10. Upon the question of reservations I reserve my judgment for a full discussion and consideration.

Mr. President, the peace treaty and the league have now been submitted to the Senate. The issues involved are momentous. The fate of America and mankind is in our hands. The country and the world are looking to the Senate for a calm and dispassionate consideration of these great questions, knowing full well the grave responsibility which rests upon us under the Constitution of the United States.

JAPANESE CONTROL OF SHANTUNG.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the league of nations, therefore, appears from the view of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to be a voluntary organization possessed of involuntary and arbitrary powers. This of itself is a solecism and a most anomalous creation, both nationally and internationally. It seems, however, Mr. President, that we are still living on earth among earthy things. We have not yet reached the millennium, unless it be a psychological one, nor are we dealing with demigods or angels. We are still dealing with human nature as we find it on this earth, somewhat erring at times, but

nevertheless possessed of vast hope and optimism, and struggling along the highway of human progress year by year and century by century toward a better course and better things.

However, I can not believe that a psychological millennium will affect well the practical affairs of mankind. Only yesterday blood was shed in Fiume. Only a short time before that we had a 4th day of July; and as preliminary to the discussion of articles 156, 157, and 158 of the treaty I desire to recite the current history of the 4th day of July, 1919, as it affects the peaceable dispositions of mankind.

A certain portion of our people are suffering from verbal delusions. They mistake words for facts and phrases for elemental principles. It is a species of self-hypnotism. There are always people who are good subjects for traveling mesmerists and the crop is unusually heavy just now. We are living among the sunlit peaks of a glorious idealism, with a serene contempt for the changeless laws of nature or our own selves. Our beloved President is sounding the accepted slogans for the grand army of star gazers. All alike are heedless of their feet, and are even now stumbling and falling in the ditches with monotonous regularity.

Several years ago a business depression was described by the President as a psychological condition, and we were bidden to be of good cheer and change the state of our minds. It is so with evangelizing the world. Universal peace will be ushered in by wishing it, and savage, warlike nations instantly lie down by the still waters in green pastures by listening to a few homilies on their wicked ways. Thus we are lulled with documents and soothed into trustful sleep by the promises of our seven-months-absent President. Europe's atmosphere clings to his person. He brings with him the choicest products of Old World diplomacy compounded of the intrigues of Europe and the perfidy of oriental deception mitigated by wholesale robbery of millions of people and hundreds of millions of territory and property.

The league of nations is the colossal confidence game of the ages. Of all its miserable dupes the American and the Chinese peoples are bound by a common misfortune in the superlative degree as proposed victims. China, a mighty, untrained, pacifist nation, is helpless before military Japan. The United States is either betrayed or a victim of incompetence at Paris. Unless we train our military force, we, too, will suffer partition and benevolent absorption by those who claim we are unable to exclude their enemies from our borders. Both are on the brink of perpetual servitude to nations their superiors in diplomacy or arms.

All this is heralded as the millennium. War is no more and peace is secured by crushing every nation that questions the existing order of human affairs. This power rests in three hands, two of whom control. Fiat peace and virtue abound springing from the league of nations. Nations are thereby reborn and purged of all evil. The psychological millennium has arrived. Actual occurrences, however, in an unideal world grate harshly on our ears.

Let me tell the Senate—and if there is a Member in it who can afford to speak his sentiments and tell the truth, I believe he now has the floor—only yesterday the report is, by this morning's cablegrams, that Great Britain withdrew from the Vatican her envoy, who has been there for several years. That of itself is a recognition of political power in an ecclesiastical organization. A papal envoy has been for years—I say "years"; since the beginning of the war it has occurred—from the Vatican itself in London. London papers—the London Spectator, the London Star, the London Times, the ancient "thunderer" from the days of Napoleon—all of them have commented upon this change. A vast unrest is found among the British people because of it. I do not state it simply as a criticism, but I state it as a profound departure from the policies of Great Britain since the days of Henry VIII. Not since the days of that wife-murdering monarch has there been a papal envoy sitting in London from the Vatican. Still we go along serenely oblivious of these changes. I speak of them as political changes of a vital character in the mechanism of nations, and I believe it to be true. To note the recognition of political power in an ecclesiastical organization is not an attack on the church. It is to advise the public of impending change.

Mr. President, I read among the signatory nations, the 32 original elect, the name of Peru. It is one of the 45—32 original signatory nations, and 13 invited. At 3 o'clock—inopportune time, indeed—on the morning of the 4th of July, 1919, two regiments of soldiers rushed in on the palace of the President at Lima, seized by force Señor Don José Pardo, President of Peru, in his private office at that unseemly hour, and immediately conveyed him to the penitentiary, where they confined him, with the principal members of his cabinet. He remained in close confinement until last week, when he was put aboard a launch and headed for an ocean-going steamship, so that he might go into exile and never more trouble the gentlemen who took the trouble to depose him. I shall observe with mild curiosity what our President thinks of it—if it is a summary method of disposing of cabinets.

Two soldiers and three civilians were killed. While the slaughter was far from satisfactory for a coup d'etat in such a Republic, the principle of self-determination of a free people is felt to be sufficiently vindicated.

It is almost superfluous to say that Peru had an election for President last May with two candidates in the field. As usual, both candidates claimed to be elected. Neither could believe the people would refuse to avail themselves of an offer to serve them. They were nearly as sure of this as Henry Ford was in Michigan. President Pardo was maintaining the status quo while the contest was pending before the Peruvian Congress for hearing July 28. Senor Augusto Leguia, candidate of the independent party, claimed four-fifths of the votes were cast for him. A conspiracy was on foot to defeat, he said, the will of the people in the contested election. President Pardo was alleged to favor the seating of Senor Aspillaga, who was Senor Leguia's rival candidate in the May election. Senor Leguia knew what an unfriendly administration can do in an election contest and countered with two regiments of soldiers while it was yet time.

The provisional government of Senor Leguia is in possession of all public offices. He is a constructive statesman of liberal views. He is opposed to revolutions, and only resorted to force to vindicate free government. President Pardo had a rubber-stamp congress of executive echoes and had packed the election committee against him. President Pardo will be tried for violating the constitution and conspiring against the institutions of his country. A responsive chord will be touched among us when we learn the first thing President Liguia did was to establish a strict telegraph and cable censorship. It is believed among Peruvian diplomats such a graceful recognition of United States customs will secure prompt recognition of the palace revolutionaries. The Tinoco revolution in Costa Rica, however, was denied recognition by President Wilson, as he thinks such methods of settling a campaign fracas ought to be frowned on.

An embarrassing feature of Leguia's rude interference with the election contest was breaking off a Fourth of July celebration arranged by the American Legation at Lima. The reign of universal peace vouchsafed by the league of nations was to have been celebrated in speech and song with floats, international flags, and music. All invitations to sit on the platform were canceled and the American colony stayed off the plaza all day. The only familiar event was a speech by the revolutionary President Leguia from the balcony of the palace he captured before daylight that morning. He eloquently defended the league of nations, and declared the only way to have peace in Peru was to run his enemies out of the country or keep them in jail.

That is exactly what the league of nations says. The only mitigating circumstance to Americans in Peru is the country is not yet gone bone dry and they are philosophically availing themselves of this advantage denied home folks.

Even the way, sensational as it is, of settling election contests in Peru did not close the Fourth of July, the natal day of the greatest Republic on earth. Willard met Dempsey that day for the first time in the universal peace era. Willard has solved the question of permanent peace. He expects to return to Kansas as soon as he can stand the motion of the train. Utah scores heavily and the sunflower State must now depend on Vic Murdock to keep in the press reports. The wretched sarcasm of events never dealt so heavy a blow to idealism as the fistic affair on the Erie shore.

Here is what happened: In Toledo, Ohio, July 4, 1919, a prize fight occurred authorized by the law of that State. The law does not refer to it as a prize fight. It is just another case of self-deception. A boxing match sounds better, sparring contest better yet, and a physical contest of muscular development really makes one almost search Wilson's New Freedom for details. The cold daylight truth is, it was a brutal beast of a fight. The front page of the public press carried the headline limits. The league of nations was itself knocked out of first place by something it deprecates or denies. We read of left hooks, of terrific batterings, of punches in the stomach, of Willard knocked down five times hanging helplessly on the ropes, one eye swelled shut and the other on the way to rest, while his knees sagged and a far-away look was noted in what could be seen of his last receding eye, rocking on his heels with quivering body, the blood pouring from his mouth. Again, we

are regaled with a cut under Willard's eye, his face a battered mass, rapid-fire pile-driving swings which left him dazed and staggering about the ring and wabbling into the ropes where he collapsed in his chair with his left jaw dislocated and some of his teeth knocked out. He was covered with blood as he was carried out of the ring. It was indeed a day of triumph at Toledo, a more amazing moral boxing exhibition, punching the stomach, knocking out teeth, and otherwise committing mayhem, assault with intent to do great bodily injury, and other felonies too numerous to mention. The Roman contests of gladiators, Spanish bull fights, and game cocks vary only in degree. The bulls and chickens can not help it. Men make them fight. The captive gladiators killed each other and the survivor was set at liberty while we save him to beat up others until he takes the count. So the cycle of punching stomachs, breaking jaws, and knocking out teeth and eyes goes on in a free country, among a people who lead the world in peace.

I should like some time to have the account of the Dempsey-Willard fight printed at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD opposite the address of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

The advantage so far lies with the gladiators, the bulls, and the game cocks. The Toledo affair was a statutory fight draped with a euphonious name. A disgraceful, barbarous animal affair, it is to be explained only by remembering the country went dry three days before and the beast in us had to work out some way. What distresses me is to have all these uncivilized things happen just as the President comes home with the league of nations and universal peace. Just as we begin to pass under the influence of a psychological millennium men who lack vision in Peru and Ohio, to quote from the President's last message, shock us back into a world of cold unideal realities.

Mr. President, leaving this matter, which is merely as an introduction to reach actual affairs, I now take up the question of the Shantung territory covered by this treaty as it affects China and the rest of the world.

I read from volume 1 of Malloy's Treaties, page 212. We have manufactured many philanthropic documents in the last eight months. However, in 1858 we entered into a treaty with China. I read from article 1 of the treaty of peace, amity, and commerce of the year named:

> There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta Tsing Empire and between their people, respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause so as to produce an estrangement between them, and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feeling.

This is an existing treaty, possessed of vitality and promise. Therefore it becomes our duty under article 1, when informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing our friendly feeling. I believe it the duty of the Senate so to do. It is the duty of the Senate to discuss articles 156, 157, and 158 of the treaty in order if possible to mitigate the hardships that may fall upon a friendly power. Let us act in the spirit of this treaty, to the end that our friend may not have trusted us in vain.

China has given evidence of her confidence in us for many years. She has trusted our good faith; she has confided in our promises to her. She went into the war; she gave of her men, some 300,000 serving behind the lines. They are not trained. She is a nonmilitary nation. She gave of her men to render every nonmilitary service requested. She gave fully according to the requirements made by the Allies and their associated nations. She trusted us. The question is whether that trust has been well reposed and our good faith will be shown in this transaction.

I now read from page 1046 of the same volume, from what is ordinarily known as the Root-Takahira notes. The language of each is practically the same. It is an exchange of views between the United States of America and Japan. The notes declare:

> 1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.
> 3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.
> 4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principles of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

This will be of some consequence in view of later developments.

I now read from Overlach on Foreign Financial Control in China, page 187. Referring to Japan's activities in 1914 and subsequent years when she entered the war and began active operations against Germany in China, this author says:

> When Japan took possession of the territory originally leased to Germany she did so as the representative of Great Britain and her European allies. At that time Count Okuma claimed that: "Every sense of loyalty and honor obliges Japan to cooperate with Great Britain to clear from these waters the enemies who in the past, the present, and the future menace her interests, her trade, her shipping, and her people's lives." And the Japanese foreign office addresses the United States as follows: "Aside from the history of the seizure of the place by Germany and her conduct dating back to and including her intervention, in conjunction with Russia and France after the Chino-Japanese war, it is absolutely necessary to eliminate such possession completely if Japan is to restore immediately complete peace in the Far East in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-Japanese alliance."

Again I read, from page 213 of the same author, from the message of President Wilson in 1913 at the time the American banking group were compelled by the moral suasion exercised to withdraw from the contemplated loan in China. This loan, it will be remembered, had been developed under the auspices of Mr. Calhoun, who was the minister to China representing this Government in that and prior years. He returned to this country successful in the negotiation of the loan. The American banks had made the necessary arrangements to advance the sums required. At that time, however, they approached, before finally parting with their funds, President Wilson to know whether the moral support and approval of the United States Government would be given to the enterprise. He denied it. He used the following language:

> The conditions of the loan seem to us to touch very nearly the administrative independence of China itself, and this administration does not feel that it ought, even by implication, to be a party to those conditions. The responsibility on its part which would be implied in requesting the bankers to undertake the loan might conceivably go the length in some unhappy contingence of forcible interference in the financial and even the political affairs of that great oriental State, just now awakening to a consciousness of its power and of its obligations to its people. The conditions include not only the pledging of particular taxes, some of them antiquated and burdensome, to secure the loan, but also the administration of these taxes by foreign agents. The responsibility on the part of our Government implied in the encouragement of a loan thus secured and administered is plain enough and is obnoxious to the principles upon which the Government of our people rests. * * * Our interests are those of the open door—a door of friendship and mutual advantage. This is the only door we care to enter.

What a tremendous change has come over the spirit of the President's dreams since!

Keeping this in mind, then, Mr. President, I now read from the treaty of Paris of June 28, 1919. I quote the article relating to the Shantung treaty from section 8, articles 156, 157, and 158:

> SECTION VIII.
>
> SHANTUNG.
>
> ARTICLE 156.
>
> Germany renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights, title, and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochow, railways, mines, and submarine cables—which she acquired in virtue of the treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.
>
> All German rights in the Tsingtau-Tsinan Railway, including its branch lines, together with its subsidiary property of all kinds, stations, shops, fixed and rolling stock, mines, plant and material for the exploitation of the mines, are and remain acquired by Japan, together with all rights and privileges attaching thereto.
>
> The German State submarine cables from Tsingtau to Shanghai and from Tsingtau to Chefoo, with all the rights, privileges, and properties attaching thereto, are similarly acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.
>
> ARTICLE 157.
>
> The movable and immovable property owned by the German State in the territory of Kiaochow, as well as all the rights which Germany might claim in consequence of the works or improvements made or of the expenses incurred by her, directly or indirectly, in connection with this territory, are and remain acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.
>
> ARTICLE 158.
>
> Germany shall hand over to Japan within three months from the coming into force of the present treaty the archives, registers, plans, title deeds, and documents of every kind, wherever they may be, relating to the administration, whether civil, military, financial, judicial, or other, of the territory of Kiaochow.
>
> Within the same period Germany shall give particulars to Japan of all treaties, arrangements, or agreements relating to the rights, title, or privileges referred to in the two preceding articles.

What is the limit, Mr. President, which these rights give to Japan in point of time? How long will she keep this territory, these port cities? Is this merely a temporary exercise of the rights and privileges gained under these three articles? So far as it appears from the treaty there is no time limit. The occupancy of that territory lasts so long as human government may remain upon earth. This morning the cablegrams report that a distinguished Japanese diplomatic authority in Paris says their occupany is temporary only; that the Japanese Government proposes to relinquish in a reasonable time all the rights acquired in Shantung under these three articles. If that is true, then no reason appears in the Senate why those articles in the treaty should be ratified. On the contrary, an express reservation or even a specific repudiation ought to be made in the Senate of those three articles relating to an ancient and friendly country.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that he is placing the proper interpretation upon the treaty when he asserts that the rights conferred by this treaty upon Japan will endure as long as human government lasts? The Senator will take into account the fact that Germany's rights were such as were derived from her treaty with China in 1898, and under that treaty her rights in the Shantung Peninsula were limited to 99 years. Twenty years of that period have elapsed. Her rights ipso facto would terminate at the expiration of the 99-year period. Obviously when she concedes or yields her rights under this treaty or any other instrument she could not dispose of more than that which she had. Therefore, under this treaty Japan's rights, conceding that she took all of Germany's rights, would be only those of Germany, and Germany's rights expiring at the expiration of practically 70 years from now, certainly Japan's rights would terminate at that time, assuming that in some other instrument she has not limited her rights under this treaty and assuming that she has not by some other arrangement agreed to terminate her rights sooner than the period to which I have referred. Does not the Senator think that his statement is entirely too broad in assuming that Japan's rights are in perpetuity?

Mr. SHERMAN. I had the 99-year limit in mind in the original leasehold, as it is called, made by the Chinese Government to Germany in 1898, following the war of 1897 and 1898, and intended to come to it in due time later on, but I will anticipate that by taking it up now. I do not think my statement is too broad.

For what Germany considered to be good cause she declared war against China. It was not, according to our standards, a cause to wage war. The missionaries were killed by a fanatical outburst in this Province. This Province is the most ancient of all Chinese civilization. Shantung is the home of Confucius and the home of many other Chinese teachers and patriots, running back through many hundreds of years, who have given the doctrine of pacificism to the Chinese people. The dust of Confucius is mingled some place with Mother Earth in the Province of Shantung. It is to the Chinaman holy ground. If there is anything in all that vast unknown Empire that appeals to the ancient memories and the ancient glories of their people, it is this Province. These two missionaries, two Roman Catholic priests, were killed by ignorant fanatics in this Province. The priests were subjects of the Kaiser. It was at most a matter for negotiation by diplomats or national agents to settle in some satisfactory way this breach of international rights. We have had literally hundreds of our citizens killed brutally in a bordering Republic without a solitary protest on the part of this administration, without war save an impotent expedition, in which we were finally told there that three directions of the compass we could not travel, and one, directly north, we could. We did not go to war, and have not gone to war yet. Great Britain has had her subjects slain in various quarters of the globe, and only exacts reparation and guaranties for future safety. She does not go to war at all times for such causes.

Germany, however, in 1898, following our unfortunate expedition in the Philippine Islands, had a portion of her naval force in the far Pacific. When these missionaries were murdered she immediately made it the pretext—I do not say made it the cause but the pretext—to clear for action in Chinese waters. She sent her battleships within gunshot of the port cities. She delivered an ultimatum to the Chinese authorities. She treated it as if armed intervention in German affairs was necessary in the Orient. She treated it as the act of a nation, this act of a few ignorant fanatics in an outburst of vicious religious prejudice.

When the immediate granting of their demands did not come, Germany proceeded to threaten the landing of forces and the desolation of Chinese Provinces. The Chinese Government yielded. The result of this surrender and settlement was the lease of 1898, to which the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has alluded. It was a lease for 99 years. It secured territorial rights, mining rights, concessions, and franchises for railways. Germany remained in possession until she was ejected by armed Japanese forces after the declaration of war in 1914. Japan, having some friendly relations with one of the Allies, Great Britain, under the Anglo-Japanese treaty, entered into an understanding finally by which she made war upon Germany and drove her out of her Chinese possessions. In 1915 and 1917 such an understanding was had that before Japan finally ceased her efforts she was guaranteed protection and safety in the future peace treaty for the Chinese possessions which she had taken from Germany. Twenty years or more had elapsed of that 99 years, leaving some 78 years under the unexpired lease.

Let me briefly trace the conduct of Japan since she has taken possession of those rights. Nothing indicates that her possession has a time limit upon it. She has seized the ports, the railways, the mines, and is exercising every concession that belonged to the lease directly or indirectly. She has even in addition to that gone beyond those rights, I believe, seizing other territory and property rights that do not properly belong to the lease.

Let me now refer to Japan's condition.

She is an island nation. She has a limited number of square miles. Her population now reaches near 55,000,000. For many years, up to within the last century, she had no territory on the mainland in Asia. Her possessions began with Korea, with her claims in Manchuria. They have extended, under various pretenses, over both of those countries, although originally the promise was for temporary occupation. Every treaty which has been made public to which Japan's signature, by her accredited representatives, is attached, guarantees the territorial integrity of China. Every treaty, either made at the end of war or in diplomatic negotiations, under which Japan has entered on the Continent of Asia provides for a limited time for the occupation of the territory seized. Japan will not vacate Korea. She will not vacate Manchuria. Japan will not vacate Formosa. Japan will not vacate a square foot of soil on the mainland of Asia over which she has military power or her jurisdiction has extended unless she be driven off by force of arms.

It is her history, it is her diplomatic conduct, for 40 years at least, that when she has entered upon territory on the Continent of Asia, obtained possession of it, and planted her posts and military forces on that soil she remains there and flatly refuses to recede or to surrender. Because of that, because she seized the leasehold of Russia at Port Arthur, following on her difficulty, ending in 1905, with the Russian Government, because she has steadily gathered territorial rights by negotiation, by conquest, by every means known to her, and refused steadfastly to let go of a square mile of province she has gained on the mainland, I have come to the conclusion that when she obtains possession under a 79-year unexpired lease she will allow this part of the treaty to go the way of her other treaties. Why does not Japan restore to China her rightful possessions now? China was robbed by Germany in 1898. Why rob her again, and this time in the house of her supposed friends? Why do not Great Britain and the United States keep Alsace-Lorraine? It would be as just.

But it is very easy in this Chamber to end the argument. Let us, by a reservation, limit the rights of Japan to 79 years, and call upon her to stipulate that at the end of that time she will surrender possession. Even this is confirming the wrong of Germany. If justice is not stillborn in the league of nations, return it to China. Why not have put it in the treaty, in articles 156, 157, and 158? It would have been easily done; but, like the Monroe doctrine reservation, it remains for the Senate to make the objection and require the stipulation to be inserted in the document itself. That is the reason why I think the Senate ought to take action.

Every improvement, every move made by Japan in Shantung, indicates permanent occupation. All of the improvements made in the harbor, every public building, every dry dock, every pier, every military hospital, every barrack that has been erected indicates a permanent occupation, because they are of a permanent character. There are no temporary improvements. They all indicate a settled purpose on the part of Japan to remain where she now is.

Again, a mere leasehold right gives no right to Japan to exercise sovereignty, to land armies, to garrison forts, to build up the great port cities, and to fortify the harbors. These are rights of sovereignty, and these are rights that Japan is now exercising over a leasehold right she has acquired.

Again, it seems to me that we ought not to ratify by our conduct here a leasehold right extorted from China by force of arms. No country gives up spheres of influence within its territorial limits voluntarily. They only surrender by force. China parted with Shantung to Germany because Germany's guns threatened the desolation of her Provinces. Anything extorted by force, when the robber no longer can hold possession, calls upon every civilized government exercising good faith to restore the extorted, robbed property to the victim. Instead of joining here to perpetuate the remaining 79 years in Japan, we ought to join here to restore this property, stolen at the muzzle of German guns, to the nation despoiled, and a friendly power to us for many years.

Let me suggest, we know the condition in which this property and territory is. We know how it was acquired from the country that originally owned it in 1897, parting with it in 1898. If we permit another power to seize this property with this knowledge on our part, we become accomplices, even for

the 79-year unexpired term of the lease. If we permit this, we have guilty knowledge; and we help, by ratifying the treaty with these articles in it, to pass this property from China, the original owner of this territory and sovereign over this domain. We help by our votes to pass stolen property into the hands of an alien power.

There is an old maxim about criminal courts that the accomplice who aids to pass stolen property through the hands of either the original criminal or others, knowing it to be stolen, becomes an accomplice; and the receiver of stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, is equally guilty with the original criminal. That maxim applies here, and I think it well to invoke it at this time, to see that justice may be done.

Let us consider how the methods of framing the treaty and the motives of men have been influnced. Is it any better than the negotiations of old? Can we examine the motives of men at the Paris peace conference and find that they are any more exalted than those of former years? What has Great Britain received? Colonies in Africa. She has received the spoils of successful war, and, further, she has received article 10 in the league of nations, which guarantees that we, with our military and naval force, will undertake to protect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity of all the member nations of the league, including England. That is worth something.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator complain of the acquisition of territory in Africa by British colonies in South Africa? Does the Senator think that the United States ought to have taken possession of any of the German colonies there? And if not, who is better prepared to assume the control and administration of German colonies in South Africa than the English Crown possessions in South Africa?

Let me say, before the Senator answers that question, that he will recall that Great Britain, before the treaty was entered into, earnestly urged that the United States become a mandatory for the German colonies in South Africa. There was a very strong feeling among our people that we ought not to become a mandatory of any of the territory which the Senator denominates the spoils of war. I am not so sure that that sentiment was not well-nigh universal, and I am inclined to think that it was well founded. But some disposition had to be made of the colonies of Germany. Obviously, Germany ought not to have received back those African possessions. She had murdered the inhabitants, the aborigines, of those African colonies. She had reduced the number from several thousand, and in one or two instances several hundred thousand, to a minimum. She had subjected them to slavery intolerable, and to atrocities and brutalities that no one can defend. Clearly those colonies ought not to have been restored to her. Somebody had to take possession of them. I think Great Britain acted magnanimously. She desired some other nation to become a mandatory, but no nation desired to become a mandatory; at least, our Nation did not; and it seems to me the Senator ought not to complain because in South Africa some of the German colonies have passed now to the Crown of Great Britain or to one of her colonial dependencies.

Does the Senator suggest any different policy, any different method of dealing with the South African German colonies, than that which was pursued by the peace conference?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I fear the Senator has not wholly appreciated my comments. I am not in a censorious mood because Great Britain has received the German East African colonies. It is a happy riddance for us. I am opposed to any mandatory in any of the great continents on the other side of the world or across the Atlantic Ocean. However, Great Britain is an adept at always appearing to be a philanthropist. She is now appearing to be a philanthropist in taking these colonies whose population had been abused, as the Senator from Utah says. I think some very gross abuses had been practiced, but we could not administer their affairs. Great Britain knew that we would decline, and would suggest and very readily agree to her administering the affairs of these colonies, so she took them with a spirit of great self-denial and sacrifice. Now, notwithstanding that the greater part of us in this Chamber are of English blood or origin, directly or indirectly, and that our language and laws and literature are very kindred, that ought not to blind us to matters that are of some consequence to us.

Great Britain undertook to administer the affairs of the German colonies in East Africa. I am not complaining about her doing so; I am glad she did; but I need do no more than remind the Senator from Utah that Great Britain has had a protectorate in Egypt for many years. Twenty-five or thirty or more years ago the man known in the Far East as Chinese Gordon went up the Nile to Khartoum. At that time England was just beginning to exercise her protectorate rights in Egypt successfully. After Gordon reached Khartoum his force was surrounded and cut to pieces because of a lack of sufficient support. Kitchener came in a few years, drove out the Arabs that destroyed the British forces, established an orderly government, took possession and administered affairs, and left a civil officer in control. Great Britain has had her Cape colonies for years. If Great Britain's history is followed, it will be found that whenever gold and diamonds are discovered in any country in the world she is always ready to be the philanthropist and administer affairs for that country. She often finds it proper to maintain the blessings of English civilization in such lands. She has been a philanthropic enterprise in Cape Town from the time the white man found that gold existed there in profitable quantities.

From the time the Kimberley diamond mines were discovered, when Cecil Rhodes dreamed his great dream of empire, she has sent her soldiers and her men into South Africa to establish her paramount rights where vast treasures are dug from the bowels of the earth. Of course, it has been concealed and draped with a euphonious philanthropy. It is to see that the blessings of Christianity reach the benighted heathen, to see that the Hottentot should no longer live in his primeval hut, and, incidentally, that the resources of the country, including the precious stones and the metal I have suggested, might be developed for the benefit of mankind.

Here were the two extremes, Mr. President. I am not complaining about it, but I am stating that profit and philanthropy frequently go hand in hand with England; and it is so in the league of nations. Beginning up near the waters of Aboukir, where Nelson destroyed the French fleet in the time of Napoleon, following the Nile, with all her explorations in the days of Livingstone and Stanley, she pushed into the far interior. She built a railway from the mouth of the Nile to Khartoum. It was first a military road, built by Kitchener in that noted expedition. They went far into the interior. They passed the Equator. They carried English settlements and English commerce on the way. From below, from the Cape Town country, they were pushing north. They were building railroads. Between those two colonies in the extreme north and south of the Dark Continent there lay the German Provinces, not of any great value in a commercial sense, but from the strategic standpoint, from their military significance, they meant a world to the Empire of England in Africa. The German colonies thrust their wedge between. The very railroads that came to the German Provinces were not allowed to connect their irons with the railroads outside, so that neither freight nor passenger cars could travel or be transferred or switched from a British railroad to the railroads within the German territory.

That was for military purposes. It is true the Germans treated the natives brutally. They are not the only Europeans who have that history. In the days of King Leopold the Kongo horrors shame and pale into insignificance even the cruelties of the Germans in Belgium. Still we said nothing. The philanthropic instincts of England were not aroused, because they did not concern her territory.

The war came and we had the peace treaty written at Paris. Bear in mind, I am not complaining; I am stating the facts in their orderly development. When it was suggested that Germany should lose her chief African provinces Great Britain said nothing. France talked; the representatives of the United States talked; Italy talked; Belgium talked; but Great Britain said nothing. After a convenient interval of discussion one day the representative of the Australian Government was suddenly heard on the question, and he objected to Germany keeping her far Pacific islands or her colonies in East Africa. He claimed it was a menace to the Australian Government. New Zealand in like manner so insisted. Therefore Great Britain after a while presented herself as willing for the sacrifice.

Not since the day when Great Britain entered upon the Egyptian protectorate has there been anything so convenient and opportune to further her purposes of African empire as the seizing of these colonies. Her dream of the Cape-to-Cairo railroad can now be realized. With the exception of the gap between the rails in the German territory, practically those roads are now built. They are ready for operation with the resumption of peace. This removes the last obstacle, and Great Britain can now run her railway trains from Cape Town to Cairo unobstructed, unmolested by any foreign enemy.

So I say I do not complain; that we ought not to administer these colonies as a trustee for their affairs; and that England has taken them because she is best qualified to do so. She is a great administrator of colonial dependencies; she has had the experience of 150 years, and we have had none, practically; it is contrary to the form and the genius of our Government, anyhow. We willingly saw England take them. I make no criticism, but I state the fact that it was extremely opportune and convenient to England's purposes for her to become the mandatory of the German provinces.

I think when Great Britain gets the colonies of East Africa formerly governed by Germany, and gets article 10 by which we undertake to preserve the territorial integrity around the world, she is obtaining a substantial share of the practical worldly loaves and fishes in this treaty.

Again, France is a party to this treaty. She receives Alsace and Lorraine. It is proper for her to take them. They were taken from her in 1870 or 1871. Germany can not complain, because, in the main, their population was French; they spoke the French language; they were of the French blood; they were Germanized by law; they were compelled to speak German in the schools, to speak it in public and on the streets; the records and the laws were written in the German language; and everything that was of French origin was put under the ban. But, nevertheless, Alsace and Lorraine remained French and are French to this day. So France gets substantial recognition in the righting of an ancient wrong. Japan receives her share of the world's loaves and fishes alluded to—Shantung.

If that high sense of justice prevailed in making this treaty which the President would have us believe in his last address delivered in this Chamber and by many texts in former years, Shantung ought to have been handed back to China. It was taken from her by military force; it was the fruit of a shameless robbery; and we, instead of returning it to the victim, return it to an alien power with a 79-year unexpired term of the lease, with no guaranty on their part, pledges, or security of any kind that they will surrender it even at the expiration of that time. We have back of that the uniform history of this same nation since she became a dominant power in the East, on the mainland of Asia, that when she has planted her power upon Asiatic soil she has never yet removed it, and her policy uniformly indicates that she will not do so in this case.

So Japan has Shantung to console her for an inconsiderable sacrifice. How many men lie in their graves as a result of Japan's entry into the war? How many dollars, gold or yen, are spent as a result? How many of her ships are sunk by submarines—unless they were merchant vessels on some mission of trade in other quarters of the world? Few. Practically all her soldiers that lie in their graves to-day were killed in taking Shantung from the Germans.

What does South Africa get? They get Jan Christiaan Smuts and his draft of a peace league. That satisfies their ambition as well as their provincial or national vanity. With four drafts of a peace league, one by this country and three by others, ours was set aside and the one written by the South African statesman of Cape Town was taken as the draft of the league of nations. That ought to satisfy them. The garlands of immortality about his brow is something to gratify.

What has the United States got? Articles 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 19 of the league of nations. Those articles, with the Shantung articles in the peace treaty, Mr. President, prepare a powder magazine in Asia for future explosion. When the eruption comes we will ride high among the predestined victims of this fateful document. The United States practically went into the war claiming little, and we have nothing but air castles as our share of it. Verily the league of nations, as far as it is interwoven with or affected by the peace treaty, is a thing of shreds and patches.

Just as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said a day or two ago, unless checked, China is on the verge of dismemberment. With her more than 300,000,000 people, with 2,000,000 square miles of territory, with vast mines of iron and other minerals, she is on the verge of division and partition among the powers; and articles 156, 157, and 158 are the entering wedges of that oriental dissolution. Poland is restored in Europe the same year China is partitioned in Asia. What a glorious result for us!

Here are the spheres of influence, as given by an Englishman. Great Britain has 28 per cent of the spheres of influence; Russia—and this was before her dissolution of government and present troubles—42 per cent; France, 3 per cent; Germany, 2 per cent; Japan, 5 per cent.

It is said here by the same authority:

> These spheres have been gerrymandered by the war, but the table brings out the secret of Japan's efforts in China—the fear of being excluded from the Continent of Asia. Japan's stern and positive policy toward China has for its aims the protection of Japanese life and property and the safeguarding of Japanese interests.

It is almost unnecessary to have added that; we know it.

Therefore, Mr. President, when we take all these matters together, if we ratify this treaty we set the seal upon the first great division of Chinese territory; we become responsible—directly responsible, not merely morally responsible—by setting our ratification upon this division. History rang for 150 years with the partition of Poland. Let not the future sound with our denunciation as an unholy partner in dividing and destroying China as the first concrete result of the league of nations.

China appeals powerfully to the sympathy and support of the American people. The treaty pending in the Senate is another step in the dismemberment of an ancient empire. This step can be checked either by the United States expressing its emphatic disapproval of articles 156, 157, and 158 or by an awakening of China from her dream of pacifism. China is traveling to the goal to which all nations who will not develop enough military strength for self-defense ultimately go. A vast population for many years has sought safety by peace and by keeping within her own borders. She has disturbed the territory of no other country. She has sought no conquest and been content with her own possessions through the centuries.

Lacking the power to resist aggression, she has been a victim of repeated spoliation. Great Britain has held 410 square miles in Hongkong and vicinity as the English area of influence since 1842, and leases at Weihaiwei 288 square miles since 1898. Great Britain further wields a tremendous influence over the Yangtse Valley and Tibet. China in 1895, at the close of the war with Japan, ceded the island of Formosa, of 13,995 square miles, to Japan. Port Arthur and vicinity was taken by Russia on a leasehold, later comprising 1,362 square miles. Kiaochow leasehold, taken from Germany, together with all the rights appurtenant to it, is the last acquisition of Japan. France has Indo-China-Tonkin territory of 46,000 square miles. Germany's interest is transferred to Japan, and for the present the former disappeared from the Chinese question. Russia transferred her Port Arthur rights to Japan and at present is not a factor in this treaty relating to Shantung. Why China should be exploited, her territory absorbed in the guise of leaseholds, her port cities dominated by alien powers, her mining and railway rights seized by Japan, does not appear, except under the rule of covetous desire coupled with military force. It is a most inauspicious beginning of the substitution of right for might, which is announced to be the basis of the league of nations.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] in his compact and luminous address, fairly summing up what can be said for it, stated that the substance of the league of nations was the substitution of justice for force. If that be so, upon that solemn principle, upon that obligation of our official oaths, let us practically apply the principle in the Shantung Province. If there be justice in this, then indeed has reason fled from the minds of men and we are ruled again, as in the days of old, by might. Governed by justice and not by force! If we could photograph the minds of the men in this conference as they voted on the numerous bargains and concessions and log-rollings made to finally arrive at some conclusion, there is as little excuse for some of the conduct as anything that ever emanated from the Congress of Vienna.

It has been admitted on the floor of the Senate Chamber that Shantung was given to Japan to pacify her and keep her in the league of nations and procure her consent to the treaty and to the league of peace. That practically is the argument. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated that some concessions had to be made. That is true; but they ought to be concessions that do not involve international grand larceny of territorial possession. No compromise can be made upon things that are eternal in their injustice. Justice is not a matter of barter and compromise. Compromise can be made upon matters that are not vital to continued sovereignty and independence of a powerful country, of our ancient friends, of a nation that we asked to join this league, with her three hundred millions of people; and she only drew her mantle about her, in the dignity of her insulted pride, and refuses to attach her signature either to the treaty or to the league. I honor China's name for it. A great race of pacifists, following the principles of their philosophers and teachers of the early days, they have consistently lived, except for internal revolutions of their own, at peace with the world.

Indeed, why did Great Britain sign it? It is said that Great Britain thought but little of the league of nations. Why did

she sign it? Because of article 10, another concession, that this powerful Republic, with her great established credit in the markets of the world, with her great military force, with her potential resources in the soil to feed and victual great armies, might, under article 10, guarantee her territorial possessions every place in the globe with our blood and our treasure. That is why she signed it. That is another concession that I commend to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] as a matter of compromise, compromising away the life and treasure of our own country. How many hundreds of thousands of our men, how many hundreds of thousands of the boys yet in their cradle, helpless infants, are bargained into hopeless military servitude under a foreign sun in battle under article 10, to defend Great Britain's territory, with her mines of diamonds, of gold, her territorial possessions, and her wide-flung commerce around the globe? We pay the price. That is another concession if we ratify the league, and that I commend not only to the Senator from Mississippi but to the people of all our country. God grant it may not return to desolate our homes and burden our taxable resources in the years to come.

France so far has received no bribe; Belgium no bribe. They fought for self-preservation. Will we receive any share of this indemnity from Germany? Not a pound sterling. It will be divided among some of those countries, properly between Belgium and France, to rehabilitate, to rebuild their devastated provinces; properly to Great Britain. I do not complain. Let them have it. But we receive neither territory nor treasure for the taxes we have paid and for the lives we have sacrificed. Not an American grave under European sky speaks of sordid gain to us. They fought for our country, not to plunge future generations into the world's wars everywhere. We did it in self-defense. I am not willing to go any further than that now. If again the same conditions arise threatening our peace and safety, I am willing to vote to declare war, to levy armies, to raise navies necessary to defend ourselves; but we can not and ought not go beyond the law of self-defense. It is the law of human selfishness, but we have not reached that idealistic age yet where we can do more in binding ourselves in international alliances than to make that the basis of our Union.

The reasons assigned for exploiting China and Shantung are far from convincing. It is urged that China, with 2,000,000 square miles of territory, not including Thibet and Mongolia, has 90 per cent illiterate of over 300,000,000 inhabitants. If all who are illiterate shall be reduced to servitude, it will be somewhat uncomfortable for some Americans. A great many Central Americans and much of South America will be in sore distress.

Japan is paralleled with this great people, with only 169,381 square miles of territory and 55,000,000 population, only 10 per cent of which are illiterate. It is said there are many obstacles to stable government in China. Different provinces widely separated, little railway communication, and poor highways or none, it is charged the Chinese lack public spirit; that the different communities build up trade barriers against each other, promoting racial conflict among the Chinese themselves. This in turn, it is alleged, leads to international embarrassments and makes it impossible to maintain trade relations. China is called a vast political desert. The oases are the foreign concessions or spheres of influence of Great Britain, France, and Japan. Without such spheres, it is alleged, no communication could be had with the Chinese. I read the philanthropic assertion that "Japan's stern and positive policy toward China has for its aims the protection of Japanese lives and property and the safeguarding of Japan interests."

Japan is obliged, it is urged, to pursue that course to prevent being crowded off the Asiatic mainland. Her absorption of Korea, her occupation of Manchuria, is indispensable to the growth of Japan. It is argued that if a strong nation like Japan or Great Britain does not observe with a vigilant eye Chinese affairs, powers hostile to these Governments will obtain a foothold in China. They therefore combine police and commercial rights, which with Japan ripen into sovereignty. It is said China is too indifferent or pacifistic to exclude such hostile powers as Germany or is unable in war to drive them from her borders. This, therefore, it is presumed, justifies Japan and other nations of similar conscience which are found members of the league of nations to supervise Chinese affairs. It is evident self-interest is the basis of such conduct.

I read the complacent assurance that Japan has a strong central government; that 16 cabinet changes have occurred in 30 years showing that frequent rotation in office guarantees popular rights. If that is a qualification, in 30 years we have had 80 changes in Cabinet officers. So we still have the best of them in that showing.

It is admitted the military power at times act independently of civil government. It might further be admitted that certain extracts from the constitution of Japan do not smack of the self-determination of free people. Article I declares "The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of emperors unbroken for ages eternal." There is no third term about that. It lasts forever, providing the government lasts that long.

Again quoting from the constitution:

> The Emperor is sacred and inviolable. He is the head of the Empire combining in himself the rights of sovereignty.

He is so like Woodrow Wilson. Small wonder there was a community of interests when he met at Paris the representatives of the Japanese Emperor. They were two of a kind.

> A fellow feeling makes one wondrous kind.

It is material to notice under the Japanese Constitution the Emperor has the supreme command of the army and navy, declares war, makes peace, and concludes treaties. The Kaiser could do no more in the days he menaced Europe and the world. It is uncomfortably so a similar power. The legislative branch of the Japanese Government is a house of peers and of representatives. The peers are composed of the members of the imperial family, of the orders of nobility, and of those persons who have been nominated thereto by the Emperor, whose reign of himself and his descendants is eternal. That is a good, sound temporal power. That government possesses all the autocracy, the absolutism, and the concentration of the powers of peace and war in a single head that characterized Prussia from the days of Frederick the Great. What such a system developed in Europe among Caucasians it will develop in Asia among Orientals. It is as plain as the noonday sun that the government is autocratic, and that it will add Chinese province upon province, concession upon concession, until an Asiatic Kaiser, armed with all the modern implements of scientific destructive war, will dominate the affairs of Asia and the Pacific Ocean.

There is in the making another Atilla to come from the confines of Asia again to menace all the civilized world, as in the days of Rome, and all western Europe when destruction was threatened at the hands of that ancient barbarian. Such a concentrated power is never at rest. In time it is as certain to raise up a potential world conqueror as that Macedonia produced Alexander or the French Revolution Napoleon or that the Prussian system produced the Kaiser.

China must either develop military strength or yield her sovereignty in the struggle. There is a community of interests, a fraternal bond, between the Chinese and the United States in this fight. The United States has either been overreached by more capable diplomats or the indifference of those recreant to their duty. China was the first to respond from the neutral nations to the call of our President against Germany. She trusted our professions, our ideals of free government, our opposition to wars for territorial conquest, and to the new freedom promulgated by the author on the part of our country of this treaty. The old maxim that those who trust most suffer most is illustrated once more. China, trusting the United States, the Allies, and associated nations at the peace table, finds herself facing another step in the dismemberment of her country. She finds, too, that the United States joins with those who plunder her territory and rob her of her people. This is done when we are preaching to the world confidence in each other and universal peace based upon justice to all, the strong and the weak alike. If this does not rouse China and develop a military spirit, she is doomed unless the United States comes to the rescue. The open door of John Hay, the friendly relations subsisting for many years, the development of China's resources, through the extension of American credits, are all at an end. There is no open door in Shantung. There will be no extension of credit there save as it profits Japan. The excuses made by Japan and her apology aggravate the original injury. They are the reasons that in every age arbitrary power has advanced to despoil and oppress its helpless victims. Like every outrage, the more it is attempted to be justified the more flagrant and inexcusable the aggression becomes.

The mere fact that Japan claims she is the only power sufficiently near to defend China from the covetous hands of other nations lends special significance to this treaty. Under the plea of protection to China she is riveting Japanese control upon that country in perpetuity. The very argument of necessity is Germany's argument in Belgium and France. Her excuse that there is no other direction in which she can expand makes it impossible to believe Japan ever intends to abandon Shantung or release the seizure of the interests enumerated. The more Japan necessities are exhibited the more evident it becomes that those necessities are the supreme law to Japan and not the justice published in the league of nations.

I commend this underlying principle of action in Japan to all those, not only the Senators to-day but those hereafter, who

shall so sturdily advance the triumph of justice over the rule of force.

If Japan's great commercial interests are urged, it but strengthens the presumption that Japan will remain where she may have the advantage as against other nations. If it be insisted that Japan is the only independent powerful Government within several thousand miles of Peking, it must be remembered that mere proximity is not now measured by miles, but by swift steamships and wire and wireless communications. Civilization, trade, and friendly relations no longer depend upon mere contiguity. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that Japan is preparing to seize Shantung for permanent occupation. Her history in past affairs justifies this belief. Her practices in relation to other treaties convince the observant that it will be repeated here.

In 1897 Germany, professing to be exasperated by the murder of two exiled German missionaries by ignorant fanatics in Shantung, sent German warships to the bay, bombarded the ports, landed troops, and occupied the territory. In settlement she compelled the Chinese Government to sign a 99-year lease, with concessions for railway building and mining. A mere lease of property by one government to another does not divest the lessor government of sovereignty over the territory so leased. Japan entered the war for the express purpose of driving the Germans out of the leased territory. The expulsion of Germany gave Japan no sovereign rights there which she has since assumed. She not only advanced her army over the leased territory but over neutral Chinese territory as well. Of course, it was necessary; it was another military necessity. We heard much of that in Belgium. It was an outrage unspeakable, and followed by equally unspeakable cruelty in Belgium. It was an outrage in Shantung outside of the leased territory. The harshness of Japanese occupation, the cruelties inflicted on the helpless inhabitants, the seizure of property, and the resulting looting irresistibly turn one's thoughts to the German conduct in Belgium. We denounce one in unmeasured terms. We are asked to approve the other and declare it justified in a holy cause. In order further to sanctify this benevolent absorption Japan took the precaution to obtain a secret covenant with Great Britain and France in February, 1917, that they would support Japan's claims at the peace conference. Great Britain and France knew this clandestine arrangement when China declared war against Germany and joined her forces with the Allies. China was in blissful ignorance of this secret compact. The partition of Poland had something to recommend it. It was done openly and defended by the hardy freebooters, who divided the spoils. The perfidy of China's betrayal needs no comment. It so taints and poisons the altruism with which the league of nations was heralded to the world as to stamp it as the superlative treachery in the history of the world.

Japan intends, we are told, in a limited time to withdraw from Shantung and return the country to the Chinese. Japan has planted herself on the continent of Asia in every instance under a promise to occupy for a limited time. In not a single case, whether by treaty, by lease, by promise, or otherwise, has she withdrawn from occupied territory, nor did she intend to when she entered it, nor will she ever do so if left to her own devices. There is no temporary occupation in the character of the improvements made by Japan. From the time that Germany capitulated, November 7, 1914, Japan has had possession over four and a half years. Their building program for factories, business houses, piers, docks, customhouses, naval yards, and all important public property indicates a permanent occupation. Why should military barracks be built, a permanent military hospital constructed, great harbor improvements, and the like be made merely for claim of temporary occupancy? Japan intends to stay where she has placed herself. We are asked to justify those claims. The 21 demands made on China in May, 1915, and acceded to under threat of war from Japan, have never been disavowed. The three sets of notes of 1915 between China and Japan are significant. In substance they give Shantung to Japan. The claims made can not be reconciled with any other intention. Let Japan's declaration, August 24, 1914, through Count Okuma be considered. He said:

> As Premier of Japan I have stated and now again state to the people of America and to the world that Japan has no ulterior motive, no desire to secure more territory, no desire of depriving China or other people of anything which they now possess. My Government and my people have given their word and pledge, which will be as honorably kept as Japan always keeps her promises.

In May, 1915, he said:

> There is not the least obligation on the Imperial Japanese Government's part to return the place [Shantung] to China.

There is an irreconcilable difference between Japan's promise out of possession of Shantung and her performance in possession.

Everywhere in this country the league of nations is referred to as the basis of permanent peace. There is no peace in injustice. Japan will brook no equal rights in China with any other power. Like Germany, her sphere must be universal and exclusive. She will have not only preferential rights outside of Shantung, but exclusive right in this gateway to the Pacific. The United States will find the open door closed in her face. The great strategic and economic advantages will pass to Japan. Not even peace in China will result. Resentment must inevitably be bred against Japan. Civil commotion and revolution will be the natural result. Instead of preventing future wars, this article of the treaty will inevitably involve the world in a future war at no distant time.

If the party now being developed in China shall gain strength, if a militaristic party shall once seize the reins of power over her 300,000,000 of people, the Chinese can fight as well as other Orientals. If once that mighty power be awakened and the drillmaster of the Caucasian penetrates into the interior of China armed with governmental power, there will awake the strength of the sleeping giant, and she will rid herself of Japan, and she may continue her march to the west when once aroused. It is her only salvation, unless the powers of Christendom shall intervene.

The United States exercises sovereignty in the Philippines. Japan's expansion is seaward as well as landward. Her ambition covers the Pacific Ocean as well as the Asiatic mainland. With Germany in perpetual intrigue, it is no far inference that a practical partition resulting from a union of those two powers in Europe and Asia is no impossible event. So such a coalition is the standing menace of the world's peace. The future of Russia in such a coalition is conjectural. The joinder of Germany and Japan is extremely probable, because it follows the lines of self-interest. World league or no world league, nations will cleave to each other following the law of self-interest. The union of Germany, with her military knowledge, with her scientific power to utilize the forces of nature, with the Prussian of the Orient, will sweep away the cobwebs of a mere documentary league as if it had not been.

The United States asks nothing and expected nothing from this war. She is the only one of the principal nations outside of Belgium that has not asked and some have received the spoils of victory. The Allies have met great losses and incurred heavy expenditures. England has received territorial conquest; France has had restored to her Alsace-Lorraine; Japan succeeds to the rights of Germany in Shantung. Some of these three great powers will divide a large indemnity from defeated Germany. The United States takes nothing save the consciousness of a just cause and the vindication of our country's right. I am not in sympathy with the lofty pretensions that we entered the war to defend the rights of free peoples throughout the world. Neither do I believe our controlling purpose was to defend the weaker nation. The propelling motive was to defend ourselves. Whatever may be said the President himself prior to our entry into the war made it plain enough. In his message of April 2, 1917, he said:

> We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

July 14, 1917, he declared:

> It is plain enough how we were forced into the war. The extraordinary insults and aggressions of the Imperial German Government left us no self-respecting choice but to take up arms in defense of our rights as a free people and of our honor as a sovereign government.

In his message of December 4, 1917, after we had been eight months at war, he demanded that the war shall not end with annexation, contribution, nor punitive indemnity. The foregoing does not square with the message of July 10, 1919, in which he declared that—

> We entered the war only as a champion of right, which we were glad to share with free men and lovers of justice everywhere.

Neither does it harmonize with the annexation of Chinese territory ratified by this treaty nor the immense gain accruing to Japan of an economic character.

A vote in this Senate is the only barrier in the way of international injustice. The economic barriers to be built up against us in Asia by the advantage given Japan put a new meaning on the repudiation of the third principle of the 14 points. The mention of these forgotten articles serve little more now than to point the moral and adorn the tale of the utter futility of attempting to forecast the future. We emerge from our great adventure with nothing but the loss of life, a great public debt, and a request from the President to set our seal upon this crowning disgrace for us and humiliation of a friendly nation to strengthen a jealous power that more than once has given evidence of profound dissimulation.

Against such an injustice the league of nations can not prevail to procure lasting peace. The expressions of English papers are unequivocal. The London Observer of July 5, 1919, "demands a peace in which there is some consideration for the better natures of all the people, in which there is hope for world democracy, and in which there is less hatred, less provision for war, less cause for war." It quotes with approval a statement that:

So in article after article they have bequeathed to the world not an unprecedented increase in the common stock of good will but new legacies of division, ascendancies, subjections, dismemberment, new motives for hatred and revenge.

Never were such imaginable quantity of words employed with a view to signing, sealing, and delivering engagements which sooner or later will prove utterly untenable in their substance.

I again recur to the 4th day of July—a memorable day in our own country and memorable elsewhere.

July 4, 1919, Lloyd-George addressed the Commons. His preliminary statements of the league of nations were received with loud laughter. It drew from him this paragraph:

I beg no one in Great Britain to sneer at the league of nations. I look on it as a great and hopeful experiment. I beg that this country may give it a fair and honest trial. Let us try. It will not stop all troubles. It may stop some.

That is just about all that Lloyd-George, on his conscience, could say. The news dispatches and the cablegrams in which this was wired over said that the members sat about on the benches with skeptical looks upon their faces; that their visages expressed great humor at the idea of the league of nations accomplishing anything in the settlement of European troubles. The very look on their faces carried with it their skepticism, and aroused even that supposedly nonexistent quality of humor in the English nation. It even made visible that, and it is supposed that it takes a cold chisel to get it through some of the time. I must confess that if that is the best Lloyd-George can do at the end of the war before the British House of Commons, there is no great abiding faith in his heart in the value of this document. If this is all that can be said for it, what can be thought of its use against such an injustice as the Shantung article to this treaty? Does it not require an optimist exceeding the bounds of human probability to predict peace on such a basis?

Japan assumes sovereign rights over Chinese territory. Mere refinement of language or specious interpretation will not remove this impending truth. Japan will not surrender the advantage so gained unless she denies all of her history and practices since she has been known or her affairs opened up to Caucasian governments. Every step taken from her entry on continental Asia years ago to the present points unerringly to her permanent occupation of Shantung. Secret treaties may be disregarded in the league of nations, but they will never be released or forgotten in oriental diplomacy. Alleged rights under them will be urged again in spite of the league of nations. Japan will become the saber rattler of the world. How much terror she will inspire depends upon the self-possession and degree of military and naval preparation of those whom she wishes to affect.

Whether Shantung becomes under article 10 a part of the territorial boundaries of Japan depends on the interpretation of the council of the league. The community of interests in preserving the existing status in Asia will tend to lead Great Britain and Japan to interpret this article alike. If China should appeal to arms to restore her lost Province, we likely will find ourselves in the disagreeable rôle of making war with Japan to vindicate her right to keep it. Our undertaking to preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity of Japan will have an unpleasant ending. Article 10 and the portion of the treaty relating to Shantung are twin brothers of a common iniquity. They speak the language of a joint outrage and bear all the evidence of deliberate prearranged conspiracy.

Great Britain bore a large part in the war. She is a diplomatist who has ever cared for her own imperial interests. Nations, like individuals, are often selfish. We have not forgotten that in 1861 the abolition of slavery appealed to the moral sentiment of civilized mankind. Those who administered the affairs of that Empire forgot the justice of human liberty in the covetous desire to see a commercial rival rent in twain. Before Gladstone died he acknowledged that one of the great mistakes he made was in the sympathy he extended to the Confederate States of America while he administered power for his Empire. The lifeblood of Great Britain is her foreign trade. She is a seafaring nation. Her merchant shipping enters the ports of the globe. She has ever been farsighted, unsentimental, and sometimes practically cruel in promoting her commerce against all competitors. It must be remembered ever that we are now her competitor with the conclusion of peace. The usual motives that have prompted Great Britain in former years will resume their sway. We have grown to very great financial strength. We are without adequate experience in foreign trade. We are upon the threshold of that experiment. Great Britain is keenly observant of our course. She has been void of sentiment and sometimes of humanity in breaking down and destroying her rivals in different parts of the world. She is amply able to take care of herself in every great competitive struggle. While a common language and kindred blood go far to promote friendship, they will not remove Great Britain's disposition to take care of herself.

The United States Government must look well to its own defense and preservation. I regret not to be able to accept the splendid dreams generated by the league of nations. I believe our safety is not mere sentiment; it will rest in the strong arm and disciplined military forces of our people. We have denied Japan the right of immigration for her subjects. It has been repeatedly alluded to during the peace conference of Paris by representatives of that nation. The equality constantly proclaimed in the league logically directs Japan's thoughts to that denial. Its refusal has sunk deep into their sensibilities. It is a wound to their pride. We are vulnerable in the Philippines. Our great friend lies beyond in the people of the Chinese Republic. In our day of peril it must be remembered that the interests of Great Britain and Japan in the Orient are identical. Our strength can be divided and our weakness promoted in the time of extremity to let us wage our war with Japan alone. That will be Great Britain's opportunity to regain the commercial and financial supremacy from us. We can defend ourselves. It will be a heavy price to pay, but it will be paid. We may lose the Philippines. We can afford to do so, but I repeat it is questionable in my mind in that hour of trial if the league of nations or Great Britain will be of material assistance. We must defend ourselves. Our trained forces on land and sea must defend our shores and our territory from invasion. Our greatest friend may then be the Chinese people, whom to-day we are asked to humiliate and dismember. Let us remember, not in selfish purpose but upon the immutable principle of justice to a great people, that we ought to defeat these articles 156, 157, and 158 in this treaty, and send forth at the threshold of this period of alleged universal peace our moral condemnation of the territorial theft committed on a friendly power.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there has been much discussion of late with reference to where public sentiment lies concerning the league of nations. Great effort has been put forth by the advocates of the league to satisfy the Senate that the sentiment in favor of the league is overwhelming. I assume, by reason of the effort that has been made to satisfy those who must vote upon this matter, that public sentiment is behind them, that they are interested in knowing precisely what the public sentiment is, and where the majority of the American people actually stand with reference to this important question.

There can be no reason for this continued and persistent effort upon the part of the advocates of the league to demonstrate that the overwhelming public sentiment is in favor of it other than that of procuring votes in the Senate. I think it is a legitimate enterprise in which they are engaged if properly conducted. Speaker Reed once said, "No man rises above his environment"; and I presume most Senators want to keep fairly in touch with their constituency. I want to suggest to-day, in the beginning of what seems a new crisis, in view of the White House conferences, that there is only one way by which to test accurately the public opinion of this country. I invite those who contend that the public opinion of the country is in favor of the league, and who believe that the people of this country want the league, to consider the proposition which I am going to submit. If they believe what they say, they will accept the proposition.

This is not an ordinary treaty. If it were, the argument might be very well made that, the treaty-making power being lodged entirely with the President and the Senate, it is their duty to discharge the obligation which rests upon them, and that the public sentiment of the country would not be instructive and, of course, would not be binding. But this is something more than a treaty. While it passes in popular parlance by the name of a treaty, it really incorporates a scheme which, either directly or indirectly, greatly modifies our governmental action with reference to foreign affairs and our governmental powers. In other words, it is dealing with a matter which must always be of prime concern to the people, and that is the modification, either directly or indirectly, of the form and functions of their Government. It is not in any sense an ordi-

nary treaty. It is a matter of great concern to every citizen of the country. Everyone who is interested in his Government, in preserving it as it exists, and who is anxious to guard against any unwise modification, would be deeply interested and would be entitled to be consulted with reference to any program which would have a tendency, either through actual contractual obligation or in practice, to change or modify his Government.

A popular vote can be had upon this question if those who are in favor of the league will cooperate with those who are opposed to it. I am perfectly aware that the Congress could not provide for a vote which would be legally binding; but if the advocates wish to know accurately public opinion and then wish to call upon their Senators to conform to that public opinion, if they wish to know the judgment of the country in order that Senators may respond to that judgment, there is only one way to do it, and that is to give the people of the country an opportunity to cast a ballot upon this matter. That vote could be taken either upon the treaty as a whole, including the league, or it could be taken upon the two propositions separately.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Will the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Constitution, of course, provides for the election of Senators and Representatives and for the election or appointment of presidential electors. Will the Senator kindly point out under what section of the Constitution the Congress of the United States could provide for such a vote as he has indicated?

Mr. BORAH. I do not contend, as I said a moment ago, that a vote could be taken which would be covered by the Constitution so as to make it legally binding. I do contend, however, that in this effort to test public opinion which is being made a process and program may be devised by which a really accurate expression of public opinion may be had. As a moral guide it could be secured and I claim nothing more. It will not be legally binding upon the Senate any more than the petitions which are coming in are legally binding. They are sent for their moral effect as a moral guide in the performance of our duty here, or else hundreds of thousands of dollars would not be spent by Wall Street and big business, as the league pamphlet informs us, to get them.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am interested in the legal question now. It will require the expenditure of certain money and the provision of certain machinery in order to conduct such an election as the Senator has in mind. Does the Senator think that the Congress of the United States could provide for an appropriation which would stand the test of the courts that might be necessary for the holding of such an election?

Mr. BORAH. As compared with many appropriations which we have made during the last three years in countless instances, some of which have been sustained, I would have no hesitancy whatever in doing it. I have no doubt whatever that we could make the appropriation. We could avail ourselves of the election machinery of the States through a joint resolution or an act of Congress and take that which would not be legally binding upon us, but that which could for all practical purposes be regarded as a judgment of the people upon this matter. If you want public opinion and propose to call upon Senators to obey public opinion, then let us have as accurate and fair an expression as possible.

I am led to urge this by reason of the fact that every possible method is being adopted and devised for the purpose of throwing into Congress what they claim is the public opinion of the country. My scheme and my process may not be absolutely accurate and possibly could not be measured by legal measurements so that it would in any sense be binding upon anybody; but there could be no possible doubt that it would be infinitely more accurate, and, in fact, so far as moral effect, it would be entirely accurate as to the public sentiment of the country. That, Mr. President, is the program which I have no doubt Congress could provide for and could make the appropriation to pay the expenses of.

If those who are interested in organizing the public opinion of the country are not willing to do that, shall we be asked to accept as any expression of public opinion at all resolutions which are adopted by organizations or conferences or assemblies and sent here? There must be something which is desired to be accomplished by pursuing this method, and if you do desire to achieve as best you may an accurate survey of public opinion then let us go about it in the very best possible way we can under the Constitution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has very strong convictions upon the subject of the league of nations as he has upon everything else. I venture to ask him if the expression of public sentiment should be obtained along the line that he suggests or any other and the expression should be for the league instead of against it, would it influence the Senator's vote upon the treaty?

Mr. BORAH. If I should stay in the Senate under such circumstances, it would not influence my vote. I can conceive a situation arising where a Senator from a State would be under obligation to retire.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that answers the question.

Mr. BORAH. But if I should remain here it would not affect my vote. Neither will these petitions and telegrams and letters, manufactured and otherwise, which are sent in here have the slightest effect upon anything that I shall do.

But, Mr. President, I was going to say that there must be a desire on the part of the advocates of the league, assuming that they are acting honestly and in sincerity, to have a survey of public opinion upon this matter. That being true, I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to join with them in securing the very best test of it that we can possibly get under the peculiar circumstances.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me to so say, I differ with him very radically as to the authority which Congress might have to provide for an election of the character indicated. I have no fear as to the result of that election. The only regret I would have in the event that we have it would be that I would be afraid, in view of what the Senator has said, that he would retire from the Senate; and that we would all regret.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator need not feel uneasy. The Senator from Idaho represents a very intelligent and patriotic constituency.

Mr. POMERENE. I was aware of that fact, and it was because of my information on that subject that I ventured the opinion I did.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the President of the United States has been sending for Senators and will continue to send, I understand, until the quota is completed.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment I will yield. That is a program with which I find no fault. I might express regret that it has not more often been adopted. I think possibly good might often be obtained by the program which now has been adopted. I do not criticize it at all. But, Mr. President, I submit it is not in accordance with the best tenets of republican institutions and of democracy to settle the question whether certain sovereign powers of the Republic shall be transferred to a foreign council dominated by foreign powers behind the doors either of the White House or anywhere else other than as nearly as possible we can get to the public mind of the country. In my opinion the proper thing to do would be to "send for the people," and you can do that by passing a law providing for a plebiscite. Let those who will have to bear the burden, pay the taxes, and fight the battles of the future pass upon this question, which involves not merely the making of a treaty but involves in it the reorganization of some of the most important powers of the Government.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, holding the views the Senator holds, and with which I think I am in thorough accord as to the power of this body to ratify such a treaty as has been proposed or to assist in the creation of a government ultra constitutional, is it not the opinion of the Senator, as it is mine, that under the tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States the method proposed by the Senator now is the only method by which the Congress of the United States can ascertain what the people propose to do with the power which is left with them? The tenth amendment reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The proposition of the Senator, I understand, is to ascertain from the people themselves whether they desire us to go beyond what we conceive to be our constitutional duty or to violate what we conceive to be our constitutional oath. It strikes me that the only method by which we can ascertain from the people themselves, who have this power, what they desire to be done is by a submission of the question under Article X.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for calling attention to that particular section of the Constitution.

Mr. President, in undertaking to measure public sentiment and to find out how the people feel about this question, we are constantly meeting with cross currents of public sentiment, and the situation is such at the present time that if one really desires to know how the people feel in regard to the matter there would be no possible way of ascertaining it. We get resolutions, and then we get letters from people who were present declaring the resolutions did not represent the views of the majority of those present.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I will yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I was simply going to call the Senator's attention to another section of the Constitution, which seemed to have been overlooked by my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], with reference to treaties. Section 10 of Article I provides that—

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

I realize, of course, that does not go directly to the question of a vote, but the treaty-making power is vested in the President and the Senate. So without some special legislation by the States I do not understand how we would have any right to provide for a vote upon this subject.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to restate my position, and then I should like to be permitted to make my statement, and at the close of my statement I should be very glad to yield to any interrogatory anyone may desire to submit.

I state again that I am not assuming to present a constitutional basis for a vote in the sense that it would be in any way legally binding upon the Senate. I do say, however, that Congress could pass, either by joint resolution or by a law, some measure providing for a method by which a vote could actually be taken, and so far as a test of public opinion is concerned it could be taken in such way as to make it entirely accurate. I have no doubt about that at all, and I am simply presenting it from the standpoint of being a much better method, a more accurate method, and a more reliable method than the method that has already been adopted and which is being pursued throughout the country to survey public opinion.

Mr. President, we are told day by day that the Europeans are anxiously awaiting our action upon this treaty; that public sentiment throughout Europe is in favor of this treaty and the league of nations. The news is brought to us in one way or another that the great masses of the people throughout war-ridden Europe are anxiously awaiting the action of the Senate. On the other hand, the same processes of news gathering and news purveying carries to the Europeans the fact that the great masses of the American people are in favor of the league of nations and of the treaty. If anyone is interested to investigate just how this news is gathered and how it is purveyed back and forth, he will find that it is a part of the propaganda which is going on, if I may use the term, to mislead the masses of Europe as to the views of the people of America and to mislead the people of America as to the view of the masses of Europe. The censorship is just as active and just as effective and doing business at the old stand in the old way just as much to-day as it was during the war. By a little different process, by a widely organized and highly financed plan, all news which favors the treaty and league is brought across the ocean, amplified, accentuated, and thoroughly distributed, while the news against the treaty and the league is either discouraged or minimized. There has never been in the history of civilized society so thoroughly organized and so thoroughly successful a plan to stress one side and to conceal the facts on the other side. You can not get the real views from the people of France in this country at all. France has a censorship as drastic and as efficacious and as persistent to control news that France does not want to go out as it had during the war. Great Britain is no better, and the United States is worse than either. There is only one kind of news that is permitted to have full report concerning the league of nations from those countries, and that is the manufactured, the propagandized news, to reach a certain purpose and accomplish a certain end. I am speaking now of the news from Europe to America and from America to Europe.

That is not all, Mr. President. We have an organization in this country called the League to Enforce Peace. That organization is industriously organizing the public opinion in this country for the purpose of effecting a ratification of the treaty, and a very large portion of the material which it sends to the Senate is unreliable. It is a misrepresentation of the facts, and the men who send it here are in a position to know that it is a misrepresentation of the facts.

I have in my possession the evidence of three different instances where resolutions were put through under the management or inspiration of this organization which upon their face seem to be an expression of the sentiment of the particular assembly or gathering, when there was not a party connected with putting it through who but must have known that it did not represent the full views of the assembly or gathering. And yet it is all sent here for the purpose of compelling the Senate, under the compulsion of public opinion, to perform an act which is perhaps the most important that it has ever been called upon or ever will be called upon as a Senate to perform.

Let me call attention to one illustration which I am permitted to use. On the 30th day of June the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] read into the RECORD a resolution passed by the Federation of Catholic Alumnæ at St. Louis. It was read here for the purpose of satisfying the Senate that this great Catholic organization was in favor of this league of nations. I will read one single paragraph from it:

Resolved, That this International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ, in convention in St. Louis, Mo., representing educational institutions of more than 40 States and in the Dominion of Canada, indorses a league of nations that will give freedom and justice to all—

And so forth.

I called attention at the time to the fact that while I did not know anything about it, in all probability that was not an indorsement of this league of nations at all. I hasten to say that undoubtedly the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who presented it to the Senator from Nebraska, were misled into the belief that it was an indorsement of this league of nations. We know that those Senators would not have so claimed unless they had believed it. But it was different with those who had been instrumental in securing it and who had been instrumental in getting it into the hands of the Senators. They must have known that it was not only not an indorsement of this league but that it was intended and stated to be at the time it was passed a condemnation of this league. I read a telegram.

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *July 1.*

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH: Statement made Monday—

That is, this statement—

in Senate that International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ in convention at St. Louis indorsed present form of league of nations not correct. I am personally responsible for an amendment to resolution sent to us for adoption by League to Enforce Peace. Amendment carried unanimously indorsing a league which would give justice and freedom to all the world and protesting against covenant in present form.

ADA K. GANNON,
Governor of Iowa Alumnæ.

I have the following telegram dated to-day:

International Federation of Catholic Alumnæ at convention in St. Louis did not indorse league of nations. Senator HITCHCOCK mistaken.

MRS. CHAS. A. JACKSON,
Waterbury, Conn., National Trustee.

That is one, Mr. President, which I am permitted at this time to use. There are other instances in which the League to Enforce Peace sent abroad resolutions asking for an indorsement of this league, and they were changed, and a league to accomplish certain things was indorsed and sent out as an indorsement of this league. There are hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of people who believe that a league can be framed which will accomplish justice and which will insure peace, and those same hundreds of thousands of people believe that this league will not do that, and therefore they are opposed to it. Even when they send out resolutions indorsing this league and they are rejected for resolutions which indorse a different league, they are sent here as an expression of public sentiment as to this particular league.

Wherever those people express themselves in any way that they may see fit in favor of their proposition, it is immediately transmitted here under the activity of the League to Enforce Peace as an indorsement of their proposition. I denounce the scheme as a deliberate program to deceive the American people. It is well worthy of the organization, backed as it is by interested financiers of the United States, who for selfish purposes would make this Government underwrite their investments in Europe. The first thing the ex-President of the United States ought to do, if he wishes to preserve an honored name from contempt, is either to put an end to such methods as is now being carried on or withdraw his name from the organization.

Mr. President, let us examine for a moment the public opinion of Europe on this subject as it comes up from the masses of the people of Europe. I hold in my hand a synopsis of expressions from a number of liberal newspapers of Europe. Everyone knows that the liberal people of Europe, the liberal newspapers,

have been for a league, and we are told therefore that this vast sentiment of the struggling people of Europe is in favor of this league. What are the facts? The facts are that the liberal organizations, the liberal sentiment, the liberal mind, and the liberal press of Europe are against this league. It is coming in slowly, coming by freight, because, as I say, the news purveyors do not carry this information and the masses of the American people do not get it. But it is coming along as we get their weekly publications, as we get their resolutions, and the expressions of their leaders.

The New Statesman is familiar to all readers of English periodicals, a liberal publication. In a recent issue it says:

> In public the proposals of the Allies may find a few defenders; in private they find none.

Another English publication says:

> The more closely the treaty of peace and the covenant of the league of nations are examined the more absurd and unworkable do they appear.

The London Nation, one of the ablest of the liberal publications, in a late issue, declares:

> Now, we know what is in store for us. There the peace terms are as they were in 1772, 1815, 1866, and 1871. Will no disaster ever teach us? For the covenant of the league might as well try to alter and maintain new courses for the planets as to regulate the passions challenged in the treaty terms, to moderate the greed and resentment generated by such annexations and transferences of peoples. It is all impossible. Though potent of evil beyond any computation, the treaty, before it is signed, is as dead as a tablet of Babylon.

Further along in the same editorial is this paragraph:

> For whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap. There is no escape from that law. Time hunts him down. No covenants in any league can forge a substitute for the consequences of committing evil. Men have their passions, and for a time may be deluded into a wrong use of them by leaders who say one thing, but mean the doing of another. Yet there is a term to it all, for the majority of men are not mean, are not cunning, nurse no cold and evil intent, are not cruel and vindictive. We know they can be just and generous to the point of sacrificing all they have, even their lives, to a right cause. But statesmen who still base their policies on sentiments which their peoples no longer hold, on passions no longer felt, can not pretend that Europe has not during five years afforded them with examples of what happens to those who maintain a folly after its popular sanction has gone.
>
> The compulsion of the treaty terms is based not on their inherent reason and justice but on a blind trust in force; on the ability of arms to compel from others what otherwise they would never grant. The old idea.

In another editorial of the New Statesman, after commenting on the work at Versailles, says:

> Yet the delegates in Paris, bound by their own words and by the wretched bargains which they have made with each other, appear determined to press the issue and to force on Europe a peace which no one wants and which can not fail to bring fresh disasters upon the world.

In the New Age, another Liberal paper or periodical, says:

> Nobody can tell in what place the inherent rottenness of the edifice will first show itself. By a colossal effort of military, naval, economic, and every other form of support it is just possible, indeed, that for a generation or two the Versailles building will appear to stand upright. But fall it will sooner or later, and on its fall the world will be once more engaged in universal murder and suicide. Public opinion, no less than kings of old, pays dearly for the favorites who slobber upon its neck and play upon its weaknesses.

In a later issue of the London Nation I find another editorial. It is too long to read here, but I quote paragraphs:

> What are men and women to do who have any thought for the future, any apprehension for what is latent in the treaty terms, any sorrow and alarm because of the terrible and unmerited sufferings to-day of millions of innocents in Europe? Is not all being done for us, and in a way which fills us with the deepest anxiety? Something very different ought and must be done. All Conservatives, Liberals, and Socialists, who are alike in thinking that civilization, leaderless and blind, is drifting to destruction, accelerated by the old sort of peace, with its usual accessories, inevitable wars of every kind, are looking for a rallying point. Their differences may wait. Their differences are minor. Their differences had to wait in 1914. To-day the time is no less serious and urgent than then; indeed, it is now more serious and urgent. Various religious bodies have protested against the peace; but they are almost helpless, and they know it. The truth is, we are troubled by a sense of an endangered future, and many of us are looking to organized labor to help us—doubtfully, it is true; uncertain of its mind, still more uncertain of the ability and aim of its leadership. But we ask: Where else shall we look?
>
> Yet it must be confessed that the terms of peace have been received by labor also with a feeling of helplessness; and this feeling, in a measure, extends to the organized labor movements in the various allied countries. But it must be said for international labor that its voice is the first to be raised in effective condemnation of the "peace." The French Socialists are united from right to left and are in accord with the French trade-unions in a repudiation of the treaty in spirit and letter. The Italian Socialists are even more strongly opposed, and the British labor party has issued a manifesto in which the injustices and absurdities of the Paris proposals are exposed. Japan has still no organized labor movement that can make its voice heard, while the American labor movement is too divided politically to be articulate on any noneconomic issue. But to the voices of British, French, and Italian labor is added the voice of the labor international, which has promptly repudiated the peace of injustice and violence. Whatever may or may not follow in the way of action, there can be no doubt that labor is everywhere opposed to the old diplomacy of Versailles.

Again writes the editor of the New Age:

> It is too late in the day, however, to attempt to enlist on behalf of reaction the terrors once associated with German Prussianism. Germany, it can not be concealed, is, in the common phrase, down and out; and the fresh fears of the English people are no longer of Prussianism abroad, but of Prussianism at home. It is significant that everywhere the complaint of organized labor of every class is directed against "militarism."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator construe that article as a condemnation of the entire treaty rather than any particular portion or section of it?

Mr. BORAH. It is a condemnation of the entire treaty, including the league of nations.

Mr. THOMAS. Including the league of peace?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is correct.

I read a paragraph from an editorial in Reconstruction, under date of August, 1919. This is a liberal publication, published in this country. While it is comparatively new, it voices the views of a very large constituency:

> We should all like a league of free nations, meaning, thereby, a league dominated and controlled not by Old World diplomatists and politicians but dominated and controlled every inch of the way by the peoples of the world.
>
> Is the league advocated by Mr. Wilson such a league? He knows it is not. Everybody knows it is not. This league, if formed, will be controlled by the same constituent elements that have heretofore controlled world politics. The people will have nothing to say as to who shall be their national representatives in the league, not even the people of the United States. Nor in any nation will the people have an opportunity by direct ballot to halt any league move that they believe is drawing them into war.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> What in the last analysis does the league policy mean but force? It is true that it provides for a certain amount of talk before force is used, but has there not always been enough talk before war was declared? What are the English workingmen afraid of now in their own country? They are afraid of militarism. They take it for granted that the league of nations will come into being; but they have no confidence in it, and they are afraid of militarism. The league covenant provides for the use of all the force it can muster against those who do not bow to its decisions. The President speaks as if the league covenant provides for disarmament. If it did, the league would have stronger claims to public confidence.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator from what paper he was reading?

Mr. BORAH. The last statement?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. The issue of Reconstruction of August, 1919.

The New Republic, published in this country, was one of the first advocates of a league—a faithful supporter of this administration and able advocate of the 14 points—but it rejects the present treaty with the league incorporated in decisive and in what might be called, if it were not so well justified, bitter language. It says:

> It [the treaty] weaves international animosities and the class conflict into the very fabric of the proposed new system of public law. The European politicians who with American complicity have hatched this inhuman monster have acted either cynically, hypocritically, or vindictively, and their handiwork will breed cynicism, hypocrisy, or vindictiveness in the minds of future generations. The moral source of the political life of modern nations remains polluted. * * * In our opinion the treaty of Versailles subjects all liberalism, and particularly that kind of liberalism which breathes the Christian spirit, to a decisive test. * * * Liberalism lost the peace. That is triumphantly proclaimed by the reactionaries. There are no fantastic ideals, they point out, in the peace of Paris. It is the same kind of peace as the peace concluded after any war of older time—a peace of spoils to the victor, woe to the vanquished, and all the spoils and woe that the traffic could bear or more. Nor do the liberals read any other meaning in the peace.

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

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

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. KING. I do not quite assent to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado, if I understood his suggestion, and the reply of the Senator from Idaho. I have read a number of those articles to which the Senator refers, as well as some of the so-called liberal publications of Europe and some of the so-called liberal publications of the United States. As I read those publications, the condemnation is not of a league—that is, an organization seeking the cooperation of the nations for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of war—but the liberal papers of Europe, particularly those of England, denounce the treaty because of its supposed harshness to Germany; and the

Senator will recall that recently a Socialist convention was held in Italy and another convention was held which Miss Jane Addams attended, and there was at each of those conventions a severe arraignment of the treaty because it was alleged that it bore too heavily upon the German people. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not think he can deduce from those publications a condemnation of the principle of a league for the purpose of securing peace and enforcing peace.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken to a certain extent, and to a certain extent he is correct. There is no doubt that the liberal press of France and all of Europe is generally opposed to the treaty, and has condemned it. It is equally true, however, that the same liberal press has condemned, in connection with the treaty, the league as it is now incorporated in the treaty and as it is now framed. The Senator will find over and over again it is condemned because it does not inhibit conscription, because it fails to incorporate the principle of self-determination and those principles which were indorsed by the liberal press of Europe in the inception as the basis of the league. The contention is now made by the liberal press of Europe that this league does not conform to the league which they had indorsed or, indeed, to the league which the President had indorsed before he went to Europe.

The fact is that during the war certain propositions were announced as being essential to a successful league of nations. One of those principles was that of self-determination. Another principle, as announced from Europe, at least, was that there should be a provision for disarmament which should be effective and a provision against conscription. The liberal press of Europe are in condemnation of this league because it fails to comply with those propositions and many others. Now, mind you, what I am trying to present is the fact that when it is stated to the American people that the masses of the people of Europe are in favor of this league it is a misconstruction of the public sentiment of that country.

The fact is, Mr. President, that Mr. Wilson went to Europe with one league. He came back with an entirely different league. He went to Europe with a league based upon the principle of democracy, a league of people based upon the principle of self-determination, of absolute disarmament, of the freedom of the seas, and he returned with a different league. He went to Europe with an American league based upon the principles of the American Government, of representation, of democracy, and of free institutions. He came home with a European league based upon the principle of imperialism, of force; and it is condemned by the liberal people of Europe for that reason.

Mr. Wilson may not be willing to admit that he went with an American league and came back with a European league, but the people of Europe know that he did. I challenge any man to find in this league a single principle which was announced as the basis of a league before the meeting of the peace conference. It is the old European system of imperialistic power, with force—force to the limit—that is incorporated in this league. The people of Europe have discovered that fact, and while they condemn the treaty they also condemn the league; and they especially condemn the league in view of the fact that the league is organized for the purpose of enforcing the terms of the treaty, which, as this article which I have read says, will necessarily mean war, interminable war, for Europe.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The last statement of the Senator is somewhat surprising to me. One of the mental criticisms I have made of the framework of the league is the absence of that degree of force which seemed to me to be necessary to make its decrees effective. We all know that in the last analysis the element which governs society and makes its decrees effective is force. Now, if I comprehend the framework of this league, its provisions only reach the limit of force after other efforts at correction and discipline have been attempted and exhausted, and not then until the nations themselves shall be heard from.

It has seemed to me, for example, that there was no force provided for in the provisions of the league that could effectively prevent the rebellion—if I may use that term—of a great power like England or the United States. For instance, if Great Britain should refuse to conform to the provisions of the league and an economic boycott was declared against her, my opinion is that it would prove ineffective, if not ridiculous; for to attempt to boycott by economic discrimination an empire covering two-thirds of the surface of the globe—not occupying all that territory, of course—is an impossibility. It seemed to me, therefore, that one weakness of the league lay in the fact that apparently no effective provision is contained in it which the league could primarily enforce if the member to be discriminated was one of the great powers.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is correct, as usual. The league is an absurdity wherein it provides for economic pressure, so far as the five great powers are concerned. Of course, it would be absurd to talk about enforcing an economic boycott against England, and nobody contemplates that the league ever intends to do it.

Mr. THOMAS. Or the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Or the United States or Japan or France; but what about the countless millions who are held in subjection by those powers? What about small nations or subject peoples? They will be crushed into subjection. In this case, as in all other leagues, the nations against which decrees run will be small nations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as to them, the league does not provide for the exercise of force, if I have read it correctly, except as a last resort.

Mr. BORAH. Well, there is always a certain amount of talking before war.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; and there is a good deal of talking after war.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but, Mr. President, as the President said in his address at Boston, lying back of all this is the organized or major force of the world. If you take military power out of this league, it crumbles; but I ask the Senator from Colorado to say where in this league any subject nationality can ever secure its independence or its freedom or its liberty by any orderly fashion or in any orderly way pointed out by the league itself? If the Egyptians want freedom, how can they get it? If India wants freedom, how can she get it? If Korea wants freedom, how can she get it? Where is the democracy or the self-determination which permits the subject nationalities to enjoy that which they were promised? Where is the principle of self-determination or the rights of small nations except as the five great nations see fit to grant it as a benevolent despot?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think that raises an entirely different question.

Mr. BORAH. That is the question I was thinking of.

Mr. THOMAS. So far as the internal affairs of the various nations as they are now constituted are concerned, the league does not pretend to interfere. The only way in which the nations to which the Senator refers could secure independence would be by a successful revolution, just as America obtained independence by a successful revolution a great many years ago.

Mr. BORAH. But America never could have obtained her independence if there had been a league of nations in existence at that time, because France, instead of assisting America, would have been siding with Great Britain to suppress America.

Mr. THOMAS. That may be true; but in the event of an internal difficulty, an insurrection occurring among any part of the peoples of the great powers without a league, the instances are exceptional where they obtain external aid. It is true that without the league they might obtain it, and with the league they might not and probably could not. But I am unable to reconcile my ideas and understanding of history if a league such as this to enforce peace can be ultimately effective unless force somewhere is placed behind it, and if it is not there, then the league is foredoomed to failure, because it has no sanction behind it which the nations composing it will respect when dissensions arise.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

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

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I think if the Senator from Colorado will read the whole of the treaty with Germany, as I take it he has——

Mr. THOMAS. I have read it twice.

Mr. LODGE. Then the Senator must have noticed a number of places—I believe I have counted 77—where the execution is left entirely in the hands of the principal allied and associated powers—that is, the five powers—and he will find, in many of those, provision for force.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true; but that has reference to the enforcement of this treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

Mr. THOMAS. My criticisms were based upon the absurd proposition of the possibility of the success of the league of nations without the sanction of force behind it.

Mr. LODGE. There is plenty of force there to carry out this treaty. I am not quarreling with it, but it is there, and it is not left to the league to do.

Mr. THOMAS. My criticism is not confined to the treaty itself, but is designed to call attention to the operation in futuro

upon the nations which may require discipline under this league. If there is no force for that purpose, of course there can be no discipline.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the vice of the argument of those who are supporting the league, as it seems to me, arises out of the fact that whenever they reach a point where they think it will be effective, and might be injurious to the United States, for instance, they say that we can refuse to act. Now, of course the right of revolution, or the right of withdrawal by force, can never be prevented by a mere legal or written instrument. That will always exist; but under article 10 and article 11, assuming that we are going to live up to the league, assuming that we are going to abide by the terms of the contract, then the combined military force of the five great powers is there, subject to the direction and action of the council at Geneva. Now, it is perfectly true that the United States might say: "I will disobey. I will refuse to act on the advice of the council." The minute it does, your league goes down like a house of cards; I agree to that; but I am arguing this league proposition upon the theory that if the United States enters into a contract, it will abide by the terms of that contract as the contract is construed by those whom the United States has agreed shall construe it.

It is one of the most absurd things to me in all the arguments presented by the advocates of the league that we will agree, for instance, under article 11, that the league shall take cognizance of anything which concerns the peace of the world, and that the council shall advise in regard to what shall be done, and then, if it does not suit us, that we will refuse to follow the advice. We may refuse, but we can not honorably refuse to follow the advice of those whom we have solemnly agreed shall advise. If that is true, then you have the combined military power of Japan, Great Britain, Italy, France, and the United States subject to the direction and control of five men, or nine at most, sitting at Geneva, and you have by every moral law the obligation of the United States to obey the instructions which are sent to her. And, Mr. President, let me go a step further. Let us assume that we could withdraw, that we could refuse to obey. I do not agree that we could honorably do so, but let us assume that we could, and let us take an illustration such as we have in the Senate to-day.

An international situation involving possible war arises. The council at Geneva advises a certain course. That course may consist of our sending, we will say, 100,000 or 250,000 or 300,000 troops to Russia or to Japan or the Balkans. You will say to me: "But the Congress of the United States must act upon it." Very well. The Congress of the United States convenes, and we have the argument which is now being presented to us as Senators who are opposed to this proposition, that "the great nations of the earth have agreed. Shall Congress stand in the way, or refuse, or step out, and break the heart of the world?" The Congress of the United States would be dealt with as it is being dealt with to-day; it would be treated with contempt for assuming to have an opinion of its own and insisting upon its constitutional right against the combined judgment of the great nations of the earth. It might not be, under the Constitution, technically binding upon us, but we would first have the moral obligation, and next we would have the pressure which would be brought to bear from every capital of Europe and perhaps from the great centers of the United States to whip Congress into line, and Congress would become an amanuensis for the five men sitting at Geneva. Especially would that be true if a few billion dollars of securities held by international bankers were in peril.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. As bearing upon our obligation to accept what has been called the advice of the council, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to the language used by the President of the United States in his recent address. I will read one rather long sentence, on page 9:

> It was only as the difficult work of arranging an all but universal adjustment of the world's affairs advanced from day to day from one stage of conference to another that it became evident to them that what they were seeking would be little more than something written upon paper, to be interpreted and applied by such methods as the chances of politics might make available—

I invite particular attention to this, now:

> If they did not provide a means of common counsel which all were obliged to accept, a common authority whose decisions would be recognized as decisions which all must respect.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for calling attention to that. There can be no doubt about our obligation to accept the advice of those whom we have designated to be our advisers. I do not think it is a solid foundation upon which to rest an argument to say that we would not be bound to accept the advice of those whom we had agreed with all other nations should be our advisers.

Mr. President, when our President was before us a few days ago, in his address on the 10th, he said:

> Shall we or any other free people hesitate to accept this great duty? Dare we reject it and break the heart of the world?

That statement, Mr. President, of course, implies—in fact, it unmistakably asserts—that the entire world is anxiously waiting for the acceptance of this league as an assurance of peace and of a return of the tranquillity which it craves.

Let us see. In the first place, I take it, there is no doubt that the rejection of this treaty and this league will not break the heart of China. There are 400,000,000 people—one-third, almost, of the population of the earth. If this treaty and this league are adopted there can be no possible doubt that it will not only be a disappointment to nearly one-third of the population of the earth, but that it will result in creating a feeling of resentment and bitterness of the 400,000,000 people if the treaty and the league are adopted. They will believe, as they now believe, that by reason of the combined power of the five great nations their country has been practically dismembered. It has at least been humiliated, and a vast portion of the people have been transferred to an alien power. They are therefore not only not in favor of the league, but its adoption will result in creating a feeling of bitterness throughout the entire Far East. It will not break the heart of China if it is rejected, but it will indeed break the heart of China if it is adopted.

Will it create a feeling of content and satisfaction with the 140,000,000 people of Central Europe, those who have protested in the most strenuous way and only signed the treaty under perhaps the most remarkable protest that was ever presented by a people—the Germans and their allies?

Will it be satisfactory to the 180,000,000 of Russia? Will it be satisfactory to the countless millions of India? Will it break the heart of those who are excluded from it?

We think in this country that India is satisfied with her situation. The fact is that discontent and unrest and incipient revolution pervade India at this time. Will it be a gratification to India to know that a convention has been made which practically precludes any subject nationality from ever securing its independence except by revolution, and that in case of revolution no great power will be permitted to assist it either directly or indirectly?

Will it be satisfactory to the Egyptians? Egypt is being held in subjection to-day by the actual force of the British arms. Anyone who has read the letters of Mr. Ellis or who has investigated the matter knows that condition in Egypt is that of imminent revolution and the only thing that holds them in subjection is the superior power of the British Empire.

I have a telegram here which reads as follows:

PARIS, *June 30, 1919.*

Mr. BORAH,
The Senate, Washington:

> In the name of humanity and justice, and in the name of the entire Egyptian people, whom I have the honor to represent, I thank you most sincerely for your kind reference to Egypt. We who have fought side by side with the Allies, who have sacrificed so heavily for what we considered the cause of liberty and justice, have been denied a hearing in the peace conference contrary to the principles for the realization of which America had entered the war. The souls of the Pharaohs have therefore been treated as a salable property and chattels. The Egyptian people rely wholly upon the support of the freedom-loving American people for the realization of the national aspiration of a people who have been condemned unheard to a permanent servitude.
>
> SAAD ZAJOUL,
> *Chairman of the Egyptian Delegation.*

I do not think, Mr. President, that a rejection of the treaty and a rejection of the league will break the heart of Egypt. I do not think it will break the heart of Ireland. I do not think it will break the heart of India. I know it will not break the heart of China. It will not break the heart of Korea. I do not think it will break the heart of the liberal people of Europe.

I repeat, the President went to Europe with a league of which all the people were in favor. The people of Egypt, of India, of Ireland, and all the subject nationalities were in favor of the proposition which the President submitted to the world. They went to the peace conference hoping to be heard and to have written into the league a principle which would enable the mass of people to secure their freedom in an orderly and proper way. That was denied them. It has been inhibited from the league, and they are now in a position where there is no avenue of escape from their bondage except that of revolution, with all possible help cut off from the outside.

Mr. President, there are just three classes in Europe who are now in favor of this league as it is written—that is, the

governing class, the military class, and the great financiers or international bankers. So far as the masses of the people are concerned, if we can judge accurately from the evidence which is coming in constantly and day by day, however much they were in favor of the original proposition, they are not in favor of the league as it has been submitted.

I do not speak in a spirit of mere criticism. I speak what all men know and what history will record when I say that this league is not the league the world was promised. The league that was promised, and which, doubtless, millions hoped for, was a league based upon the principles of democracy. This league is based upon the principles of imperialism. The one promised spoke of the rights of small nations. This league, in its very inception and by those who framed it, denies a hearing to Egypt, to India, to Ireland, and turns Korea back to the shambles of a rapacious power. The league promised was to declare that no peoples should ever be ruled by a superior power against their consent. This league has placed nearly one-half of the people of the globe under the control of those from whose rule they asked to be relieved or from whose threat of domination they asked to be protected. The league which was promised spoke of peace, but this league has intertwined in its very being, and without which it would never be accepted, a special alliance for war. The league which was promised was a league based upon Americanism and American principles. This league is based upon the European system and faithful in every respect to the system from which it sprang.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, if it is not incompatible with the public interest, whether or not the committee has considered two resolutions heretofore referred to it and dealing with the question of Mexico, the latter one particularly calling for an investigation of conditions in Mexico?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, an inquiry put in that formal and delightful manner, of course, I must answer at once. We have not taken up the Mexican resolutions. As the Senator knows, we have been buried under a treaty of 80,000 words, which we have been trying to read as a preliminary. I shall be very glad to ask the committee to take up these resolutions and dispose of them at the first possible moment.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on next Monday I shall desire to seek recognition to address the Senate on the subject of the league of nations.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, with the permission of the Senate, on Monday next, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall submit some observations on the league of nations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, immediately following the routine morning business on Tuesday next, I shall briefly discuss the league of nations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Wednesday next, after the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the league of nations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ARBITRATION TREATIES WITH ITALY, SPAIN, AND THE NETHERLANDS.

In executive session this day the following treaties were ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

ARBITRATION WITH ITALY.

The SENATE:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement between the United States and Italy, signed March 20, 1919, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on March 28, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

—

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement signed March 20, 1919, between the United States and Italy, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on March 28, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1919.

—

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of His Majesty the King of Italy, being desirous of extending for another five years the period during which the arbitration convention concluded between them on March 28, 1908, extended by the agreement concluded between the two Governments on May 28, 1913, shall remain in force, have authorized the undersigned, to wit, the Hon. Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States, and Baron Pietro Arone di Valentino, His Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Washington, to conclude the following agreement:

ARTICLE 1.

The convention of arbitration of March 28, 1908, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of His Majesty the King of Italy, the duration of which by article 3 thereof was fixed at a period of five years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the said convention on January 22, 1909, which period, by the agreement of May 28, 1913, between the two Governments was extended for five years from January 22, 1914, is hereby renewed and declared in force for a further period of five years from January 22, 1919.

ARTICLE 2.

The present agreement shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the Government of His Majesty the King of Italy, in accordance with its Constitution and laws, and it shall become effective upon the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Italian languages, at Washington, this 20th day of March, 1919.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. POLK.
[SEAL.] PIETRO ARONE DI VALENTINO.

ARBITRATION WITH SPAIN.

THE SENATE:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement between the United States and Spain, signed March 8, 1919, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on April 20, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

—

THE PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement signed March 8, 1919, between the United States and Spain, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on April 20, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1919.

—

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of His Majesty the King of Spain, being desirous of extending for another five years the period during which the arbitration convention concluded between them on April 20, 1908, extended by the agreement concluded between the two Governments on May 29, 1913, shall remain in force, have authorized the undersigned, to wit, the Hon. Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States, and his excellency, Señor Don Juan Riaño y Gayangos, chamberlain to His Majesty the King of Spain, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of His Majesty at Washington, to conclude the following agreement:

ARTICLE 1.

The convention of arbitration of April 20, 1908, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of His Majesty the King of Spain, the duration of which by article 3 thereof was fixed at a period of five years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the said convention on June 2, 1908, which period, by the agreement of May 29, 1913, between the two Governments was extended for five years from June 2, 1913, is hereby renewed and continued in force for a further period of five years from June 2, 1918.

ARTICLE 2.

The present agreement shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by the Government of His Majesty the King of Spain, in accordance with its constitution and laws, and it shall become effective upon the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at Washington, this 8th day of March, 1919.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. POLK.
[SEAL.] JUAN RIAÑO Y GAYANGOS.

ARBITRATION WITH THE NETHERLANDS.

The SENATE:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement between the United States and the Netherlands, signed March 8, 1919, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on May 2, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, an agreement signed March 8, 1919, between the United States and the Netherlands, extending for a further period of five years the arbitration convention concluded between them on May 2, 1908.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1919.

The Government of the United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, being desirous of further extending the convention of arbitration concluded between them on May 2, 1908, which convention in consequence of article 1 of the agreement between both high contracting parties of May 9, 1914, will remain in force until March 25, 1919, have authorized the undersigned, to wit, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States, and J. T. Cremer, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands at Washington, to conclude the following agreement:

ARTICLE 1.

The convention of arbitration of May 2, 1908, between the Government of the United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, which in consequence of article 1 of the agreement of May 9, 1914, will remain in force until March 25, 1919, is hereby extended and continued in force for a further period of five years from March 25, 1919.

ARTICLE 2.

The present agreement shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, and it shall become effective upon the fourteenth day after the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

Done in duplicate at Washington, in the English and Dutch languages, this 8th day of March 1919.

[SEAL.] FRANK L. POLK.
[SEAL.] J. T. CREMER.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 18, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17, 1919.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas H. Tulley to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., in place of George E. Hosmer, whose term of office has expired.

Henry Holland to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Otto A. Labudde to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 37, with headquarters at Milwaukee, Wis., in place of August M. Gawin, whose term of office has expired.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

S. M. Angell to be assistant appraiser of merchandise for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La., to fill an existing vacancy.

SECOND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Herman G. Brock, of Massachusetts, to be Second Assistant Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, vice Roy S. MacElwee, nominated to be First Assistant Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

MEMBER OF THE FARM LOAN BOARD.

Asbury F. Lever, of Lexington, S. C., to be a member of the Farm Loan Board, in place of Herbert Quick, resigned.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY.

Second Lieut. Ira Platt Swift, Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Cavalry, with rank from November 1, 1918.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Louis C. Scherer to be colonel, with rank from July 11, 1919.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Maggie Winningham to be postmaster at York, Ala., in place of Ella M. Harris, resigned.

Bays D. Cather to be postmaster at Pell City, Ala., in place of W. L. Milner, resigned.

William M. Douglas to be postmaster at Parrish, Ala., in place of Robert G. Waldrop, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Jake E. Wallace to be postmaster at Maplesville, Ala., in place of C. N. Parnell, resigned.

Ruth K. Conerly to be postmaster at Lockhart, Ala., in place of J. B. Sinquefield, resigned.

Walter Whisenhunt to be postmaster at Hanceville, Ala., in place of Arthur A. Weeks, resigned. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Jacob E. Hood to be postmaster at Cordova, Ala., in place of James H. Shepherd, resigned.

Richard C. Jones to be postmaster at Camden, Ala., in place of Gorden T. Dannelly, resigned.

Herbert L. Wynn to be postmaster at Ashland, Ala., in place of Dora A. Speer, resigned.

Daniel W. McLean to be postmaster at Headland, Ala., in place of J. W. Roberts, resigned.

Lillian L. Srygly to be postmaster at Town Creek, Ala., in place of G. N. Preuit, resigned. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

James W. Horn to be postmaster at Brantley, Ala., in place of J. W. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Clifford R. Rankin to be postmaster at Brewton, Ala., in place of C. R. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Louis C. Kelley to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, Ala., in place of L. C. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

William L. Phillips to be postmaster at Clio, Ala., in place of W. L. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John J. Dunlap, jr., to be postmaster at Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Dunlap, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 29, 1918.

Robert Stephens, jr., to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ala., in place of R. Stephens, jr. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

M. W. Camper to be postmaster at Florence, Ala., in place of M. W. Camper. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

Stephen D. Fulford to be postmaster at Georgiana, Ala., in place of S. D. Fulford. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Theresa C. Spink to be postmaster at Grand Bay, Ala., in place of T. C. Spink. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Robert L. O'Neal to be postmaster at Huntsville, Ala., in place of R. L. O'Neal. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1918.

Nannie S. Coleman to be postmaster at Jasper, Ala., in place of N. S. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Joseph S. McCain to be postmaster at Lineville, Ala., in place of J. S. McCain. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Bettie T. Forster to be postmaster at Thomasville, Ala., in place of B. T. Forster. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Robert B. Evans to be postmaster at Elkmont, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Leona Randall to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Sarah M. Salley to be postmaster at Hayneville, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William K. Cooper to be postmaster at Northport, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Jesse G. Turner to be postmaster at Slocomb, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William T. Rutledge to be postmaster at Quinton, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Marion D. King to be postmaster at Townly, Ala. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

ALASKA.

Robert S. McDonald to be postmaster at Nenana, Alaska. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George W. Robbins to be postmaster at Valdez, Alaska, in place of C. J. Todd, resigned.

ARIZONA.

George W. Sigler to be postmaster at Florence, Ariz., in place of Ella G. Clarke, resigned.

Charles P. Heisser to be postmaster at Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of James L. Byrnes, resigned.

John R. Livingston to be postmaster at Chloride, Ariz., in place of James M. Russell, resigned.

Leonard D. Redfield to be postmaster at Benson, Ariz., in place of L. D. Redfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Ida E. M. Carty to be postmaster at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of I. E. Carty. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Charles Osborne to be postmaster at Holbrook, Ariz., in place of C. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

John Towner to be postmaster at Naco, Ariz., in place of J. Towner. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Grace E. Moorman to be postmaster at Ray, Ariz., in place of G. Moorman. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Lawrence S. Williams to be postmaster at Williams, Ariz., in place of L. S. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ora J. Moss to be postmaster at Somerton, Ariz. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

ARKANSAS.

Philip J. Smith to be postmaster at Dumas, Ark., in place of P. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Laura B. Bonds to be postmaster at Lucora, Ark., in place of L. B. Denton. Name changed by marriage.

Albert S. Matlock to be postmaster at Van Buren, Ark., in place of William D. Yancey, deceased.

Storm O. Whaley to be postmaster at Sulphur Springs, Ark., in place of John B. Thompson, deceased.

Allen G. Blankenship to be postmaster at Monette, Ark., in place of Hollis S. Bass, resigned.

Claude J. Cotter to be postmaster at Marianna, Ark., in place of Emmet H. McMurry, resigned.

John W. McClenney to be postmaster at Heber Springs, Ark., in place of Arthur G. Morris, removed.

James B. Holder to be postmaster at Harrison, Ark., in place of William H. Watkins, resigned.

William H. Morton to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ark., in place of Hugh F. Reagan, resigned.

William J. Lenehan to be postmaster at De Witt, Ark., in place of Duffy Allen, resigned.

Fannie M. Zearing to be postmaster at De Valls Bluff (late Devall Bluff), Ark., in place of George C. Cooper, resigned.

Kay S. Rolley to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ark., in place of Alice L. Rolley, deceased.

Claude E. Skinner to be postmaster at Corning, Ark., in place of A. B. McKinney. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

William E. Jones to be postmaster at Bigelow, Ark., in place of R. B. Lawson, resigned.

David D. Draper to be postmaster at Ashdown, Ark., in place of Arthur R. Hill, resigned.

Alfred L. Peacher to be postmaster at Fort Smith, Ark., in place of W. J. Johnston, resigned.

Louis Reitzammer to be postmaster at Arkansas City, Ark., in place of L. Reitzammer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Mary G. Clark to be postmaster at Bald Knob, Ark., in place of M. G. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Seaborn J. Smith to be postmaster at Beebe, Ark., in place of S. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

William K. Estes to be postmaster at Calico Rock, Ark., in place of W. K. Estes. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Lawrence D. Ballew to be postmaster at Des Arc, Ark., in place of L. D. Ballew. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Lucy C. Pullen to be postmaster at Foreman, Ark., in place of L. C. Dollarhide. Name changed by marriage.

Linn Turley to be postmaster at Forrest City, Ark., in place of L. Turley. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Henry C. Maples to be postmaster at Green Forest, Ark., in place of H. C. Maples. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Benjamin C. Milhoan to be postmaster at Hartford, Ark., in place of B. C. Milhoan. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Robert H. Smiley to be postmaster at Hot Springs, Ark., in place of R. H. Smiley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1918.

Stella W. Harris to be postmaster at Junction City, Ark., in place of C. A. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Bessie Bevill to be postmaster at Kensett, Ark., in place of Bessie Bevill. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Mark E. Sherland to be postmaster at McGehee, Ark., in place of M. E. Sherland. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Noble J. Nixon to be postmaster at Mulberry, Ark., in place of N. J. Nixon. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Sylvester K. Hohes to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of S. K. Hohes. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Thomas C. Fleeman to be postmaster at Ozark, Ark., in place of T. C. Fleeman. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John A. Marr to be postmaster at Prescott, Ark., in place of J. A. Marr. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1918.

Charles McB. Cox to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of C. McB. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Benjamin W. Thomasson to be postmaster at Rison, Ark., in place of B. W. Thomasson. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Lucius Pilkington to be postmaster at Searcy, Ark., in place of Lucius Pilkington. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John P. Stafford to be postmaster at Springdale, Ark., in place of J. P. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1918.

Fred Smith to be postmaster at Stephens, Ark., in place of Fred Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Joe J. Shaddock to be postmaster at Thornton, Ark., in place of J. J. Shaddock. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Robert H. Harrison to be postmaster at Tuckerman, Ark., in place of R. H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

James M. Crider to be postmaster at Winslow, Ark., in place of J. M. Crider. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Ella H. Smith to be postmaster at Wynne, Ark., in place of E. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Aubrey Gore to be postmaster at Dierks, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John E. Bittinger to be postmaster at Grady, Ark. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Ned P. Atkin to be postmaster at Parkdale, Ark. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

J. Lewis Ragsdale to be postmaster at Russellville, Ark., in place of J. L. Ragsdale. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Leila H. Smith to be postmaster at Pangburn, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary A. Thornton to be postmaster at Yosemite, Calif., in place of William D. Thornton, resigned.

Charles R. Fuller to be postmaster at Sunnyvale, Calif., in place of J. J. Coutts, resigned.

George E. Kirby to be postmaster at San Luis Obispo, Calif., in place of George A. Barnett, deceased.

George G. Hughes to be postmaster at San Bruno, Calif., in place of Charles A. Bacon, removed. Office became presidential January 1, 1918.

Laura B. Rowden to be postmaster at Riverbank, Calif., in place of R. L. Evans, resigned.

Harvey P. Rogers to be postmaster at Quincy, Calif., in place of F. D. Robertson, removed.

Frank F. Smith to be postmaster at Oilcenter, Calif., in place of J. W. Heard, resigned.

Myrtle M. Evers to be postmaster at Novato, Calif., in place of Thomas F. Keating, deceased.

George W. Archer to be postmaster at Norwalk, Calif., in place of Frank J. Kolash, resigned.

Ambrose E. Daneri to be postmaster at Merced, Calif., in place of C. D. Radcliffe, resigned.

Anna V. Hocker to be postmaster at Hercules, Calif., in place of Andrew M. Ashenfolter, removed. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Albert O. Peterson to be postmaster at Escalon, Calif., in place of Rosanna M. Sharkey, deceased.

Selma A. Porter to be postmaster at Dunsmuir, Calif., in place of George B. Coon, removed.

George E. McElroy to be postmaster at Dixon, Calif., in place of John R. Snead, deceased.

Harry G. Hastings to be postmaster at Coachella, Calif., in place of Joseph H. Ramsdale, resigned.

William E. Perry to be postmaster at Artesia, Calif., in place of George R. Frampton, resigned.

Anna M. McVeigh to be postmaster at Brea, Calif., in place of R. G. Pettigrew, resigned.

Myron P. Meacham to be postmaster at Altadena, Calif., in place of M. P. Meacham. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Charles L. Gassaway to be postmaster at Banning, Calif., in place of C. L. Gassaway. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

James A. Kelly to be postmaster at Beaumont, Calif., in place of J. A. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles G. Clyne to be postmaster at Benicia, Calif., in place of C. G. Clyne. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Peter D. McIntyre to be postmaster at Blythe, Calif., in place of P. D. McIntyre. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Luella Mann to be postmaster at Boulder Creek, Calif., in place of Luella Mann. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Owen Kenny to be postmaster at Calistoga, Calif., in place of Owen Kenny. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Benjamin F. Hudspeth to be postmaster at Chico, Calif., in place of B. F. Hudspeth. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

William A. Dickey to be postmaster at Chino, Calif., in place of W. A. Dickey. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ira J. Cree to be postmaster at Claremont, Calif., in place of I. J. Cree. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Wellington E. Hiatt to be postmaster at Cloverdale, Calif., in place of W. E. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Katherine S. Bell to be postmaster at Clovis, Calif., in place of K. S. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles H. Guy to be postmaster at Concord, Calif., in place of C. H. Guy. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Virginia H. Gould to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Calif., in place of V. H. Gould. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Evelyn Mitchell to be postmaster at Dos Palos, Calif., in place of Evelyn Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Rosalia A. Crandall to be postmaster at Etna Mills., Calif., in place of R. A. Crandall. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1918.

H. P. Martin Eriksen to be postmaster at Ferndale, Calif., in place of Martin Eriksen. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Phillippe P. Roche to be postmaster at Fillmore, Calif., in place of P. P. Roche. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William W. Ware to be postmaster at Fort Bragg, Calif., in place of W. W. Ware. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Charles H. Coffey to be postmaster at Gonzales, Calif., in place of C. H. Coffey. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Corinne Dolcini to be postmaster at Guadalupe, Calif., in place of Corinne Dolcini. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Reuben E. Baer to be postmaster at Healdsburg, Calif., in place of R. E. Baer. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Thomas C. H. De Lapp to be postmaster at Huntington Beach, Calif., in place of T. C. H. De Lapp. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Samuel J. Hindman to be postmaster at Inglewood, Calif., in place of S. J. Hindman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Nathan L. Rannells to be postmaster at La Jolla, Calif., in place of N. L. Rannells. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Johnnie L. Murphy to be postmaster at Medera, Calif., in place of J. L. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Thomas H. Miller to be postmaster at Morgan Hill, Calif., in place of T. H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

James I. C. Kennedy to be postmaster at Mountain View, Calif., in place of J. I. C. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

John E. Walden to be postmaster at Napa, Calif., in place of J. E. Walden. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1918.

Fred M. Kelly to be postmaster at Needles, Calif., in place of F. M. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

John Mitchell to be postmaster at Ontario, Calif., in place of John Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

James Fullerton to be postmaster at Orange, Calif., in place of James Fullerton. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Fred N. Paxton to be postmaster at Oroville, Calif., in place of F. N. Paxton. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Elgin C. Hurlbert to be postmaster at Pacific Grove, Calif., in place of E. C. Hurlbert. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Charles E. Tabler to be postmaster at Parlier, Calif., in place of C. E. Tabler. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Wilmot D. Wood to be postmaster at Paso Robles, Calif., in place of W. D. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Edward B. Warmoth to be postmaster at Red Bluff, Calif., in place of E. B. Warmoth. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

James V. Swift to be postmaster at Redwood City, Calif., in place of J. V. Swift. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Leota M. Stewart to be postmaster at Rialto, Calif., in place of L. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

K. D. Harger to be postmaster at Riverside, Calif., in place of K. D. Harger. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Joseph Galewsky to be postmaster at St. Helena, Calif., in place of J. Galewsky. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Margaret C. Hamilton to be postmaster at San Anselmo, Calif., in place of M. C. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Ross H. Hille to be postmaster at San Fernando, Calif., in place of R. H. Hille. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles D. Overshiner to be postmaster at Santa Ana, Calif., in place of C. D. Overshiner. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Charles E. Lilly to be postmaster at Santa Cruz, Calif., in place of C. E. Lilly. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Harry Hines to be postmaster at Santa Monica, Calif., in place of H. Hines. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

George E. Meekins to be postmaster at Stanford University, Calif., in place of G. E. Meekins. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Alfred W. Rozier to be postmaster at Tuolumne, Calif., in place of A. W. Rozier. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ralph P. Giddings to be postmaster at Turlock, Calif., in place of R. P. Giddings. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

William B. Hagans to be postmaster at Ukiah, Calif., in place of W. B. Hagans. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Daniel M. Gibson to be postmaster at Van Nuys, Calif., in place of D. M. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Ernest H. Haack to be postmaster at Watsonville, Calif., in place of E. H. Haack. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

John J. Blaney to be postmaster at Weaverville, Calif., in place of J. J. Blaney. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Nellie Hawkins to be postmaster at Yreka, Calif., in place of N. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Cinie J. Mills to be postmaster at La Habra, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Joseph P. Schaefer to be postmaster at Mayfield, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Fred F. Darcy to be postmaster at Montebello, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1917.

William Henson to be postmaster at Riverdale, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ruby Vinten to be postmaster at Terminal, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Valentine L. Dillon to be postmaster at Yucaipa, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Harrington Brown to be postmaster at Los Angeles, Calif., in place of H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1918.

Daniel F. Stafford to be postmaster at Covina, Calif., in place of D. F. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Willard Wells to be postmaster at Eureka, Calif., in place of Willard Wells. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Charles H. Gallagher to be postmaster at Sebastopol, Calif., in place of C. H. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Lewis C. Poor to be postmaster at Sherman, Calif., in place of L. C. Poor. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Virgil W. Norton to be postmaster at Sutter Creek, Calif., in place of V. W. Norton. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Stella D. Wilson to be postmaster at Arcadia, Calif. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

COLORADO.

Joynt G. Lett to be postmaster at Yuma, Colo., in place of Harry M. McKinney, resigned.

Edward Slates to be postmaster at Walsenburg, Colo., in place of A. T. Manzanares, removed.

Anna B. Casady to be postmaster at Springfield, Colo., in place of R. O. Casady, deceased.

Edward S. Spangler to be postmaster at Simla, Colo., in place of Lucille Armstrong. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Vivian A. Chambers to be postmaster at Pagosa Springs, Colo., in place of Lydia J. McGee, resigned.

Frances L. Browning to be postmaster at Oak Creek, Colo., in place of William D. Richardson, resigned.

Homer L. Woodbury to be postmaster at Nederland, Colo., in place of Ralph H. Crawford, resigned.

Robert E. McCunniff to be postmaster at La Jara, Colo., in place of Thomas McCunniff, deceased.

Ralph E. Finnicum to be postmaster at Kiowa, Colo., in place of Olive A. Killin, resigned.

Vina Work to be postmaster at Fleming, Colo., in place of Mary E. Holmes, resigned.

James J. Roper to be postmaster at Alamosa, Colo., in place of Herbert R. Sabine, resigned.

Clarence H. Reagan to be postmaster at Aguilar, Colo., in place of Joseph Ray, resigned.

Lester T. Britton to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, Colo., in place of J. E. Hanley, deceased.

Joseph A. Theobold to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Colo., in place of J. A. Theobold. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Milas N. Johnson to be postmaster at Calhan, Colo., in place of M. N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Dorr W. Shores to be postmaster at Carbondale, Colo., in place of D. W. Shores. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Frank W. Childs to be postmaster at Cedaredge, Colo., in place of F. W. Childs. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Benjamin F. Stapleton to be postmaster at Denver, Colo., in place of B. F. Stapleton. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1919.

William F. Ordway to be postmaster at Dolores, Colo., in place of W. F. Ordway. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Joseph W. Burkhard to be postmaster at Florence, Colo., in place of J. W. Burkhard. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1919.

William G. Hubbell to be postmaster at Fort Lupton, Colo., in place of W. G. Hubbell. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Andrew V. Sharpe to be postmaster at Fruita, Colo., in place of A. V. Sharpe. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Sarah J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Georgetown, Colo., in place of S. J. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Jerry A. Ferris to be postmaster at Golden, Colo., in place of J. A. Ferris. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

James Brennan to be postmaster at Grand Valley, Colo., in place of James Brennan. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Ray H. Cowdin to be postmaster at Hugo, Colo., in place of R. H. Cowdin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Marion R. McCauley to be postmaster at La Junta, Colo., in place of M. R. McCauley. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

James M. Brown to be postmaster at Mancos, Colo., in place of J. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Madge L. Weller to be postmaster at New Castle, Colo., in place of M. L. Weller. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Thomas Mowatt to be postmaster at Ouray, Colo., in place of Thomas Mowatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Walstien N. Haas to be postmaster at Silverton, Colo., in place of W. N. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John Davis to be postmaster at Arriba, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frank G. Colburn to be postmaster at Mount Harris, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frederick C. Tighe to be postmaster at New Rayner, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George J. W. Longmore to be postmaster at Louisville, Colo., in place of G. J. W. Longmore. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Catherine E. Melis to be postmaster at Aurora, Colo. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

CONNECTICUT.

John P. Callahan to be postmaster at Branford, Conn., in place of J. P. Callahan. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Edward R. Wooster to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Conn., in place of E. R. Wooster. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Everett I. Pardee to be postmaster at Cheshire, Conn., in place of E. I. Pardee. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Willys R. Monroe to be postmaster at Coscob, Conn., in place of W. R. Monroe. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Thomas H. Collins to be postmaster at Farmington, Conn., in place of T. H. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

David A. Wilson to be postmaster at Hartford, Conn., in place of D. A. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Thomas F. Ryan to be postmaster at Litchfield, Conn., in place of T. F. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Frederick H. Wall to be postmaster at Manchester, Conn., in place of F. H. Wall. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John F. Penders to be postmaster at Meriden, Conn., in place of J. F. Penders. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

John Mulville to be postmaster at Norfolk, Conn., in place of John Mulville. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Walter H. Bishop to be postmaster at North Haven, Conn., in place of W. H. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Michael J. Howard to be postmaster at Norwalk, Conn., in place of M. J. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Timothy J. Kelly to be postmaster at Oakville, Conn., in place of T. J. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Emery W. Doolittle to be postmaster at Plantsville, Conn., in place of E. W. Doolittle. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Alexander Gilman to be postmaster at Putnam, Conn., in place of Alexander Gilman. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

William P. Stone to be postmaster at Salisbury, Conn., in place of W. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

John J. Moran to be postmaster at Southington, Conn., in place of J. J. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William H. Russell to be postmaster at Southport, Conn., in place of W. H. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Joseph F. Leahy to be postmaster at Stonington, Conn., in place of J. F. Leahy. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Daniel P. Hurley to be postmaster at Terryville, Conn., in place of D. P. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William L. Hanley to be postmaster at Thomaston, Conn., in place of W. L. Hanley. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Thomas S. Rourke to be postmaster at Unionville, Conn., in place of T. S. Rourke. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

John W. Cook to be postmaster at Beacon Falls., Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Frank La Favre to be postmaster at Central Village, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William C. Saunders to be postmaster at Waterford, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George H. Foley to be postmaster at Mystic, Conn., in place of G. H. Foley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Edward L. Reidy to be postmaster at Winsted, Conn., in place of E. L. Reidy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

DELAWARE.

Frederick L. Willey to be postmaster at Bridgeville, Del., in place of F. L. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

J. Frank Starling to be postmaster at Dover, Del., in place of J. F. Starling. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

George R. Mears to be postmaster at Georgetown, Del., in place of G. R. Mears. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Edwin V. Ocheltree to be postmaster at Greenwood, Del., in place of E. V. Ocheltree. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Effie M. Truitt to be postmaster at Rehoboth Beach, Del., in place of E. M. Truitt. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

FLORIDA.

Samuel T. Ward to be postmaster at Panama City, Fla., in place of E. L. Brigman, resigned.

John W. Doe to be postmaster at Palm Beach, Fla., in place of E. R. McKenna, resigned.

Dona H. Weaver to be postmaster at Mayo, Fla., in place of T. J. Weaver, resigned.

Gustavus M. Rhoden to be postmaster at Macclenny, Fla., in place of James O. Milton, resigned.

George L. Drew to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Fla., in place of Peter A. Dignan. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

William J. Carter to be postmaster at Homestead, Fla., in place of L. R. Nixon, resigned.

Elisha D. Wightman to be postmaster at Fruitland Park, Fla., in place of L. L. Kenny, deceased.

Louis J. Cowan to be postmaster at Daytona, Fla., in place of William Jackson, deceased.

James A. Douglas to be postmaster at Chipley, Fla., in place of F. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

Benjamin F. Bucanan to be postmaster at Bunnell, Fla., in place of J. L. Councill, resigned. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

John M. Kelly to be postmaster at Bocagrande, Fla., in place of J. M. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Thomas E. Blackburn to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Fla., in place of T. E. Blackburn. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

James F. McKinstry to be postmaster at Gainesville, Fla., in place of J. F. McKinstry. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Milton D. Bell to be postmaster at Inverness, Fla., in place of M. D. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

James L. Stokes to be postmaster at Micanopy, Fla., in place of J. L. Stokes. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Laura Knight to be postmaster at Millville, Fla., in place of Laura Laird. Name changed by marriage.

William C. McLean to be postmaster at Orlando, Fla., in place of W. C. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

John W. Jackson to be postmaster at Palmetto, Fla., in place of J. W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John R. Thompson to be postmaster at Saint Andrew, Fla., in place of J. R. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Orlando E. Hannah to be postmaster at Tavares, Fla., in place of O. E. Hannah. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Lenora K. Gilbride to be postmaster at Fort Dade, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Rinda Daniel to be postmaster at Moore Haven, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Caroline D. Simrall to be postmaster at Ormond, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Capers S. Weathersbee, jr., to be postmaster at Branford, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

GEORGIA.

James H. McWhorter to be postmaster at Wrightsville, Ga., in place of R. P. Hicks, resigned.

Rebie I. Corbin to be postmaster at Warrenton, Ga., in place of J. C. Evans, resigned.

Freeman R. Hardisty to be postmaster at Statesboro, Ga., in place of E. M. Anderson, resigned.

Frank C. Lovett to be postmaster at Sparks, Ga., in place of M. M. McCranie, removed.

Agnes Wells to be postmaster at Smithville, Ga., in place of J. L. Wells, deceased.

George C. Thompson to be postmaster at Manchester, Ga., in place of J. H. Cotter, resigned.

Clement C. Moseley to be postmaster at Lyons, Ga., in place of F. M. Smith, resigned.

Thomas W. Allgood to be postmaster at Loganville, Ga., in place of G. M. Kilgore, resigned.

Walter L. Turner to be postmaster at Lagrange, Ga., in place of Robert Hutchinson, resigned.

John L. Dorris to be postmaster at Douglasville, Ga., in place of C. F. Selman, resigned.

Louise C. Riddle to be postmaster at Davisboro, Ga., in place of L. J. Moye, resigned.

Harry B. Maxwell to be postmaster at Cornelia, Ga., in place of L. F. Maxwell, resigned.

Thomas D. O'Kelley to be postmaster at Conyers, Ga., in place of J. S. Francis, resigned.

Walter W. Daves to be postmaster at Cartersville, Ga., in place of H. J. Jolly, resigned.

Charles P. Graddick to be postmaster at Barnesville, Ga., in place of W. M. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Josephine M. Gray to be postmaster at Adairsville, Ga., in place of J. M. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John W. Wells to be postmaster at Adel, Ga., in place of J. W. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Thomas B. Perry to be postmaster at Camilla, Ga., in place of T. B. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Emma Pettis to be postmaster at Cave Spring, Ga., in place of E. Pettis. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Frank L. Asbury to be postmaster at Clarkesville, Ga., in place of F. L. Asbury. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Wilbur S. Freeman to be postmaster at Claxton, Ga., in place of W. S. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William T. Thurmond to be postmaster at Commerce, Ga., in place of W. T. Thurmond. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1918.

William T. Adkins to be postmaster at Edison, Ga., in place of W. T. Adkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Robert L. Horne to be postmaster at Ludowici, Ga., in place of R. L. Horne. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Albert S. J. McRae to be postmaster at McRae, Ga., in place of A. S. J. McRae. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Julien V. Frederick to be postmaster at Marshallville, Ga., in place of J. V. Frederick. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Thomas Davis to be postmaster at Meigs, Ga., in place of T. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

George G. Brinson to be postmaster at Millen, Ga., in place of G. G. Brinson. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Frank D. Colson to be postmaster at Ocilla, Ga., in place of F. D. Colson. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1918.

Loyd W. English to be postmaster at Pelham, Ga., in place of L. W. English. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

P. Brooks Ford to be postmaster at Sylvester, Ga., in place of P. B. Ford, resigned.

John Q. West to be postmaster at Thomson, Ga., in place of J. Q. West. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Josephine H. Lunceford to be postmaster at Union Point, Ga., in place of J. Hilliard. Name changed by marriage.

Tilden A. Adkins to be postmaster at Vienna, Ga., in place of T. A. Adkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

James C. Newsom to be postmaster at Washington, Ga., in place of J. C. Newsom. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Benjamin R. Leggett to be postmaster at Broxton, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Anna A. Addison to be postmaster at Carnesville, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William D. Wallace to be postmaster at Chamblee, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Abbie F. Beacham to be postmaster at Glenwood, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Herbert F. Rudulph to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ga. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Sam Tate to be postmaster at Tate, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Henry M. Miller to be postmaster at Colquitt, Ga., in place of H. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Emory F. Boyd to be postmaster at Tignall, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Joseph B. Williams to be postmaster at Rhine, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Jane M. Wilkes to be postmaster at Lincolnton, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Barbour C. Warnock to be postmaster at Brooklet, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

HAWAII.

John F. Daly to be postmaster at Hilo, Hawaii, in place of H. D. Corbett, removed.

Caesar R. Jardin to be postmaster at Kohala, Hawaii, in place of C. R. Jardin. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Mary Mitchell to be postmaster at Fort Kamehameha, Hawaii. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

I. Ching How to be postmaster at Paia, Hawaii, in place of Millicent M. E. Cumming, resigned.

IDAHO.

Helga M. Cook to be postmaster at McCall, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John E. Wood to be postmaster at Harrison, Idaho, in place of J. E. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Ross D. Bothwell to be postmaster at Weiser, Idaho, in place of F. S. Harding, deceased.

Oliver F. Vose to be postmaster at Salmon, Idaho, in place of T. H. Holbert, declined.

Robert B. Haskell to be postmaster at Burley, Idaho, in place of R. S. Story. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1918.

Elsie Harrell to be postmaster at Cambridge, Idaho, in place of F. J. Hill, resigned.

Richard L. Baker to be postmaster at Ashton, Idaho, in place of E. J. Kidd, resigned.

Austin A. Lambert to be postmaster at Hailey, Idaho, in place of J. W. Pearson, resigned.

William T. Roberts to be postmaster at Bellevue, Idaho, in place of W. T. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

William F. Winkler to be postmaster at Council, Idaho, in place of W. F. Winkler. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Alva A. White to be postmaster at Mountain Home, Idaho, in place of A. A. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Thomas J. Russell to be postmaster at Post Falls, Idaho, in place of T. J. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Walter A. Fiscus to be postmaster at Potlatch, Idaho, in place of W. A. Fiscus. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Samuel R. Gwin to be postmaster at Hagerman, Idaho. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

James Campbell to be postmaster at Hope, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Franklin B. Fiss to be postmaster at Kuna, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Grant A. Bristol to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

ILLINOIS.

James M. Fairbanks to be postmaster at West Chicago, Ill., in place of Joseph Kramer, resigned.

Clara M. Smith to be postmaster at Weldon, Ill., in place of Edna Clemons, resigned.

Joseph S. Euans to be postmaster at Watseka, Ill., in place of J. H. Carey, deceased.

Albert Heyl to be postmaster at Waterloo, Ill., in place of David Schein. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Fred L. Mosimann to be postmaster at Troy, Ill., in place of August Droll. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1917.

Frank A. Reese to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ill., in place of C. J. Swisher. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1917.

Thomas B. Williams to be postmaster at Sidell, Ill., in place of A. J. Gillogly, resigned.

Harley R. Hootman to be postmaster at Sheldon, Ill., in place of C. L. Butler, resigned.

Rose C. Auth to be postmaster at Rankin, Ill., in place of G. A. Griffith, sr., resigned.

John S. Murphy to be postmaster at Pontiac, Ill., in place of D. C. Eyler, deceased.

Charles Stade to be postmaster at Park Ridge, Ill., in place of K. M. McClements, resigned.

Alfreda Desborough to be postmaster at Panama, Ill., in place of D. R. Bennett, resigned.

Edwin L. Ballard to be postmaster at National Stock Yards, Ill., in place of J. S. Grimes, resigned.

Audie Lindsey to be postmaster at Mahomet, Ill., in place of Eva Carson, resigned.

James W. Cogswell to be postmaster at Louisville, Ill., in place of A. J. Ikemire, deceased.

Mary S. McClymonds to be postmaster at Kirkwood, Ill., in place of R. E. Gamble. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Edward Suppiger to be postmaster at Highland, Ill., in place of F. A. Winter. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1918.

John D. Perrine to be postmaster at Herrin, Ill., in place of Alonzo Bonen, removed.

Rollo W. Churchill to be postmaster at Grayslake, Ill., in place of C. J. Wightman, resigned.

John S. Redshaw, jr., to be postmaster at Granville, Ill., in place of F. I. Peterson, resigned.

Bertha M. Densmore to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ill., in place of R. H. Lewman, resigned.

Catherine Burroughs to be postmaster at Genoa, Ill., in place of W. W. Story. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1918.

Ella Martz to be postmaster at Elmwood, Ill., in place of Philip Maher, resigned.

James H. Nelms to be postmaster at Edinburg, Ill., in place of C. G. McClary, resigned.

Thomas Berta to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of William Baskerville, deceased.

Roscoe Tygett to be postmaster at Christopher, Ill., in place of Moses Jordan, removed.

William F. Lammers to be postmaster at Buckley, Ill., in place of Mabel Minger, resigned.

Joseph H. Coffman to be postmaster at Augusta, Ill., in place of J. B. F. Agnew, resigned.

Grace R. Skelton to be postmaster at Port Byron, Ill., in place of W. D. Hall, deceased.

Nathan T. Crews to be postmaster at Menard, Ill., in place of E. C. Richter, declined.

Hugh L. B. Mason to be postmaster at Equality, Ill., in place of W. H. Stader, resigned.

Wesley A. Challacombe to be postmaster at Carlinville, Ill., in place of J. T. Harkins, deceased.

John T. Kelahan to be postmaster at Algonquin, Ill., in place of J. T. Kelahan. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Joseph L. Lampert to be postmaster at Alton, Ill., in place of J. L. Lampert. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1918.

Thomas W. Medlin to be postmaster at Anna, Ill., in place of T. W. Medlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas W. McGraugh to be postmaster at Ashland, Ill., in place of T. W. McGraugh. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Hazel L. Garvey to be postmaster at Blandinsville, Ill., in place of H. L. Garvey. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Mahala E. Trainer to be postmaster at Blue Mound, Ill., in place of M. E. Trainer. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Wilbur F. Whitney to be postmaster at Byron, Ill., in place of W. F. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Frank P. Williams to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ill., in place of F. P. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Benjamin L. Washburn to be postmaster at Carterville, Ill., in place of B. L. Washburn. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Isaac C. Davidson to be postmaster at Carthage, Ill., in place of I. C. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

George B. Marvel to be postmaster at Clinton, Ill., in place of G. B. Marvel. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1918.

Walter E. Roberts to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill., in place of W. E. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Robert C. Baird to be postmaster at Coulterville, Ill., in place of R. C. Baird. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Stephen A. D. Howe to be postmaster at Cowden, Ill., in place of S. A. D. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Edwin J. Kingdon to be postmaster at Cullom, Ill., in place of E. J. Kingdon. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Ludwig A. Karcher to be postmaster at Dahlgren, Ill., in place of L. A. Karcher. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

George R. Tilton to be postmaster at Danville, Ill., in place of G. R. Tilton. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1919.

James L. Molohon to be postmaster at Divernon, Ill., in place of J. L. Molohon. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William F. Hogan to be postmaster at Dixon, Ill., in place of W. F. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Darlin H. Thompson to be postmaster at Earlville, Ill., in place of D. H. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

John J. Lloyd to be postmaster at Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. J. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Carl E. Schmidt to be postmaster at Farina, Ill., in place of C. E. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Frank H. T. Maronde to be postmaster at Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of F. H. T. Maronde. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Michael C. Slattery to be postmaster at Galena, Ill., in place of M. C. Slattery. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John A. Pence to be postmaster at Gibson City, Ill., in place of J. A. Pence. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Frank W. Freeman to be postmaster at Grant Park, Ill., in place of F. W. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William M. Cannedy to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ill., in place of W. M. Cannedy. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John A. Mathews to be postmaster at Greenview, Ill., in place of J. A. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

David Wilson to be postmaster at Gridley, Ill., in place of David Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edward T. Crock to be postmaster at Hampshire, Ill., in place of E. T. Crock. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Henry Earle to be postmaster at Hebron, Ill., in place of Henry Earle. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

John R. Paskell to be postmaster at Henry, Ill., in place of J. R. Paskell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frank G. Pierski to be postmaster at La Salle, Ill., in place of F. G. Pierski. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Joseph C. Lampert to be postmaster at Lena, Ill., in place of J. C. Lampert. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William Q. Crane to be postmaster at Lomax, Ill., in place of W. Q. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Cora L. Tisler to be postmaster at Marseilles, Ill., in place of C. L. Tisler. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Solomon H. Handy to be postmaster at Marshall, Ill., in place of S. H. Handy. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edward F. Poorman to be postmaster at Mattoon, Ill., in place of E. F. Poorman. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1918.

Emil J. Hess to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of E. J. Hess. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Samuel M. Stewart to be postmaster at Metropolis, Ill., in place of S. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

John E. Herman to be postmaster at Mounds, Ill., in place of J. E. Herman. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Helen G. Longenbaugh to be postmaster at Moweaqua, Ill., in place of H. G. Longenbaugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas E. Davis to be postmaster at Mulberry Grove, Ill., in place of T. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

George Rankin to be postmaster at Normal, Ill., in place of G. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Harry Bryant to be postmaster at Norris City, Ill., in place of H. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Ann Sheehan to be postmaster at Ohio, Ill., in place of A. Sheehan. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles Walkup to be postmaster at Oregon, Ill., in place of C. Walkup. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1918.

Ben C. Allensworth to be postmaster at Pekin, Ill., in place of B. C. Allensworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Hugh Rice, jr., to be postmaster at Piper City, Ill., in place of H. Rice, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Merton L. Spangler to be postmaster at Plainfield, Ill., in place of M. L. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Horace C. Aleshire to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ill., in place of H. C. Aleshire. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Ernest R. Duncan to be postmaster at Potomac, Ill., in place of E. R. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles E. Baum to be postmaster at Ridge Farm, Ill., in place of C. E. Baum. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Wiley B. Barnum to be postmaster at Ridgway, Ill., in place of W. B. Barnum. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William H. Hefferan to be postmaster at Rockford, Ill., in place of W. H. Hefferan. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Charles L. Stephenson to be postmaster at St. Francisville, Ill., in place of C. L. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

John T. Scott to be postmaster at Saybrook, Ill., in place of J. T. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

George B. Gray to be postmaster at Sesser, Ill., in place of G. B. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Isaac W. Terry to be postmaster at Tamaroa, Ill., in place of I. W. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

John T. Carroll to be postmaster at Toluca, Ill., in place of J. T. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

George L. Hausmann to be postmaster at Vandalia, Ill., in place of G. L. Hausmann. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Harold M. Oakford to be postmaster at Walnut, Ill., in place of H. M. Oakford. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

John H. Henson to be postmaster at Xenia, Ill., in place of J. H. Henson. Incumbent's commission expired August 27, 1917.

Glen S. Fleming to be postmaster at Catlin, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mabel G. Holmes to be postmaster at Cornell, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Perry Westerfield to be postmaster at Frankfort Heights, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Enoch M. Runyon to be postmaster at Green Valley, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William Sutton to be postmaster at Kempton, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Benjamin F. Bosley to be postmaster at Ransom, Ill. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Robert Selby to be postmaster at Lovington, Ill., in place of R. Selby. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John Coveny to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Ill., in place of J. Coveny. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1918.

Mary Anen to be postmaster at Winthrop Harbor, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John C. Reuter to be postmaster at Freeburg, Ill., in place of J. C. Reuter. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Joseph V. Campeggio to be postmaster at Ladd, Ill., in place of J. V. Campeggio. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Frank S. Stults to be postmaster at Oquawka, Ill., in place of F. S. Stults. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Albert J. F. Larimore to be postmaster at Beecher City, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Rollin A. Gouwens to be postmaster at South Holland, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Dora Blair to be postmaster at New Douglas, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Chriss C. Kavanaugh to be postmaster at Mason, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Louis I. Hannig to be postmaster at Hopedale, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

INDIANA.

Burr Atkinson to be postmaster at Vanburen, Ind., in place of George W. Doyle, deceased.

James E. Turner to be postmaster at Roann, Ind., in place of Benjamin E. Goltry, resigned. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Gilbert A. Wilson to be postmaster at Roachdale, Ind., in place of Fred. G. Rice, removed.

Charles A. Wall to be postmaster at Ridgeville, Ind., in place of Garland D. Williamson, deceased.

Clarence E. Skelton to be postmaster at Orleans, Ind., in place of S. L. Frost, resigned.

Frank A. Keller to be postmaster at Newburg, Ind., in place of A. H. Martin, deceased.

William H. Morey to be postmaster at Lowell, Ind., in place of Mortimer Castle. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1918.

George J. Richman to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ind., in place of W. A. Service, resigned.

William L. Denman to be postmaster at Greencastle, Ind., in place of W. B. Vestal. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Oren S. Hurst to be postmaster at Farmland, Ind., in place of J. H. McFarland, resigned.

Charles L. Berg to be postmaster at Bremen, Ind., in place of Franc Mensel, resigned.

Charles R. Carrette to be postmaster at Whiting, Ind., in place of D. B. Purinton, declined.

Burt E. Kimmel to be postmaster at Howe, Ind., in place of C. E. Schaeffer, resigned.

Francis M. Fultz to be postmaster at Akron, Ind., in place of F. M. Fultz. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Charlie E. Heiney to be postmaster at Andrews, Ind., in place of C. E. Heiney. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Henry E. Snyder to be postmaster at Atlanta, Ind., in place of H. E. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Miles Baxter to be postmaster at Auburn, Ind., in place of M. Baxter. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1918.

William L. McMillen to be postmaster at Brook, Ind., in place of W. L. McMillen. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

J. Bruce Pessell to be postmaster at Butler, Ind., in place of J. B. Pessell. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Merrimon Straughn to be postmaster at Cambridge City, Ind., in place of M. Straughn. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John W. Brand to be postmaster at Columbia City, Ind., in place of J. W. Brand. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

Peter F. Hein to be postmaster at Crown Point, Ind., in place of P. F. Hein. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Benjamin F. Houseman to be postmaster at Dunkirk, Ind., in place of B. F. Houseman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

James J. Littrell to be postmaster at Elkhart, Ind., in place of J. J. Littrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

Theodore Hoss to be postmaster at Fowler, Ind., in place of Theodore Hoss. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Walter M. Engle to be postmaster at Francesville, Ind., in place of W. M. Engle. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

George E. Erdmann to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of G. E. Erdmann. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

William W. Drake to be postmaster at Greenwood, Ind., in place of W. W. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1918.

Edward E. Cox to be postmaster at Hartford City, Ind., in place of E. E. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John P. Huther to be postmaster at Jasper, Ind., in place of J. P. Huther. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

John Postma to be postmaster at Milford, Ind., in place of John Postma. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Amasa S. Robinson to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ind., in place of A. S. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Rudolph F. Schneider to be postmaster at Montpelier, Ind., in place of R. F. Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1918.

Frank Billings to be postmaster at Morocco, Ind., in place of Frank Billings. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Alvin E. Hauk to be postmaster at Morristown, Ind., in place of A. E. Hauk. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

John A. Cody to be postmaster at New Albany, Ind., in place of J. A. Cody. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Thomas C. Dowling to be postmaster at New Haven, Ind., in place of T. C. Dowling. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Charles F. Ill to be postmaster at Notre Dame, Ind., in place of C. F. Ill. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Alfred M. Hiatt to be postmaster at Pennville, Ind., in place of A. M. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frank E. Campbell to be postmaster at Red Key, Ind., in place of F. E. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Charles K. Lewis to be postmaster at Russiaville, Ind., in place of C. K. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Allen Swope to be postmaster at Seymour, Ind., in place of Allen Swope. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Levi T. Pennington to be postmaster at Spiceland, Ind., in place of L. T. Pennington. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1918.

Verado W. Bigney to be postmaster at Sunman, Ind., in place of V. W. Bigney. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

James H. Roy to be postmaster at Topeka, Ind., in place of J. H. Roy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Charles W. Reed to be postmaster at Upland, Ind., in place of C. W. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

R. William I. Boggs to be postmaster at Veedersburg, Ind., in place of R. W. I. Boggs. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Eugene Kelley to be postmaster at Waterloo, Ind., in place of Eugene Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

George A. Dalton to be postmaster at West Baden, Ind., in place of G. A. Dalton. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Winfield S. Sanders to be postmaster at Westport, Ind., in place of W. S. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

William Marmaduke to be postmaster at Wingate, Ind., in place of W. Marmaduke. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Frank E. Parker to be postmaster at Colfax, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Hurbert J. Harris to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Benjamin H. Knapp to be postmaster at Wheatfield, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Marley Kendall to be postmaster at Dana, Ind., in place of Marley Kendall. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Henry B. Snyder to be postmaster at Gary, Ind., in place of H. B. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

John L. Rohde to be postmaster at Hammond, Ind., in place of J. L. Rohde. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Louis G. Trixler to be postmaster at Huntington, Ind., in place of L. G. Trixler. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Don C. Ward to be postmaster at Union City, Ind., in place of D. C. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Charles C. Rickard to be postmaster at Pekin, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Charles Van Arsdall to be postmaster at Hymera, Ind. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Charles J. Metzger to be postmaster at Ferdinand, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Harry C. Wesner to be postmaster at Campbellsburg, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

IOWA.

Hope C. Niemann to be postmaster at Marcus, Iowa, in place of Benjamin Delaney, resigned.

Arthur E. Granger to be postmaster at Marion, Iowa, in place of T. T. Williams, deceased.

Maude E. Barkley to be postmaster at Pierson, Iowa, in place of Charles E. Perdue, resigned.

Albert H. Stoltenberg to be postmaster at Schleswig, Iowa, in place of Emil M. Peters, resigned.

Philip W. Tembke to be postmaster at Sibley, Iowa, in place of Jacob H. Bahne, resigned.

Esther Y. Walster to be postmaster at Marble Rock, Iowa, in place of Merton I. J. Aekley, resigned.

James F. Conover to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of Jacob Meyer, resigned.

Kathryn McGuire to be postmaster at Audubon, Iowa, in place of S. B. Morrissey, resigned.

Edwin P. Anderson to be postmaster at Winfield, Iowa, in place of J. W. Hanna, resigned.

Frank E. Moravec to be postmaster at Oxford Junction, Iowa, in place of Frank Kenney, resigned.

Edward J. Kooreman to be postmaster at Alton, Iowa, in place of E. J. Kooreman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Carl L. Little to be postmaster at Ames, Iowa, in place of C. L. Little. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Maurice Fay to be postmaster at Anamosa, Iowa, in place of M. Fay. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Harry H. Cate to be postmaster at Anita, Iowa, in place of H. H. Cate. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Henry Durst to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Iowa, in place of H. Durst. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Peter J. Cool to be postmaster at Baxter, Iowa, in place of P. J. Cool. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Joseph E. McKillip to be postmaster at Bellevue, Iowa, in place of J. E. McKillip. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Frank C. Siebengartner to be postmaster at Bettendorf, Iowa, in place of F. C. Siebengartner. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Hans E. Eiel to be postmaster at Buffalo Center, Iowa, in place of H. E. Eiel. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John H. Pettibone to be postmaster at Burlington, Iowa, in place of J. H. Pettibone. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

John E. McNamara to be postmaster at Castana, Iowa, in place of J. E. McNamara. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Walter H. Dewey to be postmaster at Chariton, Iowa, in place of W. H. Dewey. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

George W. McKeehan to be postmaster at Cincinnati, Iowa, in place of G. W. McKeehan. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Bernhard M. Jacobsen to be postmaster at Clinton, Iowa, in place of B. M. Jacobsen. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1918.

John J. McAreavy to be postmaster at Coggon, Iowa, in place of J. J. McAreavy. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Watson B. Chapman to be postmaster at Correctionville, Iowa, in place of W. B. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

George F. Hughes to be postmaster at Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of G. F. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Nels A. Christensen to be postmaster at Alta, Iowa, in place of N. A. Christensen. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Francis D. Mead to be postmaster at Cresco, Iowa, in place of F. D. Mead. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Earl P. Patten to be postmaster at Danbury, Iowa, in place of E. P. Patten. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Charles H. Bloom to be postmaster at Delmar, Iowa, in place of C. H. Bloom. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1918.

Martin F. Kelly to be postmaster at Dewitt, Iowa, in place of M. F. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Chris Haffner to be postmaster at Donnellson, Iowa, in place of C. Haffner. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William Walter to be postmaster at Dyersville, Iowa, in place of W. Walter. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Maurice Moroney to be postmaster at Earlville, Iowa, in place of M. Moroney. Incumbents' commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas J. Capper to be postmaster at Elgin, Iowa, in place of T. J. Capper. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Inez L. Hanson to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Iowa, in place of I. L. Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Patrick H. Donlon to be postmaster at Emmetsburg, Iowa, in place of P. H. Donlon. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Samuel Manuel to be postmaster at Fayette, Iowa, in place of Samuel Manuel. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Samuel B. Wesp to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Iowa, in place of S. B. Wesp. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Madge Fell to be postmaster at Fremont, Iowa, in place of Madge Fell. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William Molloy to be postmaster at Galva, Iowa, in place of William Molloy. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

George E. Jennings to be postmaster at Garden Grove, Iowa, in place of G. E. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Frank B. Wilson to be postmaster at Greenfield, Iowa, in place of F. B. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William J. Nelson to be postmaster at Grinnell, Iowa, in place of W. J. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John Vanderwicken to be postmaster at Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of John Vanderwicken. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William C. McWilliams to be postmaster at Hedrick, Iowa, in place of W. C. McWilliams. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Max Mayer to be postmaster at Iowa City, Iowa, in place of Max Mayer. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William P. Coutts to be postmaster at Kellogg, Iowa, in place of W. P. Coutts. Incumbent's commission expired October 6, 1918.

Leo A. Dugan to be postmaster at Kingsley, Iowa, in place of L. A. Dugan. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Henry D. Mussman to be postmaster at Lakota (late Germania), Iowa, in place of H. D. Mussman. To change name of office.

William F. Oehmke to be postmaster at Larchwood, Iowa, in place of W. F. Oehmke. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

John E. McHugh to be postmaster at Lisbon, Iowa, in place of J. E. McHugh. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

James Nowak to be postmaster at Malcolm, Iowa, in place of James Nowak. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Greenup C. Boston to be postmaster at Malvern, Iowa, in place of G. C. Boston. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

H. Peter N. Rix to be postmaster at Manning, Iowa, in place of H. P. N. Rix. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Elbert H. Vary to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, Iowa, in place of E. H. Vary. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1917.

Jacob A. Cowger to be postmaster at Mediapolis, Iowa, in place of J. A. Cowger. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

William B. Durham to be postmaster at Milo, Iowa, in place of W. B. Durham. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John T. Lanigan to be postmaster at Monticello, Iowa, in place of J. T. Lanigan. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

James D. Minnes to be postmaster at Moravia, Iowa, in place of J. D. Minnes. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Cary C. Beggs to be postmaster at Moulton, Iowa, in place of C. C. Beggs. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Stanley Miller to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, in place of Stanley Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frank W. Eichoff to be postmaster at Muscatine, Iowa, in place of F. W. Eichoff. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

George E. Scoles to be postmaster at Nashua, Iowa, in place of G. E. Scoles. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Richard J. O'Connor to be postmaster at Neola, Iowa, in place of Richard O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William L. Holtz to be postmaster at Newell, Iowa, in place of W. L. Holtz. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

Harry E. Chichester to be postmaster at New London, Iowa, in place of H. E. Chichester. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Jesse A. Winger to be postmaster at Newton, Iowa, in place of J. A. Winger. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Eliza A. Butler to be postmaster at North English, Iowa, in place of E. A. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Charles A. Sample to be postmaster at Oakland, Iowa, in place of C. A. Sample. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Herman Toering to be postmaster at Orange City, Iowa, in place of Herman Toering. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

Harry A. Nash to be postmaster at Perry, Iowa, in place of H. A. Nash. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Emma Nicolay to be postmaster at Postville, Iowa, in place of Emma Nicolay. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Joseph Peters to be postmaster at Preston, Iowa, in place of Joseph Peters. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

John O'Rourke to be postmaster at Red Oak, Iowa, in place of John O'Rourke. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Albert F. Jenkins to be postmaster at Russell, Iowa, in place of A. F. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Lacey A. Wine to be postmaster at Sac City, Iowa, in place of L. A. Wine. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Walter E. Witten to be postmaster at Sloan, Iowa, in place of W. E. Witten. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Earl Bronson to be postmaster at Spencer, Iowa, in place of Earl Bronson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Albert A. Montgomery to be postmaster at Stuart, Iowa, in place of A. A. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired September 25, 1918.

James H. Noon to be postmaster at Sumner, Iowa, in place of J. H. Noon. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

J. Brady Piatt to be postmaster at Tipton, Iowa, in place of J. B. Piatt. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John Hickey to be postmaster at Vail, Iowa, in place of John Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Henry G. Kruse to be postmaster at Vinton, Iowa, in place of H. G. Kruse. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Francis A. Gallagher to be postmaster at Walnut, Iowa, in place of F. A. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Samuel W. Koster to be postmaster at West Liberty, Iowa, in place of S. W. Koster. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Richard B. McSwiggin to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of R. B. McSwiggin. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Alva S. Lind to be postmaster at Blairsburg, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Clem A. Bohnenkamp to be postmaster at Duncombe, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Alphonso T. Joder to be postmaster at Hudson, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

John W. Waterman to be postmaster at Klemme, Iowa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Jo G. Milligan to be postmaster at Pulaski, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John Grant to be postmaster at Stanwood, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alma Camblin to be postmaster at Walcott, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ira L. Breffle to be postmaster at Lake Park, Iowa, in place of I. L. Breffle. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

John F. Dalton, jr., to be postmaster at Manson, Iowa, in place of J. F. Dalton, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Paul W. Farrell to be postmaster at Barnes City, Iowa. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Daisy A. Bestor to be postmaster at Grimes, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

KANSAS.

Althea C. Curry to be postmaster at Winchester, Kans., in place on James H. Riley, declined.

Claude J. Wood to be postmaster at Wetmore, Kans., in place of T. J. Martin, deceased.

Everett R. McGalliard to be postmaster at Troy, Kans., in place of George H. Burkhalter, resigned.

Frank A. Moore to be postmaster at Tribune, Kans., in place of Lou Stienbarger, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Henry R. Payne to be postmaster at Spring Hill, Kans., in place of Fred H. Ricketts, resigned.

Lula Ferrell to be postmaster at Peru, Kans., in place of G. W. Wasson, resigned.

Burton C. Peterson to be postmaster at Lyons, Kans., in place of George E. H. Six, resigned.

Anna J. Miller to be postmaster at Lebanon, Kans., in place of James W. Adams, resigned.

John H. Roemer to be postmaster at Hoisington, Kans., in place of Fred G. Meyer, resigned.

Lee Bledsoe to be postmaster at Herington, Kans., in place of Robert L. Notson, resigned.

Robert Focht to be postmaster at Eureka, Kans., in place of Anna C. Huffman. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Sol A. Pack to be postmaster at Burden, Kans., in place of Robert V. Grattan, resigned.

Charles D. Wyatt to be postmaster at Beloit, Kans., in place of Thomas C. Rodgers, deceased.

Horatio C. Duckworth to be postmaster at Altoona, Kans., in place of H. C. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

George S. Hartley to be postmaster at Arkansas City, Kans., in place of G. S. Hartley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Louis C. Orr to be postmaster at Atchison, Kans., in place of L. C. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Frank E. Munger to be postmaster at Atwood, Kans., in place of F. E. Munger. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William A. McClure to be postmaster at Baldwin City, Kans., in place of W. A. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Harlan W. Marmon to be postmaster at Barnes, Kans., in place of H. W. Marmon. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Clarence Coulter to be postmaster at Blue Rapids, Kans., in place of C. Coulter. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William S. Twist to be postmaster at Bonner Springs, Kans., in place of W. S. Twist. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Richard F. G. Hepworth to be postmaster at Burlingame, Kans., in place of R. F. G. Hepworth. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Frank H. Higley to be postmaster at Cawker City, Kans., in place of F. H. Higley. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Thomas Pore to be postmaster at Cedar Vale, Kans., in place of T. Pore. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

John W. Lapham to be postmaster at Chanute, Kans., in place of J. W. Lapham. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Granville S. Hoss, jr., to be postmaster at Cherryvale, Kans., in place of G. S. Hoss, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Frederick M. Murphy to be postmaster at Clyde, Kans., in place of F. M. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Elmer E. Scott to be postmaster at Council Grove, Kans., in place of E. E. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Carl E. Hallberg to be postmaster at Courtland, Kans., in place of C. E. Hallberg. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

John E. Hare to be postmaster at Cunningham, Kans., in place of J. E. Hare. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Isaac N. Richardson to be postmaster at Delphos, Kans., in place of I. N. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Henry F. Schmidt to be postmaster at Dodge City, Kans., in place of H. F. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Thomas P. Mannion to be postmaster at Eldorado, Kans., in place of T. P. Mannion. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Harrison Parkman to be postmaster at Emporia, Kans., in place of H. Parkman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John A. Lindahl to be postmaster at Enterprise, Kans., in place of J. A. Lindahl. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Joseph A. Carson to be postmaster at Erie, Kans., in place of J. A. Carson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Virginia H. Kinyon to be postmaster at Fall River, Kans., in place of V. H. Kinyon. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

P. J. Murphy to be postmaster at Gardner, Kans., in place of P. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Clayton K. Simon to be postmaster at Goff, Kans., in place of C. K. Simon. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John F. Hostetter to be postmaster at Great Bend, Kans., in place of J. F. Hostetter. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Hiram R. Fulton to be postmaster at Hanover, Kans., in place of H. R. Fulton. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Arthur C. Inlow to be postmaster at Hill City, Kans., in place of A. C. Inlow. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Ferdinand Scharping to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Kans., in place of F. Scharping. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Samuel T. Osterhold to be postmatser at Holton, Kans., in place of S. T. Osterhold. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Samuel S. Graybill to be postmaster at Hutchinson, Kans., in place of S. S. Graybill. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Michael A. Frey to be postmaster at Junction City, Kans., in place of M. A. Frey. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Benjamin F. Tatum to be postmaster at Kinsley, Kans., in place of B. F. Tatum. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Charles A. Taschetta to be postmaster at Leavenworth, Kans., in place of C. A. Taschetta. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Wenslow Cipra to be postmaster at Lincoln, Kans., in place of W. Cipra. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Lloyd E. Jackson to be postmaster at McPherson, Kans., in place of L. E. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Henry R. Honey to be postmaster at Mankato, Kans., in place of H. R. Honey. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Harry M. Brodrick to be postmaster at Marysville, Kans., in place at H. M. Brodrick. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John T. Brothers to be postmaster at National Military Home, Kans., in place of J. T. Brothers. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ernest Bray to be postmaster at Neodesha, Kans., in place of E. Bray. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William L. D. Hagan to be postmaster at Newton, Kans., in place of W. L. D. Hagan. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

George A. Milliman to be postmaster at Oakley, Kans., in place of G. A. Milliman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

James H. Cosgrove to be postmaster at Olathe, Kans., in place of J. H. Cosgrove. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Edwin F. Moody to be postmaster at Onaga, Kans., in place of E. F. Moody. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William C. White to be postmaster at Osage City, Kans., in place of W. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Aldamar P. Elder to be postmaster at Ottawa, Kans., in place of A. P. Elder. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Claud Alley to be postmaster at Oxford Kans., in place of C. Alley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Thomas J. Ryan to be postmaster at St. Marys, Kans., in place of T. J. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William F. Grosser to be postmaster at Salina, Kans., in place of W. F. Grosser. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Richard D. McCliman to be postmaster at Seneca, Kans., in place of R. D. McCliman. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Henry Block to be postmaster at Syracuse, Kans., in place of H. Block. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Timothy D. Seeley to be postmaster at Tonganoxie, Kans., in place of T. D. Seeley. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Joseph J. Keraus to be postmaster at Wakeeney, Kans., in place of J. J. Keraus. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Oscar L. Clarke to be postmaster at Washington, Kans., in place of O. L. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Catharine E. Simmons to be postmaster at Wellsville, Kans., in place of C. E. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Thomas Torgeson to be postmaster at White City, Kans., in place of T. Torgeson. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Julia B. Temple to be postmaster at Valley Center, Kans. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William L. Scott to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, Kans., in place of W. L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Daniel E. Pease to be postmaster at Greeley, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

John J. Germann to be postmaster at Fairview, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

KENTUCKY.

Ernie M. Peniston to be postmaster at Wilmore, Ky., in place of Robert J. Scott, deceased.

George L. Penny to be postmaster at Stanford, Ky., in place of Harvey J. McRoberts, resigned.

Bruner L. Stamps to be postmaster at Scottsville, Ky., in place of David C. Bradley, removed.

Edward F. Coffman to be postmaster at Russellville, Ky., in place of Charles M. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

Charles E. Cooke to be postmaster at Middlesboro, Ky., in place of W. C. Sleet, resigned.

Richard B Thurman to be postmaster at Hodgenville, Ky., in place of Lee H. Hansbrough, deceased.

James S. Glenn to be postmaster at Hartford, Ky., in place of Ernest E. Birkhead, resigned.

Tracy L. Riley to be postmaster at Fleming, Ky., in place of Mary L. Gay, resigned.

Mary Wilson to be postmaster at Crab Orchard, Ky., in place of Edward O. Gooch, deceased.

Frances L. Coldwell to be postmaster at Benham, Ky., in place of Barbra A. Rasnick, resigned.

Anna M. Sisk, to be postmaster at Allensville, Ky., in place of Olive Haddox, resigned.

Charles B. Burke to be postmaster at Beattyville, Ky., in place of G. T. Smith, resigned.

Virgie H. Lytle to be postmaster at Augusta, Ky., in place of V. H. Lytle. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1919.

Leslie C. Adams to be postmaster at Berea, Ky., in place of L. C. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1919.

Allie Reid to be postmaster at Brandenburg (late Brandenberg), Ky., in place of A. Reid. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Edward F. Yelton to be postmaster at Butler, Ky., in place of E. F. Yelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Charles E. Beeler to be postmaster at Calhoun, Ky., in place of C. E. Beeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Fannie G. Wilson to be postmaster at Campbellsville, Ky., in place of F. G. Taylor. Name changed by marriage.

Moses F. Moore to be postmaster at Central City, Ky., in place of M. F. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Otis W. Jackson to be postmaster at Clinton, Ky., in place of O. W. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1919.

Nathaniel T. Mercer to be postmaster at Columbia, Ky., in place of N. T. Mercer. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1918.

Burnett M. Powell to be postmaster at Corydon, Ky., in place of B. M. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Orie S. Ware to be postmaster at Covington, Ky., in place of O. S. Ware. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Len Beshear to be postmaster at Dawsonsprings, Ky., in place of L. Beshear. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Helen L. Gurney to be postmaster at Erlanger, Ky., in place of H. L. Gurney. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

James N. Rule to be postmaster at Falmouth, Ky., in place of J. N. Rule. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Robert H. Anderson to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ky., in place of R. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Joseph E. Moseley to be postmaster at Hopkinsville, Ky., in place of J. E. Moseley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Willis G. Bandy to be postmaster at Irvington, Ky., in place of W. G. Bandy. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Ephriam P. Brown to be postmaster at Lancaster, Ky., in place of E. P. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

John B. Wathen to be postmaster at Lebanon, Ky., in place of J. B. Wathen. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

John B. Lasley to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Ky., in place of J. B. Lasley. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Moses Kaufman to be postmaster at Lexington, Ky., in place of M. Kaufman. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

William L. Hale to be postmaster at Mayfield, Ky., in place of W. L. Hale. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

William H. Atteberry to be postmaster at Mumfordville, Ky., in place of W. H. Atteberry. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Andrew M. Edwards to be postmaster at New Castle, Ky., in place of A. M. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Lawrence T. Doty to be postmaster at Owenton, Ky., in place of L. T. Doty. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Latt W. Springfield to be postmaster at Sebree, Ky., in place of L. W. Springfield. Incumbent's commission expired October 2, 1918.

Otho C. Quirey to be postmaster at Sturgis, Ky., in place of O. C. Quirey. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Mattie E. Carter to be postmaster at Barlow, Ky. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

John W. Taylor to be postmaster at Stone, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Jesse B. Wise to be postmaster at Stithton, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

LOUISIANA.

A. Mabelle Oaksmith to be postmaster at Welsh, La., in place of Teresa M. Stewart, resigned.

William W. Drake to be postmaster at St. Joseph, La., in place of Laura B. Beaubien, resigned.

Ellet B. Jewell to be postmaster at New Roads, La., in place of J. W. Bouanchaud, resigned.

J. Wiley Miller to be postmaster at Many, La., in place of Mary E. Vandegaer, resigned.

Thomas E. Wright, jr., to be postmaster at Houma, La., in place of Thomas E. Wright, deceased.

Henry C. Baldwin to be postmaster at Franklin, La., in place of Thomas F. Frere, deceased.

Harry Preaus, to be postmaster at Farmerville, La., in place of Kate Gilbert, resigned.

Vera M. Canady to be postmaster at Eros, La., in place of Pearl Collins, resigned.

Moise Bellard to be postmaster at Church Point, La., in place of Luda M. Hargroder, resigned.

Florence A. Stuckey to be postmaster at Boyce, La., in place of J. E. Ray, resigned.

Omar G. Goldsby to be postmaster at Amite, La., in place of A. J. Alford. Incumbent's commission expired October 4, 1917.

William T. Oliver to be postmaster at Rayville, La., in place of H. A. Buie, resigned.

William La Croix to be postmaster at Colfax, La., in place of C. L. Wells, name changed by marriage.

Jacob Seiler to be postmaster at Covington, La., in place of J. Seiler. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Joseph Muth to be postmaster at Elizabeth, La., in place of J. Muth. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Hardy C. Richardson to be postmaster at Franklinton, La., in place of H. C. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Katherine J. Moynagh to be postmaster at Harvey, La., in place of K. J. Moynagh. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Lee Kiblinger to be postmaster at Jackson, La., in place of Lee Kiblinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Shep B. Hanes to be postmaster at Jena, La., in place of S. B. Hanes. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

James M. Callaway to be postmaster at Jonesboro, La., in place of J. M. Callaway. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

W. Randolph Morgan to be postmaster at Mandeville, La., in place of W. Randolph Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Joseph P. Trosclair to be postmaster at Opelousas, La., in place of J. P. Trosclair. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

William P. Willett to be postmaster at Pollock, La., in place of W. P. Willett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1918.

Samuel L. Barksdale to be postmaster at Ruston, La., in place of S. L. Barksdale. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Robinson M. Leake to be postmaster at St. Francisville, La., in place of R. M. Leake. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Frederick H. Gosman to be postmaster at Shreveport, La., in place of F. H. Gosman. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Henry J. Nelson to be postmaster at Vinton, La., in place of H. J. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Simon Kahn to be postmaster at Raceland, La. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Irvin P. Duke to be postmaster at Rochelle, La. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Felicien H. Toups to be postmaster at Lafourche (late Lafourche Crossing), La., in place of F. H. Toups. Change name of office.

MAINE.

Alice C. Havener to be postmaster at Searsport, Me., in place of Amos Nichols, resigned.

Edith G. Stuart to be postmaster at National Soldiers' Home, Me., in place of William D. Stuart, resigned.

Stanley Renier to be postmaster at Madison, Me., in place of Oscar H. Dilworth, resigned.

George D. Vose to be postmaster at Kingfield, Me., in place of Reuben A. Huse, resigned.

Harry B. Brown to be postmaster at Farmington, Me., in place of Joseph A. Linscott, deceased.

Samuel G. Wing to be postmaster at Fairfield, Me., in place of Silas T. Lawry, resigned.

Charles E. Perry to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of H. E. Roberts, removed.

Linza A. Burns to be postmaster at Clinton, Me., in place of L. A. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Fred A. Pitts to be postmaster at Damariscotta, Me., in place of F. A. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

John W. Hutchins to be postmaster at Fryeburg, Me., in place of J. W. Hutchins. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Austin W. Keating to be postmaster at Belfast, Me., in place of A. W. Keating. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Alvin E. Dresser to be postmaster at Millbridge, Me., in place of A. E. Dresser. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Dwight P. Macartney to be postmaster at Oakland, Me., in place of D. P. Macartney. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1918.

James W. Sewall to be postmaster at Oldtown, Me., in place of J. W. Sewall. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Ferdinand H. Parady to be postmaster at Orono, Me., in place of F. H. Parady. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John P. Coughlin to be postmaster at Saco, Me., in place of J. P. Coughlin. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Joseph A. Kenney to be postmaster at South Paris, Me., in place of J. A. Kenney. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Rufus L. Mudgett to be postmaster at Stockton Springs, Me., in place of R. L. Mudgett. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Elmer E. Crockett to be postmaster at Stonington, Me., in place of E. E. Crockett. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Frank B. Hills to be postmaster at Thomaston, Me., in place of F. B. Hills. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Louis P. Gagnon to be postmaster at Van Buren, Me., in place of L. P. Gagnon. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Mary P. Ross to be postmaster at Vanceboro, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Allen H. Stinchfield to be postmaster at Wayne, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

MARYLAND.

Earle B. Polk to be postmaster at Princess Anne, Md., in place of H. L. Brittingham, resigned.

Edward W. Ross to be postmaster at Pocomoke City, Md., in place of John H. Blades, resigned.

Adelia E. Bowers to be postmaster at Millington, Md., in place of Washington F. Collins, deceased.

John D. Rowe to be postmaster at Indianhead, Md., in place of Sophie E. Posey, resigned.

Walter S. Wilson to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Md., in place of William H. Jacobs, resigned.

Walper G. Musgrove to be postmaster at Brunswick, Md., in place of W. G. Musgrove. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles W. Jefferson to be postmaster at Federalsburg, Md., in place of C. W. Jefferson. Incumbent's commission expired November 29, 1917.

Patrick T. McGann to be postmaster at Frostburg, Md., in place of P. T. McGann. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

William J. Ford to be postmaster at Lonaconing, Md., in place of W. J. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

David H. Hastings to be postmaster at Lutherville, Md., in place of D. H. Hastings. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

Charles A. Deffinbaugh to be postmaster at Oakland, Md., in place of C. A. Deffinbaugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Charles Judefind to be postmaster at Rock Hall, Md., in place of Charles Judefind. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

Samuel A. Wyvill to be postmaster at Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of S. A. Wyvill. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

Joseph P. Getty to be postmaster at Western Port, Md., in place of J. P. Getty. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Benjamin C. Lefever to be postmaster at Williamsport, Md., in place of B. C. Lefever. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Elmore H. Owens to be postmaster at Perryville, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas D. Bowers to be postmaster at Chestertown, Md., in place of T. D. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

Joseph A. Williamson to be postmaster at Frederick, Md., in place of J. A. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Joseph E. Hisley to be postmaster at Fort Howard, Md. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Willard H. Howell to be postmaster at Wrentham, Mass., in place of H. A. Cowell, resigned.

W. C. Arthur Herbert to be postmaster at West Warren, Mass., in place of J. F. O'Leary, resigned.

Otis J. A. Dionne to be postmaster at Walpole, Mass., in place of Daniel A. Donnelly, resigned.

Wesley G. Rose to be postmaster at South Deerfield, Mass., in place of Luther W. Clark, resigned.

William E. Chaffin to be postmaster at Scituate, Mass., in place of Patrick Curran, resigned.

Andrew J. Maguire to be postmaster at Randolph, Mass., in place of Joseph J. McMahon, resigned.

Frederic W. Brown to be postmaster at North Scituate, Mass., in place of Dennis T. Shea, resigned.

Albert F. Newell to be postmaster at Holden, Mass., in place of W. B. Loring, resigned.

John McGrath to be postmaster at Amesbury, Mass., in place of John McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

James T. Wheelan to be postmaster at Ashburnham, Mass., in place of J. T. Wheelan. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John T. Dolan to be postmaster at Avon, Mass., in place of J. T. Dolan. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Daniel M. O'Leary to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, Mass., in place of D. M. O'Leary. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John J. Downey to be postmaster at Blackstone, Mass., in place of J. J. Downey. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John F. Shea to be postmaster at Bondsville, Mass., in place of J. F. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

James J. Gorman to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Mass., in place of J. J. Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

Edward Gilmore to be postmaster at Brockton, Mass., in place of Edward Gilmore. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Richard A. Cronan to be postmaster at Chicopee, Mass., in place of R. A. Cronan. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Daniel J. Driscoll to be postmaster at Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of D. J. Driscoll. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

J. Wentworth Earle to be postmaster at Cohasset, Mass., in place of J. W. Earle. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

George W. Jones to be postmaster at Falmouth, Mass., in place of G. W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John R. Smith to be postmaster at Fitchburg, Mass., in place of J. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Bernard F. Callahan to be postmaster at Franklin, Mass., in place of B. F. Callahan. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Charles D. Smith to be postmaster at Gloucester, Mass., in place of C. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Nicholas J. Lawler to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mass., in place of N. J. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Thomas F. Donahue, jr., to be postmaster at Groton, Mass., in place of T. F. Donahue, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

J. Francis Megley to be postmaster at Holbrook, Mass., in place of J. F. Megley. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Edward F. Dannahy to be postmaster at Holliston, Mass., in place of E. F. Dannahy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

George P. Sheldon to be postmaster at Hopedale, Mass., in place of G. P. Sheldon. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

Joseph F. Lapine to be postmaster at Hudson, Mass., in place of J. F. Lapine. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Edward E. Hoxie to be postmaster at Lee, Mass., in place of E. E. Hoxie. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Frank A. Foster to be postmaster at Manchester, Mass., in place of F. A. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Edward M. Bent to be postmaster at Medfield, Mass., in place of E. M. Bent. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

Bernard Campbell to be postmaster at Millville, Mass., in place of Bernard Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Frederick J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Monson, Mass., in place of F. J. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles D. Streeter to be postmaster at Mount Hermon, Mass., in place of C. D. Streeter. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

George L. Olivier to be postmaster at New Bedford, Mass., in place of G. L. Olivier. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Michael O. Haggerty to be postmaster at North Adams, Mass., in place of M. O. Haggerty. Incumbent's commission expired October 12, 1918.

Willie S. Smith to be postmaster at Onset, Mass., in place of W. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Alonzo W. Jones to be postmaster at Orleans, Mass., in place of A. W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Frank E. Gibbs to be postmaster at Petersham, Mass., in place of F. E. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Aloysius B. Kennedy to be postmaster at Rochdale, Mass., in place of A. B. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Joseph Metras to be postmaster at Southbridge, Mass., in place of Joseph Metras. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1918.

Maurice Williams to be postmaster at South Easton, Mass., in place of Maurice Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Susan F. Twiss to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Mass., in place of S. F. Twiss. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Benjamin P. Edwards to be postmaster at Topsfield, Mass., in place of B. P. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas G. O'Connell to be postmaster at Wakefield, Mass., in place of T. G. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

James T. Hennessy to be postmaster at Wareham, Mass., in place of J. T. Hennessy. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Thomas F. Hederman to be postmaster at Webster, Mass., in place of T. F. Hederman. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William B. Mahoney to be postmaster at Westfield, Mass., in place of W. B. Mahoney. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Maynard N. Wetherell to be postmaster at Chartley, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Margaret E. Lindsey to be postmaster at Fort Andrews, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Patrick R. Mullany to be postmaster at Hatfield, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John T. King to be postmaster at Ashland, Mass., in place of J. T. King. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

MICHIGAN.

Bert R. Miller to be postmaster at Vulcan, Mich., in place of Patrick Kearns. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1919.

Adelbert L. Stebbins to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mich., in place of A. E. Stebbins, resigned.

Eddy W. Fleming to be postmaster at Rose City, Mich., in place of I. M. Hammond, resigned.

Sadie Wheeler to be postmaster at Manton, Mich., in place of I. C. Wheeler, deceased.

Clara E. Benedict to be postmaster at Lawrence, Mich., in place of A. C. Benedict, deceased.

Henry C. Hemingsen to be postmaster at Grant, Mich., in place of William Dowing, resigned.

Mary E. Chadwick to be postmaster at Frankfort, Mich., in place of M. J. Hoppock, deceased.

James I. Galbraith to be postmaster at Croswell, Mich., in place of A. R. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1918.

Jennie McMinn to be postmaster at Bessemer, Mich., in place of Levi S. Rice, removed.

Arthur G. Creevy to be postmaster at Barryton, Mich., in place of C. L. Farwell, resigned.

Norman E. Weston to be postmaster at Kent City, Mich., in place of J. A. Saur, resigned.

Ira E. Bush to be postmaster at Ontonagon, Mich., in place of G. H. Gauthier, declined.

John Anderson to be postmaster at Gwinn, Mich., in place of M. J. Campbell, resigned.

Willard R. Noyes to be postmaster at Albion, Mich., in place of W. R. Noyes. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Claud E. Firestone to be postmaster at Allegan, Mich., in place of C. E. Firestone. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Vincent P. Cash to be postmaster at Alma, Mich., in place of V. P. Cash. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1918.

Horatio J. Abbott to be postmaster at Ann Arbor, Mich., in place of H. G. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Albert E. Millet to be postmaster at Armada, Mich., in place of A. E. Millett. Incumbent's commission expired October 9, 1918.

Fred W. Hild to be postmaster at Baraga, Mich., in place of F. W. Hild. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Edward Austin to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Mich., in place of Edward Austin. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Angus M. Miller to be postmaster at Bay City, Mich., in place of A. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

William A. Atyeo to be postmaster at Belleville, Mich., in place of W. A. Atyeo. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Jacob C. Rough to be postmaster at Buchanan, Mich., in place of J. C. Rough. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1918.

Frederick J. Kruger to be postmaster at Centerville, Mich., in place of F. J. Kruger. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Myron E. Miller to be postmaster at Charlotte, Mich., in place of M. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Patrick H. Schannenk to be postmaster at Chassell, Mich., in place of P. H. Schannenk. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

John Noll to be postmaster at Cheboygan, Mich., in place of J. Noll. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Vernon E. Johnstone to be postmaster at Chesaning, Mich., in place of V. E. Johnstone. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

James J. Jones to be postmaster at Clio, Mich., in place of J. J. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Ward J. Kelly to be postmaster at Crystal Falls, Mich., in place of W. J. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John Dunham to be postmaster at Daggett, Mich., in place of J. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Judson E. Richardson to be postmaster at Evart, Mich., in place of J. E. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Ellis T. Jermin to be postmaster at Ewen, Mich., in place of E. T. Jermin. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Peter Van Lopik to be postmaster at Grand Haven, Mich., in place of P. Van Lopik. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles E. Hogadone to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, Mich., in place of C. E. Hogadone. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Patrick Garvey to be postmaster at Hemlock, Mich., in place of P. Garvey. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

James J. Byers to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of J. J. Byers. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

William O'Riley to be postmaster at Hudson, Mich., in place of W. O'Riley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Edward G. Scott to be postmaster at Iron River, Mich., in place of E. G. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert M. Smith to be postmaster at Kearsarge, Mich., in place of R. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Salem F. Kennedy to be postmaster at Lakeview, Mich., in place of S. F. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Irwell Brody to be postmaster at Lawton, Mich., in place of I. Brody. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Charlie W. Beier to be postmaster at Lenox, Mich., in place of C. W. Beier. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Earl Hunter to be postmaster at Lowell, Mich., in place of E. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Mark Boyd to be postmaster at McBain, Mich., in place of M. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Clyde O. Barrett to be postmaster at Mackinaw, Mich., in place of C. O. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

William G. Howard to be postmaster at Marion, Mich., in place of W. G. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

James C. Beckwith to be postmaster at Marshall, Mich., in place of J. C. Beckwith. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Sidney E. Younglove to be postmaster at Monroe, Mich., in place of S. E. Younglove. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Duncan D. Stewart to be postmaster at Munising, Mich., in place of D. D. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1918.

Benjamin G. Oosterbaan to be postmaster at Muskegon, Mich., in place of B. G. Oosterbaan. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Merton N. Wolcott to be postmaster at North Adams, Mich., in place of M. N. Wolcott. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Will L. Tinham to be postmaster at Northville, Mich., in place of W. L. Tinham. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

William E. Murphy to be postmaster at Pinckney, Mich., in place of W. E. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Arthur L. Francis to be postmaster at Portland, Mich., in place of A. L. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles A. Lahser to be postmaster at Redford, Mich., in place of C. A. Lahser. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles Davidson to be postmaster at Richmond, Mich., in place of C. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Henry J. Klee to be postmaster at Rogers, Mich., in place of H. J. Klee. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1918.

Thomas H. Sawher to be postmaster at St. Clair, Mich., in place of T. H. Sawher. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

William H. Van Consant to be postmaster at St. Johns, Mich., in place of W. H. Van Consant. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Julius C. Armbruster to be postmaster at Sebewaing, Mich., in place of J. C. Armbruster. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Samuel McClellan to be postmaster at Springport, Mich., in place of S. McClellan. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Leo L. Johnson to be postmaster at Union City, Mich., in place of L. L. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John C. Downing to be postmaster at Vermontville, Mich., in place of J. C. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John B. Murphy to be postmaster at Wayne, Mich., in place of J. B. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

James Fraser to be postmaster at Webberville, Mich., in place of J. Fraser. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

John D. Burgess to be postmaster at West Branch, Mich., in place of J. D. Burgess. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Malcome D. McPhee to be postmaster at Wolverine, Mich., in place of M. D. McPhee. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John F. McInerney to be postmaster at Wyandotte, Mich., in place of J. F. McInerney. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

John G. Ulrich to be postmaster at Ceresco, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Fred J. Hohn to be postmaster at Frankenmuth, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

William H. S. Wood to be postmaster at Howell, Mich., in place of W. H. S. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1919.

Anna C. Kulish to be postmaster at Minden City, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

MINNESOTA.

Verge Kenison to be postmaster at Alden, Minn., in place of E. Q. Stanley, removed.

Prudence M. Crosbie to be postmaster at Brewster, Minn., in place of M. McC. Maher, resigned.

Levi M. Peterson to be postmaster at Cambridge, Minn., in place of Emanuel Yngve, removed.

Millie Berkman to be postmaster at Chisholm, Minn., in place of D. J. Harrington, removed.

Theresa E. Thoreson to be postmaster at East Grand Forks, Minn., in place of E. A. Buckley, resigned.

Eliza O'Hara to be postmaster at Fairfax, Minn., in place of M. D. Brown, resigned.

William P. Cody to be postmaster at Graceville, Minn., in place of James Sammon, removed.

Horace B. Lyon to be postmaster at Hinckley, Minn., in place of J. J. Folsom, resigned.

Carl F. Peterson to be postmaster at Kennedy, Minn., in place of John A. Estlund, resigned.

William P. Marston, jr., to be postmaster at Lake Crystal, Minn., in place of Elliott A. Upson, resigned.

Michael J. Rowan to be postmaster at Lakeville, Minn., in place of William F. Roche, resigned.

Alfred E. Haskell to be postmaster at Maple Plain, Minn., in place of Robert M. Mills, resigned.

Albert J. Rynda to be postmaster at New Prague, Minn., in place of James J. Remes, removed.

Henry E. Day to be postmaster at Raymond, Minn., in place of Denis J. McMahon, resigned.

Emily F. Peake to be postmaster at Remer, Minn., in place of Walter L. O'Neill, resigned.

Theodore C. Radde to be postmaster at Truman, Minn., in place of James D. Griggs, resigned.

Martin A. H. Taggatz to be postmaster at Winthrop, Minn., in place of Jacob Scherer, resigned.

Charles F. Cook to be postmaster at Austin, Minn., in place of C. F. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Agnes H. Christenson to be postmaster at Beardsley, Minn., in place of A. H. Christenson. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1918.

Joseph Haggett to be postmaster at Bird Island, Minn., in place of J. Haggett. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Eugene N. Smith to be postmaster at Blackduck, Minn., in place of E. N. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Frank Plotts to be postmaster at Blooming Prairie, Minn., in place of F. Plotts. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Henry P. Dunn to be postmaster at Brainerd, Minn., in place of H. P. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Sophus A. Nebel to be postmaster at Braham, Minn., in place of S. A. Nebel. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

James Adlard to be postmaster at Brown Valley, Minn., in place of J. Adlard. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Frank L. Gorenflo to be postmaster at Cass Lake, Minn., in place of F. L. Gorenflo. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles W. Mobeck to be postmaster at Center City, Minn., in place of C. W. Mobeck. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Egbert J. Sutherland to be postmaster at Chatfield, Minn., in place of E. J. Sutherland. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles E. Seeley to be postmaster at Coleraine, Minn., in place of C. E. Seeley. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

William Reid to be postmaster at Deer Wood, Minn., in place of William Reid. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Fred H. Baldwin to be postmaster at Edgerton, Minn., in place of F. H. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

George W. Owens to be postmaster at Elmore, Minn., in place of G. W. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Knute Nelson to be postmaster at Fertile, Minn., in place of Knute Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Judge D. Whaley to be postmaster at Fosston, Minn., in place of J. D. Whaley. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

James J. Daly to be postmaster at Frazee, Minn., in place of J. J. Daley. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Frank X. Eickmann to be postmaster at Glencoe, Minn., in place of F. X. Eickmann. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Clarence O. Madson to be postmaster at Halstad, Minn., in place of C. O. Madson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Nels J. Thysell to be postmaster at Hawley, Minn., in place of N. J. Thysell. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

John Wicker to be postmaster at Hayfield, Minn., in place of John Wicker. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Samuel G. Anderson, jr., to be postmaster at Hutchinson, Minn., in place of S. G. Anderson, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

William H. Nevin to be postmaster at Ivanhoe, Minn., in place of W. H. Nevin. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

James H. Parker to be postmaster at Kasson, Minn., in place of J. H. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John B. Hughes to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of J. B. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Martin J. O'Laughlin to be postmaster at Lake City, Minn., in place of M. J. O'Laughlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Angebret T. Vigen to be postmaster at Lake Park, Minn., in place of A. T. Vigen. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Jacob Gish to be postmaster at Le Sueur, Minn., in place of Jacob Gish. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John Butler to be postmaster at Lesueur Center, Minn., in place of John Butler. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

Mads W. Jensen to be postmaster at McIntosh, Minn., in place of M. W. Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Patrick B. Jude to be postmaster at Maple Lake, Minn., in place of P. B. Jude. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

James McGinn to be postmaster at Minneota, Minn., in place of James McGinn. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Isaac I. Bargen to be postmaster at Mountain Lake, Minn., in place of I. I. Bargen. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Alvin A. Ogren to be postmaster at New London, Minn., in place of A. A. Ogren. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Andrew Rotegard to be postmaster at New Richland, Minn., in place of Andrew Rotegard. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Frederick Pfaender to be postmaster at New Ulm, Minn., in place of F. Pfaender. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Thomas Zeien to be postmaster at North Branch, Minn., in place of T. Zeien. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Charles S. Dougherty to be postmaster at Northfield, Minn., in place of C. S. Dougherty. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Olger P. Oseth to be postmaster at Oslo, Minn., in place of O. P. Oseth. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

George Neumann to be postmaster at Osseo, Minn., in place of G. Neumann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Charles R. Frazee to be postmaster at Pelican Rapids, Minn., in place of C. R. Frazee. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Patrick McCabe to be postmaster at Proctor, Minn., in place of P. McCabe. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

John L. Harwick to be postmaster at Rochester, Minn., in place of J. L. Harwick. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Anthony J. Malmquist to be postmaster at Rushmore, Minn., in place of A. J. Malmquist. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Patrick H. Grogan to be postmaster at St. James, Minn., in place of P. H. Grogan. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

John Morgan to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, Minn., in place of J. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Chauncey W. Bulen to be postmaster at Walnut Grove, Minn., in place of C. W. Bulen. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

John F. McDonnell to be postmaster at Waverly, Minn., in place of J. F. McDonnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

John L. Sammons to be postmaster at Westbrook, Minn., in place of J. L. Sammons. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Oswald C. Brunius to be postmaster at Carver, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John I. Nasett to be postmaster at Robbinsdale, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

F. Verne Langdon to be postmaster at St. Louis Park, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edwin L. Gove to be postmaster at Madelia, Minn., in place of E. L. Gove. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

George C. Hompe to be postmaster at Deer Creek, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

MISSISSIPPI.

James W. Ashcraft to be postmaster at Charleston, Miss., in place of C. S. Summers, resigned.

William R. Flanagan to be postmaster at Collins, Miss., in place of Benjamin F. Lott, resigned.

Finley B. Hewes to be postmaster at Gulfport, Miss., in place of Newton D. Goodwin, removed.

Alfred F. Cook to be postmaster at Leakesville, Miss., in place of Thomas A. Chapman, resigned.

David H. Landrum to be postmaster at Leland, Miss., in place of John A. Collier, resigned.

Patricia Dougherty to be postmaster at Tunica, Miss., in place of Charlie P. Wadley, removed.

Minnie S. Sudduth to be postmaster at Mount Olive, Miss., in place of F. Fairly, resigned.

Joseph E. Saucier to be postmaster at Bay St. Louis, Miss., in place of J. E. Saucier. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

George C. Jackson to be postmaster at Belzoni, Miss., in place of G. C. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Susette E. McAlpin to be postmaster at Bolton, Miss., in place of S. E. McAlpin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Willie Herring to be postmaster at Bude, Miss., in place of W. Herring. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

James T. Skelton to be postmaster at Goodman, Miss., in place of J. T. Skelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Edgar G. Harris to be postmaster at Laurel, Miss., in place of E. G. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Benjamin R. Trotter to be postmaster at Lucedale, Miss., in place of B. R. Trotter. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

William W. Robertson to be postmaster at McComb, Miss., in place of W. W. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Richard H. Coke to be postmaster at Mendenhall, Miss., in place of R. H. Coke. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Nannie Stuart to be postmaster at Morton, Miss., in place of N. Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Hattie McLeod to be postmaster at Moss Point, Miss., in place of H. McLeod. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Lewis M. McClure to be postmaster at Ocean Springs, Miss., in place of L. M. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Virginia B. Duckworth to be postmaster at Prentiss, Miss., in place of V. B. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Thomas W. Cooper to be postmaster at Purvis, Miss., in place of T. W. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Rose Walley to be postmaster at Richton, Miss., in place of R. Walley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Lallie H. Humphreys to be postmaster at Greenwood, Miss., in place of L. H. Humphreys. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1918.

Frank L. Ratliff to be postmaster at Shaw, Miss., in place of F. L. Ratliff. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Daniel R. Johnson to be postmaster at University, Miss., in place of D. R. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Joseph T. Farrar to be postmaster at Anguilla, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

McCreight Dansby to be postmaster at Decatur, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Louise M. Quarles to be postmaster at Minter City, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Walter E. Dreaden to be postmaster at Lambert, Miss., in place of W. E. Dreaden. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Pink H. Morrison to be postmaster at Heidelberg, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

John V. Therrell to be postmaster at Florence, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

MISSOURI.

Grover C. Meineke to be postmaster at Essex, Mo., in place of Grady C. Darby, resigned.

Frank P. Engleman to be postmaster at Greenfield, Mo., in place of William R. Bowles, deceased.

Anna L. Davis to be postmaster at Kearney, Mo., in place of J. C. Hall, resigned.

Allen D. Osenbaugh to be postmaster at Kirksville, Mo., in place of Thomas E. Graves, deceased.

Antoinette Sullivan to be postmaster at Lamonte, Mo., in place of George D. Reavis, resigned.

Ernest A. Wilson to be postmaster at Liberal, Mo., in place of William De Lissa, resigned.

William A. Black to be postmaster at Mansfield, Mo., in place of James Coday, removed.

Joseph Kuehls to be postmaster at Odessa, Mo., in place of Eugene M. Goodwin, resigned.

Don B. Martin to be postmaster at Oregon, Mo., in place of Hugh G. Harsha, resigned.

DeWitt C. Leonard to be postmaster at Ozark, Mo., in place of Charles E. Reid, resigned.

George C. Orchard to be postmaster at Poplar Bluff, Mo., in place of Henry Macom, removed.

Tobie J. Thomure to be postmaster at St. Marys, Mo., in place of James J. Davis, jr., resigned.

Thomas J. Davis to be postmaster at Tarkio, Mo., in place of Earl J. Wright, resigned.

Thomas H. E. Mathis to be postmaster at Ava, Mo., in place of John H. Orr, resigned.

Frances J. Smith to be postmaster at Blue Springs, Mo., in place of Almae C. Hall, resigned.

Roy E. Wilson to be postmaster at Bolchow, Mo., in place of George W. Bedford, resigned.

Ed L. Reed to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Mo., in place of Gideon B. Hart, resigned.

Cleo J. Burch to be postmaster at Brookfield, Mo., in place of Thomas M. Bresnehen, resigned.

Mary L. Shackleford to be postmaster at Bunceton, Mo., in place of Louis O. Nelson, resigned.

Harvey E. Averill to be postmaster at Caruthersville, Mo., in place of William H. Wilks, removed.

Leonidas J. Hall to be postmaster at Columbia, Mo., in place of J. H. Guitar, removed.

Viola J. Moore to be postmaster at Corder, Mo., in place of Ernest M. Moore, resigned.

Ibe C. Walker to be postmaster at Cuba, Mo., in place of Louie C. Mattox, resigned.

Benjamin F. Carney to be postmaster at Crane, Mo., in place of Willis Wiley, resigned.

Delmer Pool to be postmaster at East Prairie, Mo., in place of A. S. J. Martin, resigned.

Andrew L. Davidson to be postmaster at Senath, Mo., in place of R. W. Tucker, resigned.

Gedney D. Hart to be postmaster at Warsaw, Mo., in place of Oliver Davis, declined.

Lulu R. Conway to be postmaster at Union, Mo., in place of J. G. Moutier, resigned.

John A. Cooper to be postmaster at Trenton, Mo., in place of W. E. Austin, resigned.

Leonidas W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of L. W. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

George H. King to be postmaster at Birch Tree, Mo., in place of G. H. King. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Robert W. Corum to be postmaster at Boonville, Mo., in place of R. W. Corum. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1918.

Samuel T. Breckenridge to be postmaster at Bosworth, Mo., in place of S. T. Breckenridge. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Jefferson B. Robertson to be postmaster at Brunswick, Mo., in place of J. B. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

George P. Hicks to be postmaster at Callao, Mo., in place of G. P. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Edward F. Layne to be postmaster at Center, Mo., in place of E. F. Layne. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Francis M. Traughber to be postmaster at Centralia, Mo., in place of F. M. Traughber. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John H. Taylor to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Mo., in place of J. H. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Dow S. Pollard to be postmaster at Cowgill, Mo., in place of D. S. Pollard. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

David F. Willm to be postmaster at Crystal City, Mo., in place of D. F. Willm. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

George T. Barker to be postmaster at Everton, Mo., in place of G. T. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Joseph B. Smith to be postmaster at Farmington, Mo., in place of J. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Floyd E. Watson to be postmaster at Green City, Mo., in place of F. E. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Tinsley Brown to be postmaster at Hamilton, Mo., in place of Tinsley Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

John R. Blackwood to be postmaster at Hannibal, Mo., in place of J. R. Blackwood. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

James H. Campbell to be postmaster at Higginsville, Mo., in place of J. H. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Frank D. Ball to be postmaster at Holden, Mo., in place of F. D. Ball. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William H. Farris to be postmaster at Houston, Mo., in place of W. H. Farris. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William A. Crow to be postmaster at Humansville, Mo., in place of W. A. Crow. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

William T. Dameron to be postmaster at Huntsville, Mo., in place of W. T. Dameron. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

George C. Bean to be postmaster at Illmo, Mo., in place of G. C. Bean. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Robert K. Wilson to be postmaster at Jackson, Mo., in place of R. K. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

J. Thomas Fisher to be postmaster at Jefferson City, Mo., in place of J. T. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Hickman J. Wigginton to be postmaster at Linneus, Mo., in place of H. J. Wigginton. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John V. Bumbarger to be postmaster at Memphis, Mo., in place of J. V. Bumbarger. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

James R. Lowell to be postmaster at Moberly, Mo., in place of J. R. Lowell. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

William J. Rouse to be postmaster at Monroe City, Mo., in place of W. J. Rouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Orville M. Headlee to be postmaster at Morehouse, Mo., in place of O. M. Headlee. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

James T. Dearmont to be postmaster at Mound City, Mo., in place of J. T. Dearmont. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John E. Cherry to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Mo., in place of J. E. Cherry. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Joel J. Thom to be postmaster at Neosho, Mo., in place of J. J. Thom. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1918.

Edward Smyth to be postmaster at New Hampton, Mo., in place of E. Smyth. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Harrell Johnson to be postmaster at New Madrid, Mo., in place of H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Nesbert W. Lemasters to be postmaster at Oak Grove, Mo., in place of N. W. Lemasters. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

William H. Alexander to be postmaster at Paris, Mo., in place of W. H. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Grover C. Gresham to be postmaster at Parkville, Mo., in place of G. C. Gresham. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Martin B. Yates to be postmaster at Pattonsburg, Mo., in place of M. B. Yates. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Albert R. Alexander to be postmaster at Plattsburg, Mo., in place of A. R. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Edgar R. Idol to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Mo., in place of E. R. Idol. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Samuel J. Jamison to be postmaster at Rich Hill, Mo., in place of S. J. Jamison. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Charles A. Stoner to be postmaster at Ridgeway, Mo., in place of C. A. Stoner. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Louis P. Kern to be postmaster at St. Genevieve, Mo., in place of L. P. Kern. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Robert L. Hamilton to be postmaster at Salisbury, Mo., in place of R. L. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William S. Dray to be postmaster at Savannah, Mo., in place of W. S. Dray. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Francis A. Howard to be postmaster at Slater, Mo., in place of F. A. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edwin Reavis to be postmaster at Sweet Springs, Mo., in place of E. Reavis. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Peter J. Weber, to be postmaster at Tipton, Mo., in place of P. J. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Curry B. Ellis to be postmaster at Vandalia, Mo., in place of C. B. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired August 15, 1917.

Albert E. Michie to be postmaster at Webb City, Mo., in place of A. E. Michie. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frederick Blattner to be postmaster at Wellsville, Mo., in place of F. Blattner. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Will H. Zorn to be postmaster at Westplains, Mo., in place of W. H. Zorn. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Rolla N. Owsley to be postmaster at Windsor, Mo., in place of R. N. Owsley. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Alva S. Wells to be postmaster at Wyaconda, Mo., in place of A. S. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Albert G. Whited to be postmaster at Goodman, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Richard A. Strickler to be postmaster at Wellintgon, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edson C. Utter to be postmaster at Westboro, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Bennett Wardlow to be postmaster at Lancaster, Mo., in place of B. Wardlow. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John Tappmeyer to be postmaster at Owensville, Mo., in place of J. Tappmeyer. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John W. Davis to be postmaster at Platte City, Mo., in place of J. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Thomas C. Bassore to be postmaster at Rogersville, Mo., in place of T. C. Bassore. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Patrick H. Kidwell to be postmaster at Versailles, Mo., in place of P. H. Kidwell. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Julius H. Stegen to be postmaster at Wright City, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Thomas L. Winston to be postmaster at Lilbourn, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

James E. Kinkead to be postmaster at Fornfelt, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Leonard P. Albers to be postmaster at Florissant, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

MONTANA.

Joseph D. Filcher to be postmaster at Boulder, Mont., in place of John T. Murphy, resigned.

Rose Mae Obershaw to be postmaster at Cascade, Mont., in place of Leroy W. Obershaw, deceased.

Ruth C. McClure to be postmaster at Culbertson, Mont., in place of K. O. Slette, resigned.

Earl M. Davis to be postmaster at Cut Bank, Mont., in place of Stephen J. Rigney, resigned.

Harry S. Tressel to be postmaster at Geraldine, Mont., in place of George E. Shawler, resigned.

Frank A. Gummer to be postmaster at Gildford, Mont., in place of J. T. Casey, resigned.

L. Blanche Dawson to be postmaster at Polson, Mont., in place of W. H. B. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired September 1, 1917.

William L. Marsh to be postmaster at Roy, Mont., in place of Frederick A. Barney, deceased.

Homer F. Cox to be postmaster at Shelby, Mont., in place of Dan Sullivan, resigned.

James H. Hadzor to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mont., in place of B. L. Golden, resigned.

Reginald W. Spangler to be postmaster at Superior, Mont., in place of Harriet R. Hord, resigned.

Agnes M. Lloyd to be postmaster at Walkerville, Mont., in place of John H. Suydam, resigned.

Lucy B. Cullen to be postmaster at Wibaux, Mont., in place of Thomas H. Rush, removed.

William L. Bruce to be postmaster at Musselshell, Mont., in place of B. O. Dean, resigned.

Emma McPherson to be postmaster at Ekalaka, Mont., in place of J. H. Booth, resigned.

Thomas H. Morse, jr., to be postmaster at Drummond, Mont., in place of M. E. Turrell, resigned.

David J. Kane to be postmaster at East Helena, Mont., in place of D. J. Kane. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Patrick J. Conway to be postmaster at Fromberg, Mont., in place of P. J. Conway. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Presley L. Herring to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mont., in place of P. L. Herring. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William C. Bernard to be postmaster at Harlem, Mont., in place of W. C. Bernard. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Lucile D. Knight to be postmaster at Twin Bridges, Mont., in place of L. D. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

James H. Hines to be postmaster at Valier, Mont., in place of J. H. Hines. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ephraim E. Hackett to be postmaster at Victor, Mont., in place of E. E. Hackett. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles M. Hanson to be postmaster at Wolfe Point, Mont., in place of C. M. Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Harry Kennedy to be postmaster at Rosebud, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Jennie Bywaters to be postmaster at Sandcoulee, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

NEBRASKA.

Ethel K. Thompson to be postmaster at Alma, Nebr., in place of Harry C. Furse, resigned.

Edward C. Lane to be postmaster at Dalton, Nebr., in place of J. C. Frandsen, resigned.

Nellie M. Thayer to be postmaster at Bertrand, Nebr., in place of C. E. Hendrix, resigned.

Eva R. Gilbert to be postmaster at Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Haver Bruner, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alfred O. Hastings to be postmaster at Chester, Nebr., in place of D. J. Howard, deceased.

Ethel Talcott to be postmaster at Crofton, Nebr., in place of H. D. West, resigned.

Otto A. Steinkraus to be postmaster at Dodge, Nebr., in place of Wm. C. Brodhun, removed.

Lewis A. Wight to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of H. J. Dunkin, resigned.

Charles McCray to be postmaster at Merriman, Nebr., in place of V. L. Green, resigned.

William A. Bartlett to be postmaster at Ord, Nebr., in place of H. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Linneus A. Olinger to be postmaster at Overton, Nebr., in place of F. C. Cooney, resigned.

Seth W. Oleson to be postmaster at St. Paul, Nebr., in place of J. J. Sazama, resigned.

Dollie W. Hyndshaw to be postmaster at Thedford, Nebr., in place of E. H. Hines, resigned.

Stephen D. Phillips to be postmaster at Albion, Nebr., in place of S. D. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1918.

Robert Graham to be postmaster at Alliance, Nebr., in place of R. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

John Menary to be postmaster at Arnold, Nebr., in place of J. Menary. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John R. McCann to be postmaster at Beatrice, Nebr., in place of J. R. McCann. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Sebastian E. Marty to be postmaster at Columbus, Nebr., in place of S. E. Marty. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles E. Lewin to be postmaster at Comstock, Nebr., in place of C. E. Lewin. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

William H. Latham to be postmaster at Curtis, Nebr., in place of W. H. Latham. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Russell Mooberry to be postmaster at Dorchester, Nebr., in place of R. Mooberry. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Edward P. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Elm Creek, Nebr., in place of E. P. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

William Sweeney to be postmaster at Emerson, Nebr., in place of W. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Alfred G. Corey to be postmaster at Fairfield, Nebr., in place of A. G. Corey. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Charles M. Rebbeck to be postmaster at Gordon, Nebr., in place of C. M. Rebbeck. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Dellmond A. Geil to be postmaster at Grand Island, Nebr., in place of D. A. Geil. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John S. Myers to be postmaster at Grant, Nebr., in place of J. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Daniel A. Page to be postmaster at Hardy, Nebr., in place of D. A. Page. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Tilford A. Willmore to be postmaster at Hebron, Nebr., in place of T. A. Willmore. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John Kinsella to be postmaster at Hemingford, Nebr., in place of J. Kinsella. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Fanny Dworak to be postmaster at Howell, Nebr., in place of F. Dworak. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ralph L. Duckworth to be postmaster at Indianola, Nebr., in place of R. L. Duckworth. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

William L. Zalman to be postmaster at Lawrence, Nebr., in place of W. L. Zalman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Jacob W. White to be postmaster at Meadow Grove, Nebr., in place of J. W. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Robert F. Pate to be postmaster at Minden, Nebr., in place of R. F. Pate. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

George W. Ewing to be postmaster at Nelson, Nebr., in place G. W. Ewing. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Frederick A. Mellberg to be postmaster at Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of F. A. Mellberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

William R. Pease to be postmaster at Niobrara, Nebr., in place of W. R. Pease. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

George P. Miller to be postmaster at Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Archer E. Ovenden to be postmaster at Pawnee City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Ovenden. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Mark W. Murray to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of M. W. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Frank Howard to be postmaster at Ravenna, Nebr., in place of F. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Nils Lindskog to be postmaster at Pilger, Nebr., in place of N. Lindskog. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Holton C. Letson to be postmaster at Red Cloud, Nebr., in place of H. C. Letson. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Fred W. Mathews to be postmaster at Rising City, Nebr., in place of F. W. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

George D. Thomas to be postmaster at Seward, Nebr., in place of G. D. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

John Conroy to be postmaster at Shelton, Nebr., in place of J. Conroy. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Edward P. Griess to be postmaster at Sutton, Nebr., in place of E. P. Griess. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1918.

Jarrett W. Ragan to be postmaster at Utica, Nebr., in place of J. W. Ragan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

William H. Harstick to be postmaster at Westpoint, Nebr., in place of W. H. Harstick. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Charles M. Beggs to be postmaster at Carleton, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Marguerite A. Riley to be postmaster at Dawson, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Cora D. Barlow to be postmaster at Lodgepole, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1917.

Anna J. Strahl to be postmaster at Ralston, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Isham R. Darnell to be postmaster at Benkelman, Nebr., in place of I. R. Darnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John A. Cocklin to be postmaster at Milford, Nebr., in place of J. A. Cocklin. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

NEVADA.

James D. Wallace to be postmaster at Ely, Nev., in place of G. P. Annand, resigned.

Ella C. Currie to be postmaster at Gardnerville, Nev., in place of R. W. Gale, resigned.

James H. Causten to be postmaster at Lovelocks, Nev., in place of W. C. Ruddell, jr., resigned.

Charles E. Southworth to be postmaster at Manhattan, Nev., in place of T. D. Rogers, resigned.

George T. Nugent to be postmaster at Yerington, Nev., in place of L. S. Howe, declined.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Henry A. Browne to be postmaster at Farmington, N. H., in place of F. R. Marston, resigned.

Jesse C. Parker to be postmaster at Hillsboro, N. H., in place of F. E. Merrill, resigned.

William H. Drew to be postmaster at Intervale, N. H., in place of F. W. Dinsmore, resigned.

Harriet O. Harriman to be postmaster at Jackson, N. H., in place of M. C. Harriman, deceased.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. H., in place of C. L. Bemis. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Andrew D. Davis to be postmaster at North Conway, N. H., in place of A. D. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Enoch F. Stevens to be postmaster at Raymond, N. H., in place of E. F. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

John N. Grimes to be postmaster at Troy, N. H., in place of J. N. Grimes. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Nellie A. Card to be postmaster at New Castle, N. H. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Otis F. Sumner to be postmaster at Goffstown, N. H., in place of O. F. Sumner. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

NEW JERSEY.

Ellen E. Showell to be postmaster at Absecon, N. J., in place of T. D. Showell, resigned.

Alfred Christie to be postmaster at Bergenfield, N. J., in place of George Breisacher, resigned.

Theodore A. Bishop to be postmaster at Carteret, N. J., in place of Valentine Gleckner, resigned.

John Jenkins to be postmaster at Delanco, N. J., in place of A. E. Shaw, resigned.

Sadie P. Miller to be postmaster at Netcong, N. J., in place of W. M. Miller, deceased.

William B. Lance to be postmaster at Stanhope, N. J., in place of G. C. Valentine, deceased.

Hunn Livingston to be postmaster at Allentown, N. J., in place of H. Livingston. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Maude V. Richer to be postmaster at Audubon, N. J., in place of M. V. Richer. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

James D. Magee to be postmaster at Bordentown, N. J., in place of J. D. Magee. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Milas W. Hargrove to be postmaster at Browns Mills (late Brown Mills), N. J., in place of M. W. Hargrove. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Joseph L. Hammell to be postmaster at Burlington, N. J., in place of J. L. Hammell. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Walter S. Terrell to be postmaster at Chatham, N. J., in place of W. S. Terrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles E. Crane to be postmaster at Clayton, N. J., in place of C. E. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edward W. Walker to be postmaster at Cranbury, N. J., in place of E. W. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Abraham C. Hulsizer to be postmaster at Flemington, N. J., in place of A. C. Hulsizer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Carl L. Richter to be postmaster at Fort Lee, N. J., in place of C. L. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired August 9, 1918.

Bayard C. Stavely to be postmaster at Haddonfield, N. J., in place of B. C. Stavely. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Louis F. Langham to be postmaster at Hammonton, N. J., in place of L. J. Langham. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

James C. H. Sherwood to be postmaster at Hohokus, N. J., in place of J. C. H. Sherwood. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Matthias C. Ely to be postmaster at Jersey City, N. J., in place of Matt. Ely. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Arabella C. Broander to be postmaster at Keansburg, N. J., in place of A. C. Broander. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Marcellus Parker to be postmaster at Manasquan, N. J., in place of Marcellus Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Charles C. Stewart to be postmaster at Mays Landing, N. J., in place of C. C. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Frank McMurtry to be postmaster at Mendham, N. J., in place of Frank McMurtry. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Edward W. Townsend to be postmaster at Montclair, N. J., in place of E. W. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Francis H. Reed to be postmaster at Mount Holly, N. J., in place of F. H. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

George N. Harris to be postmaster at Newton, N. J., in place of G. N. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

Alexander H. Sibbald to be postmaster at Park Ridge, N. J., in place of A. H. Sibbald. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

James F. Beardsley to be postmaster at Pompton Lakes, N. J., in place of J. F. Beardsley. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1915.

Isaac Klein to be postmaster at Salem, N. J., in place of Isaac Klein. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

James W. Rea to be postmaster at South Amboy, N. J., in place of J. W. Rea. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

George W. Baldwin to be postmaster at Summit, N. J., in place of G. W. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Robert L. DeCamp to be postmaster at Westfield, N. J., in place of R. L. DeCamp. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

James D. Carpenter to be postmaster at Woodbury, N. J., in place of J. D. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John A. Smith to be postmaster at Wrightstown, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alonzo P. Green to be postmaster at Chester, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William Fehrs to be postmaster at Little Ferry, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Gustav H. Rottgardt to be postmaster at Montvale, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Jennie Madden to be postmaster at Tuckahoe, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Addison Robbins, jr., to be postmaster at Hightstown, N. J., in place of A. Robbins, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Carl Shurts to be postmaster at Lebanon, N. J., in place of C. Shurts. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Fred P. Crater to be postmaster at Gladstone, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

NEW MEXICO.

Belle B. Sellars to be postmaster at Cloudcroft, N. Mex., in place of Olive Jones, resigned.

Frank J. Zengerle to be postmaster at Socorro, N. Mex., in place of A. C. Torres, resigned.

George U. McCrary to be postmaster at Artesia, N. Mex., in place of G. U. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

George Hoffmann to be postmaster at Belen, N. Mex., in place of George Hoffmann. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Louis L. Burkhead to be postmaster at Columbus, N. Mex., in place of L. L. Burkhead. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Harriet C. Butler to be postmaster at Farmington, N. Mex., in place of H. C. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles M. Samford to be postmaster at Hagerman, N. Mex., in place of C. M. Samford. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Bliss Freeman to be postmaster at Las Cruces, N. Mex., in place of Bliss Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Martin Q. Hardin to be postmaster at Lordsburg, N. Mex., in place of M. Q. Hardin. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1918.

James L. Seligman to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in place of J. L. Seligman. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

NEW YORK.

Edgar E. Costello to be postmaster at Corinth, N. Y., in place of J. J. Cunningham, resigned.

Allen K. Johnson to be postmaster at Eden, N. Y., in place of Abram Lang, resigned.

William H. Chillson, jr., to be postmaster at Hannibal, N. Y., in place of A. B. Byrne, resigned.

William C. De Witt to be postmaster at Kingston, N. Y., in place of S. R. Deyo, deceased.

Henry F. Blessing to be postmaster at Pawling, N. Y., in place of J. P. Kiernan, deceased.

George H. Miller to be postmaster at Pittsford, N. Y., in place of George Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1918.

Charles C. Michener to be postmaster at Silver Bay, N. Y., in place of A. B. Adams, resigned.

Lottie M. Barker to be postmaster at Spencerport, N. Y., in place of A. G. Colby, resigned.

Almon T. Clarke, jr., to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, N. Y., in place of D. P. Hayes, resigned.

Elizabeth C. Harrington to be postmaster at Wilson, N. Y., in place of J. M. Hackett, resigned.

Ada J. Folsom to be postmaster at Winthrop, N. Y., in place of J. M. McCarthy, resigned.

James J. Fleming to be postmaster at Yonkers, N. Y., in place of M. J. Walsh, resigned.

Joseph G. Cole to be postmaster at Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of C. A. Wilkins. Incumbent's commission expired November 17, 1917.

Percy J. Heimburg to be postmaster at Angola, N. Y., in place of E. A. Lemmler, resigned.

Michael J. Manton to be postmaster at Sayville, N. Y., in place of M. J. Manton. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

William F. Britt to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, N. Y., in place of W. F. Britt. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

August S. Hughes to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of A. S. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Wellman L. Bates to be postmaster at Sherman, N. Y., in place of W. L. Bates. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Frank A. Bartley to be postmaster at Sidney, N. Y., in place of F. A. Bartley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William H. Hennessey to be postmaster at Skaneateles, N. Y., in place of W. H. Hennessey. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Patrick Halloran to be postmaster at Sparkill, N. Y., in place of Patrick Halloran. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Andrew J. Fitzpatrick to be postmaster at Springville, N. Y., in place of A. J. Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

John W. Hamilton to be postmaster at Stillwater, N. Y., in place of J. W. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

James R. Comesky to be postmaster at Suffern, N. Y., in place of J. R. Comesky. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Elbridge J. Stratton to be postmaster at Theresa, N. Y., in place of E. J. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

John G. Gibson to be postmaster at Utica, N. Y., in place of J. G. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Barton L. Piper to be postmaster at Watkins, N. Y., in place of B. L. Piper. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1917.

Maynard A. Thompson to be postmaster at Waverly, N. Y., in place of M. A. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Charles E. Whitman to be postmaster at Weedsport, N. Y., in place of C. E. Whitman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Bessie M. Wyvell to be postmaster at Wellsville, N. Y., in place of B. M. Wyvell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Thomas Smith to be postmaster at West Winfield, N. Y., in place of Thomas Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Effie L. Patten to be postmaster at Whitesboro, N. Y., in place of E. L. Patten. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Louis P. Snyder to be postmaster at Williamsville, N. Y., in place of L. P. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

George A. Manwarren to be postmaster at Windsor, N. Y., in place of G. A. Manwarren. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Allen S. Brower to be postmaster at Woodmere, N. Y., in place of A. S. Brower. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles L. Goodell to be postmaster at Worcester, N. Y., in place of C. L. Goodell. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Roy J. Paxon to be postmaster at Akron, N. Y., in place of R. J. Paxon. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Archie S. Gould to be postmaster at Alfred, N. Y., in place of A. S. Gould. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Edward J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Amenia, N. Y., in place of E. J. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Francis Larkin to be postmaster at Ossining, N. Y., in place of Francis Larkin. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Charles R. Flanly to be postmaster at Babylon, N. Y., in place of C. R. Flanly. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Charles Miller to be postmaster at Baldwin, N. Y., in place of Charles Miller. Incumbent's commission expired July 26, 1917.

Willard H. Tappan to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of W. H. Tappan. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Frank P. Bagg to be postmaster at Barneveld, N. Y., in place of F. P. Bagg. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

John H. Mara to be postmatser at Beacon, N. Y., in place of J. H. Mara. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

Margaret D. Cochrane to be postmaster at Bedford, N. Y., in place of M. D. Cochrane. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Fancher M. Hopkins to be postmaster at Binghampton, N. Y., in place of F. M. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Henry J. Vollmar to be postmaster at Boonville, N. Y., in place of H. J. Vollmar. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Maud Rogers to be postmaster at Bridgehampton, N. Y., in place of Maud Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

William H. Fox to be postmaster at Brocton, N. Y., in place of W. H. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Charles F. Bergner to be postmaster at Callicoon, N. Y., in place of C. F. Bergner. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

James R. Mapes to be postmaster at Canaseraga, N. Y., in place of J. R. Mapes. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

James H. Reagan to be postmaster at Chadwicks, N. Y., in place of J. H. Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

William J. Ferrick to be postmaster at Chappaqua, N. Y., in place of W. J. Ferrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Almond Cramer to be postmaster at Cherry Valley, N. Y., in place of Almond Cramer. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Fred J. Land to be postmaster at Cohocton, N. Y., in place of F. J. Land. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1918.

William M. Heaney to be postmaster at Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y., in place of W. M. Heaney. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edgar H. Jolliffe to be postmaster at Congers, N. Y., in place of E. H. Jolliffe. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

John J. Heneher to be postmaster at Cornwall, N. Y., in place of J. J. Heneher. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Maurice F. Axtell to be postmaster at Deposit, N. Y., in place of M. F. Axtell. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Harry E. Savage to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Y., in place of H. E. Savage. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

Byron E. Ogden to be postmaster at Dolgeville, N. Y., in place of B. E. Ogden. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Thomas P. Whalen to be postmaster at Dover Plains, N. Y., in place of T. P. Whalen. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

George Taylor to be postmaster at Arkport, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Theodore M. Larsen to be postmaster at Dundee, N. Y., in place of T. M. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Michael J. Spillane to be postmaster at East Syracuse, N. Y., in place of M. J. Spillane. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Albert E. Helmer to be postmaster at Evans Mills, N. Y., in place of A. E. Helmer. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Francis M. Dowd to be postmaster at Faust, N. Y., in place of F. M. Dowd. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John P. Dugan to be postmaster at Fishkill, N. Y., in place of J. P. Dugan. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

James J. Smith to be postmaster at Fleischmanns, N. Y., in place of J. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

James H. Joy to be postmaster at Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of J. H. Joy. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Walter W. O'Connor to be postmaster at Fort Plain, N. Y., in place of W. W. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Thomas J. Courtney to be postmaster at Garden City, N. Y., in place of T. J. Courtney. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edward T. Cole to be postmaster at Garrison, N. Y., in place of E. T. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

John A. Neafsey to be postmaster at Glen Cove, N. Y., in place of J. A. Neafsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Charles Fitzpatrick to be postmaster at Goshen, N. Y., in place of Charles Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Asher C. Stafford to be postmaster at Gowanda, N. Y., in place of A. C. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

David J. McHenry to be postmaster at Granville, N. Y., in place of D. J. McHenry. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1918.

William Johnson to be postmaster at Groveland Station, N. Y., in place of William Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

John W. Salisbury to be postmaster at Hamburg, N. Y., in place of J. W. Salisbury. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

George F. Brunner to be postmaster at Harrison, N. Y., in place of G. F. Brunner. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles Hogan to be postmaster at Harrisville, N. Y., in place of Charles Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

James R. Mayne to be postmaster at Heuvelton, N. Y., in place of J. R. Mayne. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Cort Kramer to be postmaster at Holland, N. Y., in place of Cort Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Frank K. Roberts to be postmaster at Holland Patent, N. Y., in place of F. K. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John E. Barlow to be postmaster at Horseheads, N. Y., in place of J. E. Barlow. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Melvin W. Billings to be postmaster at Hurleyville, N. Y., in place of M. W. Billings. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Daniel F. Shea to be postmaster at Jamaica, N. Y., in place of D. F. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Eugene E. Mann to be postmaster at Jordan, N. Y., in place of E. E. Mann. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Jean L. Reed to be postmaster at Little Valley, N. Y., in place of J. L. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

James W. Kelly to be postmaster at Long Island City, N. Y., in place of J. W. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired October 13, 1918.

John W. Telford to be postmaster at Margaretville, N. Y., in place of J. W. Telford. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John T. Kopp to be postmaster at Martinsville, N. Y., in place of J. T. Kopp. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Wickham R. Gildersleeve to be postmaster at Mattituck, N. Y., in place of W. R. Gildersleeve. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles E. White to be postmaster at Middleburg, N. Y., in place of C. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Thomas P. Hammond to be postmaster at Middleport, N. Y., in place of T. P. Hammond. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Kent Barney to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of Kent Barney. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Elmer W. Simmons to be postmaster at Millerton, N. Y., in place of E. W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

William McNeal to be postmaster at Montgomery, N. Y., in place of William McNeal. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles E. Miller to be postmaster at Moravia, N. Y., in place of C. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Edward A. Gross to be postmaster at New City, N. Y., in place of E. A. Gross. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John A. Ganey to be postmaster at New Hartford, N. Y., in place of J. A. Ganey. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Robert J. Healey to be postmaster at New York Mills, N. Y., in place of R. J. Healey. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Augustus A. Blackledge to be postmaster at Nyack, N. Y., in place of A. A. Blackledge. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

James O. Murphy to be postmaster at Orchard Park, N. Y., in place of J. O. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

Glenn F. Pollard to be postmaster at Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of G. F. Pollard. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Jerome Ceperley to be postmaster at Otego, N. Y., in place of Jerome Ceperley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Jesse Jacobs to be postmaster at Oxford, N. Y., in place of Jesse Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Thomas H. O'Keefe to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, N. Y., in place of T. H. O'Keefe. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1919.

John S. Moran to be postmaster at Painted Post, N. Y., in place of J. S. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John H. Quinlan to be postmaster at Pavilion, N. Y., in place of J. H. Quinlan. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Willard Vosburgh to be postmaster at Port Byron, N. Y., in place of Willard Vosburgh. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Leverne Thomas to be postmaster at Prattsburg, N. Y., in place of Leverne Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Fred L. Seager to be postmaster at Randolph, N. Y., in place of F. L. Seager. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William T. Welden to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, N. Y., in place of W. T. Welden. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Len R. Francis to be postmaster at Ripley, N. Y., in place of L. R. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Charles M. Marnes to be postmaster at Rouses Point, N. Y., in place of C. M. Marnes. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1918.

Maurice H. Fanning to be postmaster at Roxbury, N. Y., in place of M. H. Fanning. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John H. Hurley to be postmaster at Rushville, N. Y., in place of J. H. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

William T. Vaughn to be postmaster at Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of W. T. Vaughn. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

George Q. Johnson to be postmaster at Ardsley, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edward W. Harrica to be postmaster at Lyon Mountain, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John W. McKnight to be postmaster at Castleton, N. Y., in place of J. W. McKnight. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

S. Jackson Fuller to be postmaster at Cattaraugus, N. Y., in place of S. J. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Gregory Dillon to be postmaster at New Rochelle, N. Y., in place of G. Dillon. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

John T. Gallagher to be postmaster at Witherbee, N. Y., in place of J. T. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Mortimer H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Aulander, N. C., in place of J. L. Harrington, removed.

John E. Brown to be postmaster at Boone, N. C., in place of M. P. Critcher, resigned.

William E. Elmore to be postmaster at Bryson City, N. C., in place of W. A. Gibson, deceased.

Albert W. Colwell to be postmaster at Clinton, N. C., in place of R. G. Morisey, deceased.

Thomas S. Booth to be postmaster at East Durham, N. C., in place of E. H. Avent, deceased.

Clarence B. Daniels to be postmaster at Faison, N. C., in place of C. H. Peirce, resigned.

Royall D. Jones to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. C., in place of J. B. Underwood, deceased.

Charles W. Bagby to be postmaster at Hickory, N. C., in place of J. H. Aiken, deceased.

Arthur G. Walton to be postmaster at Jacksonville, N. C., in place of J. B. Petteway, resigned.

William M. Hanner to be postmaster at Liberty, N. C., in place of J. M. Smith, resigned.

Robert T. Wade to be postmaster at Morehead City, N. C., in place of W. L. Arendell, deceased.

Benjamin F. Dalton to be postmaster at Rutherfordton, N. C., in place of M. H. Jones, resigned.

William M. Henry to be postmaster at Brevard, N. C., in place of W. M. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Manly W. Cranford to be postmaster at Davidson, N. C., in place of M. W. Cranford. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Samuel Y. Bryson to be postmaster at Hendersonville, N. C., in place of S. Y. Bryson. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1918.

Thomas C. Frisbee to be postmaster at Hot Springs, N. C., in place of T. C. Frisbee. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Rosse D. Edgerton to be postmaster at Kenly, N. C., in place of R. D. Edgerton. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Cyrus L. Linville to be postmaster at Kernersville, N. C., in place of C. L. Linville. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Benjamin A. Summerlin to be postmaster at Mount Olive, N. C., in place of B. A. Summerlin. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Lacy F. Clark to be postmaster at Raeford, N. C., in place of L. F. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Bartholomew M. Gatling to be postmaster at Raleigh, N. C., in place of B. M. Gatling. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Stephen L. Ross to be postmaster at Robersonville, N. C., in place of S. L. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Joseph B. Cullipher to be postmaster at Saluda, N. C., in place of J. B. Cullipher. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William J. Roberts to be postmaster at Shelby, N. C., in place of W. J. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert V. Brawley to be postmaster at Statesville, N. C., in place of R. V. Brawley. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

N. Henry Moore to be postmaster at Washington, N. C., in place of N. H. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

David T. Clark to be postmaster at Weldon, N. C., in place of D. T. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Millard F. Hales to be postmaster at Wendell, N. C., in place of M. F. Hales. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Junius Bridger to be postmaster at Windsor, N. C., in place of J. Bridger. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Charlie F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Winton, N. C., in place of C. F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Sophie H. Adams to be postmaster at Four Oaks, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Lonnie E. Stevens to be postmaster at Benson, N. C., in place of L. E. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William M. Goodson to be postmaster at Marion, N. C., in place of W. M. Goodson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Thomas J. Orr to be postmaster at Matthews, N. C., in place of T. J. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Walter S. Thomas to be postmaster at Rockingham, N. C., in place of W. S. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Archibald H. Boyden to be postmaster at Salisbury, N. C., in place of A. H. Boyden. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

St. Elmo Pearce to be postmaster at Youngsville, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Thomas L. Smith to be postmaster at Stoneville, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Minnie S. Abelein to be postmaster at Anamoore, N. Dak., in place of Peter Hengel, deceased.

Jessie J. Davy to be postmaster at Antler, N. Dak., in place of G. E. Dumont, resigned.

Evan S. Brown to be postmaster at Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of H. E. Brown, resigned.

Mabel Nelson to be postmaster at Cando, N. Dak., in place of John McPike, resigned.

Emeline A. Milde to be postmaster at Douglas, N. Dak., in place of G. M. Eng, resigned.

Hugh H. Parsons to be postmaster at Fessenden, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Darcy, resigned.

Ole B. Johnson to be postmaster at Forman, N. Dak., in place of Frank Argersinger, resigned.

Thomas G. Kellington to be postmaster at New Rockford, N. Dak., in place of Walter Priest, removed.

Bernice R. Pottorf to be postmaster at Plaza, N. Dak., in place of A. O. Dahl, resigned.

Helen D. Thompson to be postmaster at Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of J. F. McMenamy, resigned.

Martin L. Vick to be postmaster at Sheyenne, N. Dak., in place of Iver K. Vick, deceased.

Mabel E. Otis to be postmaster at Wildrose, N. Dak., in place of H. E. Stoskoff, resigned.

Michael J. Gurnett to be postmaster at Balfour, N. Dak., in place of M. J. Gurnett. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert B. Stewart to be postmaster at Bottineau, N. Dak., in place of R. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Robert J. Moore to be postmaster at Drayton, N. Dak., in place of R. J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

James A. Foley to be postmaster at Grafton, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Foley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Walter P. Osborne to be postmaster at Hunter, N. Dak., in place of W. P. Osborne. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Henrietta Rooks to be postmaster at Linton, N. Dak., in place of H. Rooks. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Charles S. Ego to be postmaster at Lisbon, N. Dak., in place of C. S. Ego. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Nettie A. Isham to be postmaster at Manning, N. Dak., in place of N. A. Isham. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Samuel Loe to be postmaster at Northwood, N. Dak., in place of S. Loe. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Patrick H. Long to be postmaster at Page, N. Dak., in place of P. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

Henry W. O'Dell to be postmaster at Reeder, N. Dak., in place of H. W. O'Dell. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Franklin E. Ellickson to be postmaster at Regent, N. Dak., in place of F. E. Ellickson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Alexander R. Thompson to be postmaster at Rolla, N. Dak., in place of A. R. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Albert A. J. Lang to be postmaster at Sanborn, N. Dak., in place of A. A. J. Lang. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Carl L. George to be postmaster at Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Thomas J. McCully to be postmaster at Sheldon, N. Dak., in place of T. J. McCully. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John P. Shahane to be postmaster at Souris, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Shahane. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

William W. Smith to be postmaster at Valley City, N. Dak., in place of W. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Robert R. Zirkle to be postmaster at Westhope, N. Dak., in place of R. R. Zirkle. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Waldo Leonhardy to be postmaster at Williston, N. Dak., in place of W. Leonhardy. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Bernhard Ottis to be postmaster at Wyndmere, N. Dak., in place of B. Ottis. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Benjamin L. Fraser to be postmaster at Wales, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Percy F. Meharry to be postmaster at Starkweather, N. Dak., in place of P. F. Meharry. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Willis L. Armstrong to be postmaster at White Earth, N. Dak., in place of W. L. Armstrong. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

OHIO.

Charles A. Bower to be postmaster at Bowerston, Ohio, in place of C. D. Royer, deceased.

William O. Wallace to be postmaster at Columbiana, Ohio, in place of C. V. Calvin, resigned.

Lillie M. Neel to be postmaster at Dillonvale, Ohio, in place of C. A. Eberle, resigned.

Lonzo S. Green to be postmaster at Freeport, Ohio, in place of W. A. Zellars, resigned.

Lewis B. Shaw to be postmaster at Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of J. E. Halliday, resigned.

Thurman T. Courtright to be postmaster at Lancaster, Ohio, in place of B. F. Price. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1917.

Russell G. Hardy to be postmaster at Liberty Center, Ohio, in place of A. J. Leahy, resigned.

Charles E. Penquite to be postmaster at Mason, Ohio, in place of H. E. Bursk, resigned.

Albert Sayers to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ohio, in place of F. W. Maiberger, resigned.

Roy Goddard to be postmaster at Orwell, Ohio, in place of Aymer Nye, resigned.

Clark R. Wilson to be postmaster at Perrysville, Ohio, in place of G. B. Darling, resigned.

Richard S. Ryan to be postmaster at St. Clairsville, Ohio, in place of B. S. C. McBride, resigned.

William W. Rider to be postmaster at Spencerville, Ohio, in place of J. C. Hoch, resigned.

Rufus R. Hannahs to be postmaster at Summerfield, Ohio, in place of R. B. Osborne, resigned. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

Charles W. Miller to be postmaster at Versailles, Ohio, in place of T. W. Fahnestock, deceased.

James C. Gray to be postmaster at West Park, Ohio, in place of J. J. Gies, resigned.

George F. Parrish to be postmaster at Toledo, Ohio, in place of G. F. Parrish. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Elwyn W. Fisher to be postmaster at Sugarcreek, Ohio, in place of E. W. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Lewis K. Thompson to be postmaster at Uhrichsville, Ohio, in place of L. K. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William A. Ault to be postmaster at Wadsworth, Ohio, in place of W. A. Ault. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Adam E. Schaffer to be postmaster at Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of A. E. Schaffer. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Emil Weber to be postmaster at Wauseon, Ohio, in place of Emil Weber. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Welker Besst to be postmaster at West Lafayette, Ohio, in place of Welker Besst. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Henry B. Popps to be postmaster at West Liberty, Ohio, in place of H. B. Popps. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

James R. Alexander to be postmaster at Zanesville, Ohio, in place of J. R. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1918.

Clarence A. Corbin to be postmaster at Ashtabula, Ohio, in place of C. A. Corbin. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1919.

Wilber Winfield to be postmaster at Beach City, Ohio, in place of W. Winfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

James A. Smith to be postmaster at Belle Center, Ohio, in place of J. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

David C. Van Voorhis to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of D. C. Van Voorhis. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Eli C. Wisman to be postmaster at Bryan, Ohio, in place of E. C. Wisman. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles F. Vollmer to be postmaster at Bucyrus, Ohio, in place of C. F. Vollmer. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Samuel A. Kinnear to be postmaster at Columbus, Ohio, in place of S. A. Kinnear. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1918.

Charles A. Lamberson to be postmaster at Coshocton, Ohio, in place of C. A. Lamberson. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John F. Bauer to be postmaster at Crestline, Ohio, in place of J. F. Bauer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Herman A. Spangler to be postmaster at Defiance, Ohio, in place of H. A. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Alexander J. Shenk to be postmaster at Delphos, Ohio, in place of A. J. Shenk. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

John S. Gossett to be postmaster at Dennison, Ohio, in place of J. S. Gossett. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Dennis W. Seward to be postmaster at Elyria, Ohio, in place of D. W. Seward. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

James G. Bell to be postmaster at Frankfort, Ohio, in place of J. G. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Carroll R. Jackson to be postmaster at Gambier, Ohio, in place of C. R. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Benjamin F. Reineck to be postmaster at Gibsonburg, Ohio, in place of B. F. Reineck. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Edward L. Hauser to be postmaster at Girard, Ohio, in place of E. L. Hauser. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

James Finlayson to be postmaster at Grafton, Ohio, in place of J. Finlayson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John H. Geach to be postmaster at Granville, Ohio, in place of J. H. Geach. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Fred M. Black to be postmaster at Greenwich, Ohio, in place of F. M. Black. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Grover C. H. Hipp to be postmaster at Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of G. C. H. Hipp. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Jacob E. Mercer to be postmaster at Hicksville, Ohio, in place of J. E. Mercer. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

John E. Robbins to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of J. E. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

James E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Lima, Ohio, in place of J. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Peter J. Bencler to be postmaster at Louisville, Ohio, in place of P. J. Bencler. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Levi E. Bierer to be postmaster at McComb, Ohio, in place of L. E. Bierer. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Robert T. Spratt to be postmaster at Malvern, Ohio, in place of R. T. Spratt. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Harry C. Brown to be postmaster at Manchester, Ohio, in place of H. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Fred M. Bushnell to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ohio, in place of F. M. Bushnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Joseph E. Blackford to be postmaster at Martins Ferry, Ohio, in place of J. E. Blackford. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Mary K. Long to be postmaster at Medina, Ohio, in place of M. K. Long. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

William Alexander to be postmaster at Miamisburg, Ohio, in place of William Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Roscoe V. White to be postmaster at Middlefield, Ohio, in place of R. V. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Louis N. Gerber to be postmaster at Middleport, Ohio, in place of L. N. Gerber. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert E. Sickinger to be postmaster at Milan, Ohio, in place of R. E. Sickinger. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

Jesse O. Shaw to be postmaster at Newcomerstown, Ohio, in place of J. O. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Francis N. Cary to be postmaster at New Richmond, Ohio, in place of F. N. Cary. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

Henry Becker, jr., to be postmaster at New Washington, Ohio, in place of Henry Becker, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Harry A. Flinn to be postmaster at Orrville, Ohio, in place of H. A. Flinn. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Frank Miller to be postmaster at Paulding, Ohio, in place of Frank Miller. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Eugene C. Chapman to be postmaster at Plain City, Ohio, in place of E. C. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Ira A. Deeter to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Ohio, in place of I. A. Deeter. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Hiram J. Blackmore to be postmaster at Pomeroy, Ohio, in place of H. J. Blackmore. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Frank J. Mitchell to be postmaster at Port Clinton, Ohio, in place of F. J. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Andrew H. Austin to be postmaster at Ravenna, Ohio, in place of A. H. Austin. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Roy E. Faber to be postmaster at Rittman, Ohio, in place of R. E. Faber. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

James A. Ryan to be postmaster at Sandusky, Ohio, in place of J. A. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

George O. Canaga to be postmaster at Scio, Ohio, in place of G. O. Canaga. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Fred F. Taylor to be postmaster at Seville, Ohio, in place of F. F. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Frank C. Schiffer to be postmaster at Shelby, Ohio, in place of F. C. Schiffer. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1918.

Val Lee to be postmaster at Sidney, Ohio, in place of Val Lee. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1918.

Arthur M. Eidson to be postmaster at Cygnet, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William J. Deibel to be postmaster at Doylestown, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Lucius W. Carruthers to be postmaster at Groveport, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Bronson O. Brott to be postmaster at South Euclid, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Merril J. Humphrey to be postmaster at Tiro, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Anna M. Tesi to be postmaster at Yorkville, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mary June Zimmerman to be postmaster at Harrison, Ohio, in place of Mary June Dick. Name changed by marriage.

Horace E. McConnell to be postmaster at Milford Center, Ohio, in place of H. E. McConnell. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

William E. Warren to be postmaster at Leetonia, Ohio, in place of W. E. Warren. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1918.

Danus D. Granger to be postmaster at New London, Ohio, in place of D. D. Granger. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

James S. Handshy to be postmaster at Frazeysburg, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Julius C. E. Jacot to be postmaster at Apple Creek, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

OKLAHOMA.

Starrett C. Burnett to be postmaster at Allen, Okla., in place of I. E. Strickland, removed.

Samuel H. Starkey to be postmaster at Altus, Okla., in place of J. N. Kimberlin. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1917.

Albert E. Howell to be postmaster at Avant, Okla., in place of D. A. Callen, resigned.

Essyl B. Logan to be postmaster at Calvin, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William J. Pointer to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of W. J. Strange, resigned.

Bernard H. Buchanan to be postmaster at Collinsville, Okla., in place of E. V. Schrimsher, resigned.

Grace E. Wandell to be postmaster at Coyle, Okla., in place of J. A. Pfalzgraf, resigned.

Seth M. Hufstedler to be postmaster at Dewar, Okla., in place of H. E. Malone, removed.

Orville Knight to be postmaster at Drumright, Okla., in place of H. S. Blair, resigned.

Clyde C. Cantrell to be postmaster at Haskell, Okla., in place of T. J. Way, resigned.

Douglas Allen to be postmaster at Lehigh, Okla., in place of M. F. Landon, removed.

Judith L. Black to be postmaster at Marietta, Okla., in place of L. B. Smith, resigned.

Preston R. Calvert to be postmaster at Pawnee, Okla., in place of J. E. McCutchan, resigned.

James C. Williamson to be postmaster at Quinton, Okla., in place of M. E. Didlake, resigned.

William H. Maxey to be postmaster at Randlett, Okla., in place of B. F. Suter, resigned.

Erasmus A. Ingle to be postmaster at Soper, Okla., in place of L. W. Hicks, resigned. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

Luther E. Brown to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla., in place of T. J. Brown, resigned.

George H. Montgomery to be postmaster at Valliant, Okla., in place of W. E. Watkins, resigned.

John W. McCracken to be postmaster at Nowata, Okla., in place of Hattie Gore, resigned.

T. Lee Hopson to be postmaster at Ardmore, Okla., in place of C. L. Byrne, resigned.

John D. Pugh to be postmaster at Anadarko, Okla., in place of J. D. Pugh. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Calvin R. Lockhart to be postmaster at Dustin, Okla., in place of C. R. Lockhart. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Lucian B. Sneed to be postmaster at Guymon, Okla., in place of L. B. Sneed. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

John B. Pope to be postmaster at Heavener, Okla., in place of J. B. Pope. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William B. Pickett to be postmaster at Hinton, Okla., in place of W. B. Pickett. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

David G. Woodworth to be postmaster at Kingfisher, Okla., in place of D. G. Woodworth. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

Walter J. Stevens to be postmaster at Lexington, Okla., in place of W. J. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edgar R. Christopher to be postmaster at Lone Wolf, Okla., in place of E. R. Christopher. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Preston S. Lester to be postmaster at McAlester, Okla., in place of P. S. Lester. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Charles L. Williams to be postmaster at Maysville, Okla., in place of C. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Jacob M. Casper to be postmaster at Okeene, Okla., in place of J. M. Casper. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1918.

Claude Weaver to be postmaster at Oklahoma, Okla., in place of C. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Phillip H. Dalby to be postmaster at Ramona, Okla., in place of P. H. Dalby. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Robert A. Lackey to be postmaster at Roosevelt, Okla., in place of R. A. Lackey. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John H. Meler to be postmaster at Sentinel, Okla., in place of J. H. Meler. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Charles D. Snider to be postmaster at Waurika, Okla., in place of C. D. Snider. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Edwin S. Gray to be postmaster at Weleetka, Okla., in place of E. S. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Edward T. Washington to be postmaster at Douthat, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Robert D. Bonham to be postmaster at Keota, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William C. Parnell to be postmaster at Meeker, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Caesar F. Simmons to be postmaster at Boley, Okla., in place of C. F. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Homer S. Chambers to be postmaster at Dilworth, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

OREGON.

Charles E. Hedge to be postmaster at Beaverton, Oreg., in place of M. E. Fitzpatrick, resigned.

Margaret Clark to be postmaster at Canyon City, Oreg., in place of C. W. Brown, resigned.

Henry A. Ball to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Oreg., in place of J. C. Lamkin, resigned.

Charles A. White to be postmaster at Lakeview, Oreg., in place of T. B. Vernon, resigned.

Richard F. Evans to be postmaster at Stanfield, Oreg., in place of E. B. Ward, resigned.

Cora Macoon to be postmaster at Warrenton, Oreg., in place of G. C. Barlow, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles R. Tyler to be postmaster at Yamhill, Oreg., in place of Guy W. Brace, declined.

Claiborne H. Stewart to be postmaster at Albany, Oreg., in place of C. H. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Lovie R. Watt to be postmaster at Amity, Oreg., in place of L. R. Watt. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Edward J. Kaiser to be postmaster at Ashland, Oreg., in place of E. J. Kaiser. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Charles O. Henry to be postmaster at Athena, Oreg., in place of C. O. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Diana Snyder to be postmaster at Aurora, Oreg., in place of D. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

John P. Cooley to be postmaster at Brownsville, Oreg., in place of J. P. Cooley. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Robert Blumenstein to be postmaster at Elgin, Oreg., in place of R. Blumenstein. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edward L. Campbell to be postmaster at Eugene, Oreg., in place of E. L. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John W. Hughes to be postmaster at Fossil, Oreg., in place of J. W. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Mary T. Mangold to be postmaster at Gervais, Oreg., in place of M. T. Mangold. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William C. Wilson to be postmaster at Joseph, Oreg., in place of W. C. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William R. Cook to be postmaster at Madras, Oreg., in place of W. R. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Gaphart D. Ebner to be postmaster at Mount Angel, Oreg., in place of G. D. Ebner. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Walter R. Hamer to be postmaster at Newport, Oreg., in place of W. R. Hamer. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

James J. Gaither to be postmaster at Toledo, Oreg., in place of J. J. Gaither. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Albert L. Cauley to be postmaster at Fort Stevens, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Nellie Elliott to be postmaster at John Day, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George C. Mason to be postmaster at Jefferson, Oreg., in place of G. C. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Hugh P. McLain to be postmaster at Marshfield, Oreg., in place of H. P. McLain. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John B. Kean to be postmaster at Alexandria, Pa., in place of C. C. Roseborough, resigned.

Archie W. Leech to be postmaster at Beaverdale, Pa., in place of C. S. Burtnett, resigned.

Charles W. Gibbs to be postmaster at Burnham, Pa., in place of J. C. Jacobs, resigned.

Joseph J. Ellison to be postmaster at Darby, Pa., in place of G. N. Coryell, deceased.

Harry L. Edinger to be postmaster at Delaware Water Gap, Pa., in place of J. M. Wallace, resigned.

Besse M. McCauley to be postmaster at Dravosburg, Pa., in place of F. F. Sumney, resigned.

Pearl C. Zittle to be postmaster at East Downingtown, Pa., in place of L. A. Moore, resigned.

Guy L. Horn to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Pa., in place of K. A. McLain, removed.

John N. Sharpsteen to be postmaster at Honesdale, Pa., in place of R. M. Stocker, deceased.

Abner I. Hartman to be postmaster at Lebanon, Pa., in place of W. E. Schaak, resigned.

Elmer D. Buckey to be postmaster at Littlestown, Pa., in place of C. P. Gettier, resigned.

Esther J. Johnson to be postmaster at Madera, Pa., in place of J. A. Shoff, resigned.

Tillie U. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Midway, Pa., in place of G. H. Powelson, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Anthony L. Brautegam to be postmaster at Monessen, Pa., in place of Edmond Jeffries, removed.

Hazel F. Bush to be postmaster at New Florence, Pa., in place of R. S. Wagner, resigned.

Mariquitta M. Smelker to be postmaster at Newton Hamilton, Pa., in place of J. M. Smelker, deceased.

Nancy T. Newland to be postmaster at Orbisonia, Pa., in place of M. E. Taylor, deceased.

Alfred A. Ziegenfus to be postmaster at Palmerton, Pa., in place of W. H. Gruber, deceased.

George B. Wilcox to be postmaster at Portland, Pa., in place of Howard Ott. Office became presidential January 1, 1918.

Harry E. Barndt to be postmaster at Sellersville, Pa., in place of A. S. Magargal. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1918.

Raymond K. Zechman to be postmaster at Sinking Springs, Pa., in place of M. D. Zechman, deceased.

Frank B. Whoolery to be postmaster at Smithfield, Pa., in place of F. P. Moates, resigned.

Delos M. Graham to be postmaster at Starjunction, Pa., in place of J. W. Keffer, resigned.

Frank W. Engle to be postmaster at Tidioute, Pa., in place of F. A. Shaw, resigned.

Michael J. Fleming to be postmaster at Tremont, Pa., in place of L. W. Kopp, removed.

Charles F. Wenrich to be postmaster at Wernersville, Pa., in place of M. H. Gundy, resigned.

Clarence L. Kamerer to be postmaster at West Newton, Pa., in place of F. E. Obley, resigned.

Susanna S. Hartman to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of J. H. Smith, removed.

William F. Burr to be postmaster at Zelienople, Pa., in place of C. J. D. Strohecker, resigned.

Emma Claughsey to be postmaster at East Brady, Pa., in place of H. W. Faloon, deceased.

Leslie C. Lockerman to be postmaster at Cheswick, Pa., in place of L. C. Lockerman. Office became presidential February 4, 1919.

James W. Ailsin to be postmaster at Christiana, Pa., in place of J. W. Ailsin. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Adam F. Hess to be postmaster at Clarion, Pa., in place of A. F. Hess. Office became presidential August 25, 1918.

Lewis J. Lieb to be postmaster at Colver, Pa., in place of L. J. Lieb. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Edmund J. Rafferty to be postmaster at Conshohocken, Pa., in place of E. J. Rafferty. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John T. Butler to be postmaster at Coraopolis, Pa., in place of J. T. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Josephine R. Callan to be postmaster at Cresson, Pa., in place of J. R. Callan. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles L. Fox to be postmaster at Daisytown, Pa., in place of C. L. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

William A. Irwin to be postmaster at Downingtown, Pa., in place of W. A. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

B. Stiles Duncan to be postmaster at Duncannon, Pa., in place of B. S. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Edward M. Dailey to be postmaster at Dushore, Pa., in place of E. M. Dailey. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Horace Lehr to be postmaster at Easton, Pa., in place of H. Lehr. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Albert E. Eckert to be postmaster at East Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of A. E. Eckert. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

John B. Shea to be postmaster at Eldred, Pa., in place of J. B. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Harry R. Schneitman to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of H. R. Schneitman. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Walter K. Ashton to be postmaster at Fairchance, Pa., in place of W. K. Ashton. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Henry G. Schleiter to be postmaster at Freedom, Pa., in place of H. G. Schleiter. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1918.

Harry K. McCulloch to be postmaster at Freeport, Pa., in place of H. K. McCulloch. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Charles B. Duff to be postmaster at Ford City, Pa., in place of C. B. Duff. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Thomas P. McCormick to be postmaster at Forest City, Pa., in place of T. P. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edward E. Fricker to be postmaster at Glenside, Pa., in place of E. E. Fricker. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Lawrence B. Rowley to be postmaster at Greenville, Pa., in place of L. B. Rowley. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

William W. Van Eman to be postmaster at Grove City, Pa., in place of W. W. Van Eman. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Daniel E. Hanrahan to be postmaster at Hallstead, Pa., in place of D. E. Hanrahan. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Daniel R. Dunkel to be postmaster at Hamburg, Pa., in place of D. R. Dunkel. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Peter V. Abel to be postmaster at Hastings, Pa., in place of P. V. Abel. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

James F. Drake to be postmaster at Hawley, Pa., in place of J. F. Drake. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William A. Kessler to be postmaster at Homestead, Pa., in place of W. A. Kessler. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1919.

Richard T. Hugus to be postmaster at Jeannette, Pa., in place of R. T. Hugus. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Forrest B. Dunkle to be postmaster at Jersey Shore, Pa., in place of F. B. Dunkle. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Michael F. Lawler to be postmaster at Jessup, Pa., in place of M. F. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Charles N. Stevens to be postmaster at Knoxville, Pa., in place of C. N. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Joseph Rodgers, jr., to be postmaster at Lansdale, Pa., in place of J. Rodgers, jr. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Frank M. Longstreth to be postmaster at Lansdowne, Pa., in place of F. M. Longstreth. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Victor E. Gill to be postmaster at Latrobe, Pa., in place of V. E. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Granville F. Rehrig to be postmaster at Lehighton, Pa., in place of G. F. Rehrig. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

John A. Hughes to be postmaster at Lyndora, Pa., in place of J. A. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired September 24, 1918.

Brinslie C. Lamberson to be postmaster at McConnellsburg, Pa., in place of B. C. Lamberson. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Clarence H. Young to be postmaster at Manheim, Pa., in place of C. H. Young. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Milton M. Dougherty to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of M. M. Dougherty. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

John W. Runkle to be postmaster at Middleburg, Pa., in place of J. W. Runkle. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

James P. Van Etten to be postmaster at Milford, Pa., in place of J. P. Van Etten. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Helen G. Flanigan to be postmaster at Mill Hall, Pa., in place of H. G. Flanigan. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

Thomas E. Grady to be postmaster at Montgomery, Pa., in place of T. E. Grady. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Warren F. Harrer to be postmaster at Montoursville, Pa., in place of W. F. Harrer. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Orville W. Chase to be postmaster at Montrose, Pa., in place of O. W. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Edward H. Sutterley to be postmaster at Morrisville, Pa., in place of E. H. Sutterley. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Edward R. Benson to be postmaster at Mount Jewett, Pa., in place of E. R. Benson. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas Wood to be postmaster at Muncy, Pa., in place of T. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Peter F. Leininger to be postmaster at Myerstown, Pa., in place of P. F. Leininger. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Charles E. Knecht to be postmaster at Nazareth, Pa., in place of C. E. Knecht. Incumbent's commission expired August 3, 1918.

James J. McArdle to be postmaster at Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of J. J. McArdle. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

George W. Heffelman to be postmaster at New Cumberland, Pa., in place of G. W. Heffelman. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

Theodore E. Warner to be postmaster at New Oxford, Pa., in place of T. E. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Thomas A. Derick to be postmaster at Newville, Pa., in place of T. A. Derick. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

David M. Means to be postmaster at New Wilmington, Pa., in place of D. M. Means. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas W. Loftus to be postmaster at Archbald, Pa., in place of T. W. Loftus. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

Arthur McKean to be postmaster at Beaver Falls, Pa., in place of A. McKean. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

Clinton W. Sausser to be postmaster at Bellwood, Pa., in place of C. W. Sausser. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

William H. Hartman to be postmaster at Bentleyville, Pa., in place of W. H. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Ulysses G. Bowers to be postmaster at Big Run, Pa., in place of U. G. Bowers. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Jacob H. Maust to be postmaster at Bloomsburg, Pa., in place of J. H. Maust. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

George D. Schoenly to be postmaster at Boyertown, Pa., in place of G. D. Schoenly. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

James G. Paul to be postmaster at Bradford, Pa., in place of J. G. Paul. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

John A. Robinson to be postmaster at Brownsville, Pa., in place of J. A. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

David V. Hays to be postmaster at Burgettstown, Pa., in place of D. V. Hays. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1919.

Jacob E. Coatsworth to be postmaster at California, Pa., in place of J. E. Coatsworth. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Blythe J. Davison to be postmaster at Canton, Pa., in place of B. J. Davison. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1919.

Patrick F. Connor to be postmaster at Carbondale, Pa., in place of P. F. Connor. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

George E. Hipps to be postmaster at Carrolltown, Pa., in place of G. E. Hipps. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Thomas P. Delaney to be postmaster at Castle Shannon, Pa., in place of T. P. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

William H. Nelson to be postmaster at Chester, Pa., in place of W. H. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Thomas V. Tormey to be postmaster at Arnot, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

George H. Houck to be postmaster at Cairnbrook, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles W. Blose to be postmaster at Delmont, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mabel E. Nye to be postmaster at Enon Valley, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

David J. Bonsall to be postmaster at Grampian, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Mary L. Simons to be postmaster at Harmony, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Gertrude Griffith to be postmaster at Heilwood, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Edna E. Snably to be postmaster at Hollsopple, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Emma McNamee to be postmaster at Imperial, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

James J. Hanlon to be postmaster at Kulpmont, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles E. Dusenberry to be postmaster at Newell, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

George Althouse to be postmaster at Radnor, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Nicholas F. Barrett to be postmaster at Carnegie, Pa., in place of N. F. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Edward D. Noble to be postmaster at Claysville, Pa., in place of E. D. Noble. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Adam Wise to be postmaster at Gap, Pa., in place of Adam Wise. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

John W. Bisbee to be postmaster at Hop Bottom, Pa., in place of J. W. Bisbee. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

William A. McAdoo to be postmaster at Kittanning, Pa., in place of W. A. McAdoo. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John W. Clouse to be postmaster at Moscow, Pa., in place of J. W. Clouse. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William Leslie to be postmaster at Parkers Landing, Pa., in place of William Leslie. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

George F. Trout to be postmaster at Stewartstown, Pa., in place of G. F. Trout. Incumbent's commission expired December 31, 1918.

John P. Hines to be postmaster at Stoneboro, Pa., in place of J. P. Hines. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Joseph P. McMahon to be postmaster at Susquehanna, Pa., in place of J. P. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

James W. Keating to be postmaster at Towanda, Pa., in place of J. W. Keating. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Frank M. Davis to be postmaster at Westfield, Pa., in place of F. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Walter J. McBeth to be postmaster at Braddock, Pa., in place of W. J. McBeth. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Frances H. Diven to be postmaster at West Bridgewater, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Ray J. Crowthers to be postmaster at West Elizabeth, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Thomas Rorer to be postmaster at North Wales, Pa., in place of T. Rorer. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1918.

Clyde G. McMurray to be postmaster at Oakdale, Pa., in place of C. G. McMurray. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Nora L. Pickering to be postmaster at Peckville, Pa., in place of N. L. Pickering. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Nathaniel S. Byers to be postmaster at Perryopolis, Pa., in place of N. S. Byers. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John Kehoe to be postmaster at Pittston, Pa., in place of J. Kehoe. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Lewis Dilliner to be postmaster at Point Marion, Pa., in place of L. Dilliner. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Bartly P. McNulty to be postmaster at Ridgway, Pa., in place of B. P. McNulty. Incumbent's commission expired October 30, 1917.

William A. Ketterer to be postmaster at Rochester, Pa., in place of W. A. Ketterer. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

William A. Furlong to be postmaster at Roscoe, Pa., in place of W. A. Furlong. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John Cashman to be postmaster at St. Marys, Pa., in place of J. Cashman. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Ralph W. Simcox to be postmaster at Sandy Lake, Pa., in place of R. W. Simcox. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

William T. Benner to be postmaster at Saxton, Pa., in place of W. T. Benner. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

John J. Durkin to be postmaster at Scranton, Pa., in place of J. J. Durkin. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Origen K. Bingham to be postmaster at Slippery Rock, Pa., in place of O. K. Bingham. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Alexander B. Grof to be postmaster at Somerset, Pa., in place of A. B. Grof. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

John J. Kinney to be postmaster at South Fork, Pa., in place of J. J. Kinney. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

James W. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Springdale, Pa., in place of J. W. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Jesse S. Stambaugh to be postmaster at Spring Grove, Pa., in place of J. S. Stambaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Lewis W. Bechtel to be postmaster at Stowe, Pa., in place of L. W. Bechtel. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

John F. Johnston to be postmaster at Strasburg, Pa., in place of J. F. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

John M. Decker to be postmaster at Stroudsburg, Pa., in place of J. M. Decker. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John E. Guthrie to be postmaster at Summerville, Pa., in place of J. E. Guthrie. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1919.

Michael J. O'Connor to be postmaster at Trevorton, Pa., in place of M. J. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1918.

Allen S. Garman to be postmaster at Tyrone, Pa., in place of A. S. Garman. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Lester N. Strickler to be postmaster at Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of L. N. Strickler. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Presley G. Katz to be postmaster at Verona, Pa., in place of P. G. Katz. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Henry R. Hummel to be postmaster at Watsontown, Pa., in place of H. R. Hummel. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1918.

Milton J. Porter to be postmaster at Wayne, Pa., in place of M. J. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

John W. Warehime to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Pa., in place of J. W. Warehime. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Corbly K. Spragg to be postmaster at Waynesburg, Pa., in place of C. K. Spragg. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Otis H. Davis to be postmaster at Wellsboro, Pa., in place of O. H. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Granville L. Rettew to be postmaster at West Chester, Pa., in place of G. L. Rettew. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Jacob T. Born to be postmaster at Wilmerding, Pa., in place of J. T. Born. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Christian Henderson to be postmaster at Woodlawn, Pa., in place of C. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Jacob L. Hershey to be postmaster at Youngwood, Pa., in place of J. L. Hershey. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Helen L. Chaffee to be postmaster at Wesleyville, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Emma C. Roseboro to be postmaster at Pomeroy, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

John W. Kelly to be postmaster at Morris Run, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Lula Buffle to be postmaster at Lock No. 4, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Lillian W. Davidson to be postmaster at Carmichaels, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Nettie Beatty to be postmaster at Beatty, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

PORTO RICO.

Nicolas Ortiz Lebron to be postmaster at Aibonito, Porto Rico. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

RHODE ISLAND.

Thomas F. Lenihan to be postmaster at Westerly, R. I., in place of J. A. Farrell, deceased.

Almira G. Blake to be postmaster at Ashaway, R. I. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Ruth A. Vars to be postmaster at Bradford, R. I., in place of R. A. Vars. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

James Mangan to be postmaster at Greystone, R. I., in place of J. Mangan. Incumbent's commission expired September 23, 1918.

Hartzell R. Birch to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I., in place of A. A. Greenman, resigned.

E. W. Perry Greenman to be postmaster at Narragansett Pier, R. I., in place of E. W. P. Greenman. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

John B. Sullivan to be postmaster at Newport, R. I., in place of J. B. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Francis Fagan to be postmaster at Pascoag, R. I., in place of F. Fagan. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1919.

Thomas F. Cavanaugh to be postmaster at Woonsocket, R. I., in place of T. F. Cavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Howard A. Littlejohn to be postmaster at Belton, S. C., in place of W. C. Clinkscales, resigned.

Toliver D. Earle to be postmaster at Landrum, S. C., in place of Rufus G. Durham, resigned.

M. Zella D. Abercrombie to be postmaster at McCormick, S. C., in place of A. A. Stuart, resigned.

Josephine B. Pelzer to be postmaster at Pelzer, S. C., in place of Landrum Padgett, deceased.

Ben Harper to be postmaster at Seneca, S. C., in place of J. T. Lawrence, resigned.

Andrew P. Burgess to be postmaster at Summerton, S. C., in place of Ellison Capers, deceased.

Stella R. Nelson to be postmaster at Ridgeway, S. C., in place of Inez H. Whitlock, declined.

Charles R. Calhoun to be postmaster at Greenwood, S. C., in place of G. B. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

David H. Taylor to be postmaster at Cameron, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Estella S. Herndon to be postmaster at Eutawville, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Loka W. Rigby to be postmaster at Moncks Corner, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alva K. Lorenz to be postmaster at Aiken, S. C., in place of A. K. Lorenz. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Benjamin J. Hammet to be postmaster at Blackville, S. C., in place of B. J. Hammet. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Tolbert D. McLaurin to be postmaster at Clio, S. C., in place of T. D. McLaurin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

James A. Parler to be postmaster at Elloree, S. C., in place of J. A. Parler. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

John W. Peeples, jr., to be postmaster at Estill, S. C., in place of J. W. Peeples, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

John A. Chase to be postmaster at Florence, S. C., in place of J. A. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

T. P. McLeod to be postmaster at Hartsville, S. C., in place of T. P. McLeod. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

James H. Bodie to be postmaster at Leesville, S. C., in place of J. H. Bodie. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Frank George to be postmaster at Lexington, S. C., in place of F. George. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Clarence D. Cooper to be postmaster at Mayesville, S. C., in place of C. D. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

George B. Stackhouse to be postmaster at Mullins, S. C., in place of G. B. Stackhouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Bernard B. James to be postmaster at Union, S. C., in place of B. B. James. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

David Duncan to be postmaster at Whitmire, S. C., in place of D. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Bruce K. Arnold to be postmaster at Woodruff, S. C., in place of B. K. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expired August 1, 1917.

John W. Geraty to be postmaster at Yonges Island, S. C., in place of J. W. Geraty. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

John D. Evans to be postmaster at Alpena, S. Dak., in place of H. H. Hatch, resigned.

Leroy A. Gage to be postmaster at Bryant, S. Dak., in place of E. J. Dunn, resigned.

Arthur D. Flagg to be postmaster at Buffalo, S. Dak., in place of C. L. Brady, removed.

Marjorie A. Slemmons to be postmaster at Canistota (late Canastota), S. Dak., in place of G. C. H. Kortboth, resigned.

Herman F. Mettler to be postmaster at Colome, S. Dak., in place of C. W. Marley, resigned.

John R. Fegan to be postmaster at Edgemont, S. Dak., in place of J. W. Applegate, resigned.

Alma J. McCormack to be postmaster at Faith, S. Dak., in place of C. S. Engler, resigned.

Mabel H. Godron to be postmaster at Gary, S. Dak., in place of Julius Palmer, resigned.

Ruth M. Dahlen to be postmaster at Oldham, S. Dak., in place of C. P. Dahlen, resigned.

Clarence E. Archer to be postmaster at Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of J. T. Doyle, removed.

Charles H. West to be postmaster at Presho, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Borcherding, resigned.

Frank Morrow to be postmaster at Pukwana, S. Dak., in place of J. A. Stansky, resigned.

Rose B. Flahart to be postmaster at White Lake, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Closson, resigned.

Hiram J. Hobart to be postmaster at Woonsocket, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Hobart. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Martin M. Judge to be postmaster at Webster, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Judge. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Victor M. Dalthorp to be postmaster at Volga, S. Dak., in place of V. M. Dalthorp. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Demetrious S. Billington to be postmaster at Spearfish, S. Dak., in place of D. S. Billington. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Theodore B. Werner to be postmaster at Rapid City, S. Dak., in place of T. B. Werner. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Albert J. Johnson to be postmaster at Murdo, S. Dak., in place of A. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John T. McCullen to be postmaster at Miller, S. Dak., in place of J. T. McCullen. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

William Lowe to be postmaster at Madison, S. Dak., in place of W. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

John L. Davis to be postmaster at Letcher, S. Dak., in place of J. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Linville Miles to be postmaster at Langford, S. Dak., in place of L. Miles. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1919.

Anton Koch to be postmaster at Isabel, S. Dak., in place of A. Koch. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Patrick H. Murphy to be postmaster at Henry, S. Dak., in place of P. H. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Emma K. Biehn to be postmaster at Gregory, S. Dak., in place of E. K. Biehn. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Anthony J. Littig to be postmaster at Flandreau, S. Dak., in place of A. J. Littig. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

George F. Davis to be postmaster at Estelline, S. Dak., in place of G. F. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Edward H. White to be postmaster at Castlewood, S. Dak., in place of E. H. White. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Leslie I. Bingham to be postmaster at Bison, S. Dak., in place of L. I. Bingham. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Hattie L. Meyer to be postmaster at Florence, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Calista M. Hall to be postmaster at Harrold, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Rhoda S. Owen to be postmaster at Vienna, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Johan W. Rydell to be postmaster at Rosholt, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Lena Salomo to be postmaster at Orient, S. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

TENNESSEE.

Franklin Abernathy to be postmaster at Tracy City, Tenn., in place of W. C. Abernathy, resigned.

Alson C. Patton to be postmaster at Bells, Tenn., in place of G. W. Bell, resigned.

Fannie J. Branch to be postmaster at Colliersville, Tenn., in place of R. L. Strong, resigned.

Ulysses S. Rose to be postmaster at Crossville, Tenn., in place of W. A. Hamby, resigned.

James E. Nelms to be postmaster at Kingsport, Tenn., in place of W. D. Kyle, resigned.

James R. Jetton to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in place of M. G. Elliott, deceased.

Lucille M. Stanley to be postmaster at Tiptonville, Tenn., in place of Lucille Morris. Name changed by marriage.

Joseph W. Nichols to be postmaster at Trenton, Tenn., in place of J. W. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

George W. Phebus, jr., to be postmaster at Union City, Tenn., in place of G. W. Phebus, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

William E. Snodgrass to be postmaster at Spring City, Tenn., in place of W. E. Snodgrass. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

John L. Nowlin to be postmaster at Sparta, Tenn., in place of J. L. Nowlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Mamie E. Perkins to be postmaster at Selmer, Tenn., in place of M. E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 29, 1918.

Robert B. Schoolfield to be postmaster at Pikeville, Tenn., in place of R. B. Schoolfield. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1917.

Benjamin F. Grisham to be postmaster at Newbern, Tenn., in place of B. F. Grisham. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

William P. Chandler to be postmaster at Knoxville, Tenn., in place of W. P. Chandler. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Eugene F. Allen to be postmaster at Ashland City, Tenn., in place of E. F. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1918.

Cobey D. Carmack to be postmaster at Columbia, Tenn., in place of E. W. Carmack. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

John B. Dow to be postmaster at Cookeville, Tenn., in place of J. B. Dow. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1918.

Fred P. Darwin to be postmaster at Dayton, Tenn., in place of F. P. Darwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1919.

Johnathan L. Haynes to be postmaster at Decherd, Tenn., in place of J. L. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1918.

John T. Patten to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of J. T. Patten. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Daniel M. Brumit to be postmaster at Elizabethton, Tenn., in place of D. M. Brumit. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

George P. Atchison to be postmaster at Erin, Tenn., in place of G. P. Atchison. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Samuel W. McKinney to be postmaster at Etowah, Tenn., in place of S. W. McKinney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Thomas P. Rucker to be postmaster at Franklin, Tenn., in place of T. P. Rucker. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1918.

Kate Penn to be postmaster at Kenton, Tenn., in place of K. Penn. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Florie W. Landress to be postmaster at Signal Mountain, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hugh G. Haworth to be postmaster at New Market, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

James J. Darnell to be postmaster at Morrison, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

James M. Gresham to be postmaster at Smyrna, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Ben G. Mason to be postmaster at Prospect Station, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

George W. Bosham to be postmaster at Bethel Springs, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Gilbert A. Sipes to be postmaster at Adamsville, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

TEXAS.

Barnett N. Jarrell to be postmaster at Temple, Tex., in place of Alex Dienst, removed.

J. Philomel Cox to be postmaster at Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of E. M. Love, deceased.

Era M. Dellinger to be postmaster at Annona, Tex., in place of C. P. Giddens. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Angus G. Vick to be postmaster at Belton, Tex., in place of A. F. Ferguson, removed.

Edith M. Dudley to be postmaster at Brackettville, Tex., in place of J. R. De Witt, resigned.

Robert A. Smith to be postmaster at Carlton, Tex., in place of J. D. Stevens, resigned.

William H. Carpenter to be postmaster at Comanche, Tex., in place of F. J. Reese, removed.

Robert H. Davanay to be postmaster at Cross Plains, Tex., in place of J. H. Shackelford, resigned.

Kenneth W. Alger to be postmaster at Crystal City, Tex., in place of W. J. Smith, resigned.

Andrew B. Carder to be postmaster at Electra, Tex., in place of R. W. Riddels, resigned.

O. Waldo Williams, jr., to be postmaster at Fort Stockton, Tex., in place of Elias Barry, resigned.

Nathan E. Porter to be postmaster at Gladewater, Tex., in place of J. V. Bradley, resigned.

Vincent V. Urban to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of S. B. Boulware, removed.

Samuel L. Erwin to be postmaster at Honey Grove, Tex., in place of S. H. Gardner, resigned.

Sam H. Lane to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Tex., in place of C. A. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1918.

Crown Dickson to be postmaster at Kilgore, Tex., in place of Andrew Barton, deceased.

Charles A. Hall to be postmaster at La Porte, Tex., in place of W. T. Hall, resigned.

Oscar W. Gallman to be postmaster at Longview, Tex., in place of R. G. Brown, sr., deceased.

Roger W. Bass to be postmaster at Mart, Tex., in place of J. G. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1917.

J. Marshall Bonds to be postmaster at Morgan, Tex., in place of Will Ligon, removed.

William P. Stockton to be postmaster at Plainview, Tex., in place of B. O. Sanford, resigned.

Dandridge A. Bibb to be postmaster at Port Neches, Tex., in place of E. H. Daniel, resigned.

George A. Barnett to be postmaster at Post, Tex., in place of Mark Hardin, resigned.

Herman Beyer to be postmaster at Rosenberg, Tex., in place of S. R. Heard, resigned.

Robert H. McCormick to be postmaster at Weimar, Tex., in place of M. R. Allen, deceased.

Oswald Garrett to be postmaster at Wharton, Tex., in place of T. J. Abell, deceased.

Charles F. Butts to be postmaster at Willis, Tex., in place of Clinton Bybee, deceased.

William A. Smith to be postmaster at Gatesville, Tex., in place of W. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

John R. Folkes to be postmaster at Giddings, Tex., in place of J. R. Folkes. Incumbent's commission expired July 17, 1918.

Virgil E. Todd to be postmaster at Gilmer, Tex., in place of V. E. Todd. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John T. Cox to be postmaster at Graesbeck, Tex., in place of J. T. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

James T. Tarlton to be postmaster at Gunter, Tex., in place of J. T. Tarlton. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Dyson L. Lunn to be postmaster at Humble, Tex., in place of D. L. Lunn. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Tilman L. D. Richardson to be postmaster at Jourdanton, Tex., in place of T. L. D. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Charles T. McConnico to be postmaster at Kerens, Tex., in place of C. T. McConnico. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Mary K. Hartson to be postmaster at Kyle, Tex., in place of M. K. Hartson. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Albert H. Wolfe to be postmaster at Ladonia, Tex., in place of A. H. Wolfe. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

George D. Zivley to be postmaster at Lampasas, Tex., in place of G. D. Zivley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Jerry N. Worsham to be postmaster at Laredo, Tex., in place of J. N. Worsham. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Walter C. Blalock to be postmaster at Linden, Tex., in place of W. C. Blalock. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Horace C. Blalock to be postmaster at Marshall, Tex., in place of H. C. Blalock. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Cicero Harper to be postmaster at Moran, Tex., in place of C. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Hattie M. Culpepper to be postmaster at Palmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Culpepper. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Bessie L. Rorex to be postmaster at Panhandle, Tex., in place of B. L. Rorex. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Augustus G. Hubbard to be postmaster at Paris, Tex., in place of A. G. Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1918.

Horace B. Cooper to be postmaster at Quinlan, Tex., in place of H. B. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

William E. Bellah to be postmaster at Saint Jo, Tex., in place of W. E. Bellah. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

James L. Crawford to be postmaster at San Benito, Tex., in place of J. L. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William T. Jackman to be postmaster at San Marcos, Tex., in place of W. T. Jackman. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

James L. Sandel to be postmaster at Saratoga, Tex., in place of J. L. Sandel. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Ernest G. Keese to be postmaster at Stamford, Tex., in place of E. G. Keese. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Joseph W. Singleton to be postmaster at Waxahachie, Tex., in place of J. W. Singleton. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Annie H. Hughes to be postmaster at Woodville, Tex., in place of Annie Stryker. Name changed by marriage.

Paul L. Alexander to be postmaster at Lamesa, Tex., in place of P. L. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Betty Ramey to be postmaster at Mathis, Tex., in place of Betty Matthews. Name changed by marriage.

Becton G. Edwards to be postmaster at Forney, Tex., in place of B. C. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Charles H. Cmajdalka to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Tex., in place of C. H. Cmajdalka. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Eugene A. Shelton to be postmaster at El Paso, Tex., in place of E. A. Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Sam H. Little to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of S. H. Little. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Samuel H. Bell to be postmaster at Deport, Tex., in place of S. H. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Aubrey L. Banks to be postmaster at Denton, Tex., in place of A. L. Banks. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Jefferson A. Davis to be postmaster at Dawson, Tex., in place of J. A. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Georgie B. Welch to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of G. B. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Charles J. Debenport to be postmaster at Commerce, Tex., in place of C. J. Debenport. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1918.

Charles F. Goodman to be postmaster at Collinsville, Tex., in place of C. F. Goodman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Ben H. Pittman to be postmaster at Coleman, Tex., in place of B. H. Pittman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Thomas A. Boothe to be postmaster at Cleveland, Tex., in place of T. A. Boothe. Incumbent's commission expired July 9, 1918.

Currie C. Powell to be postmaster at Clarendon, Tex., in place of C. C. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1919.

Ransom A. St. John to be postmaster at Cisco, Tex., in place of R. A. St. John. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Bryant H. McKinnon, jr., to be postmaster at Canton, Tex., in place of B. H. McKinnon, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert G. Bransom to be postmaster at Burleson, Tex., in place of R. G. Bransom. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

A. Burton Reagan to be postmaster at Brady, Tex., in place of A. B. Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1918.

Edwin Forrest, jr., to be postmaster at Blum, Tex., in place of Edwin Forrest, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Charles A. Taylor to be postmaster at Bertram, Tex., in place of C. A. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Jack Dies to be postmaster at Beaumont, Tex., in place of Jack Dies. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Robert E. Rankin to be postmaster at Abilene, Tex., in place of R. E. Rankin. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

James E. Davis to be postmaster at Bullard, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Lonnie Childs to be postmaster at Fairfield, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

William F. Miller to be postmaster at Happy, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Robert N. McMullen to be postmaster at Huntington, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hugh R. Park to be postmaster at Krum, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Tom W. Shank to be postmaster at Winona, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

May E. Perry to be postmaster at Carlsbad, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Roger Q. Kennedy to be postmaster at Elkhart, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

UTAH.

George F. Olson to be postmaster at Fairview, Utah, in place of Scerinda Rasmussen, resigned.

James F. Day to be postmaster at Fillmore, Utah, in place of La V. K. Day, removed.

Furnessia A. LeCheminant to be postmaster at Garfield, Utah, in place of W. W. LeCheminant, resigned.

Linda Bardsley to be postmaster at Gunnison, Utah, in place of Linda Bardsley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Daniel McMillan to be postmaster at Heber, Utah, in place of Daniel McMillan. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Lauritz P. Nelson to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah, in place of L. P. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Francis J. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Park City, Utah, in place of F. J. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Henry W. Wadley to be postmaster at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of H. W. Wadley. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

George A. Zabriskie to be postmaster at Springville, Utah, in place of G. A. Zabriskie. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Charles L. Countryman to be postmaster at Bingham Canyon, Utah, in place of C. L. Countryman. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Walter K. Granger to be postmaster at Cedar City, Utah, in place of W. K. Granger. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

VERMONT.

George W. Gorman to be postmaster at Barre, Vt., in place of G. W. Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Daniel H. Cray to be postmaster at Bellows Falls, Vt., in place of D. H. Cray. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Frederick L. Smith to be postmaster at Brandon, Vt., in place of F. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Clement A. Burnham to be postmaster at Bristol, Vt., in place of C. A. Burnham. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

James E. Burke to be postmaster at Burlington, Vt., in place of J. E. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1919.

Edward Dunn to be postmaster at Castleton, Vt., in place of Edward Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

James A. Donahue to be postmaster at Essex Junction, Vt., in place of J. A. Donahue. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

John J. Gallagher to be postmaster at Hardwick, Vt., in place of J. J. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

George W. Pierce to be postmaster at Lyndonville, Vt., in place of G. W. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Henry B. Parkhurst, jr., to be postmaster at North Troy, Vt., in place of H. B. Parkhurst, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Moses E. Leary to be postmaster at Richmond, Vt., in place of M. E. Leary. Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1918.

James A. Cannon to be postmaster at Rochester, Vt., in place of J. A. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Hugh A. Sherlock to be postmaster at South Royalston, Vt., in place of H. A. Sherlock. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1919.

John H. Wood to be postmaster at Wallingford, Vt., in place of J. H. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

George E. Randall to be postmaster at Wells River, Vt., in place of G. E. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1918.

Rodger Dwyer to be postmaster at West Rutland, Vt., in place of Rodger Dwyer. Incumbent's commission expired July 6, 1918.

David P. Mackenzie to be postmaster at Island Pond, Vt., in place of D. P. Mackenzie. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

VIRGINIA.

Otis M. Joyner to be postmaster at Courtland, Va., in place of B. A. Williams, resigned.

D. Taylor Martin to be postmaster at East Radford, Va., in place of G. A. Sullivan, removed.

Reuben M. Beazley to be postmaster at Ettrick, Va., in place of B. M. Faison, resigned.

Charles F. Cummins to be postmaster at Fairfax, Va., in place of C. E. Wiley, resigned.

David G. Snodgrass to be postmaster at Meadowview, Va., in place of H. C. Browning, removed.

George L. Bane to be postmaster at Narrows, Va., in place of C. H. Johnson, resigned.

Katherine T. Maclin to be postmaster at North Emporia, Va., in place of J. E. Everette, resigned.

Eugene A. Hyde to be postmaster at Saltville, Va., in place of J. B. Perfater, resigned.

Myrtle B. Sage to be postmaster at Toms Creek, Va., in place of F. G. Johnson, resigned.

Robert P. Cummings to be postmaster at Abingdon, Va., in place of R. P. Cummings. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Walter Fauntleroy to be postmaster at Altavista, Va., in place of Walter Fauntleroy. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Thurston W. Richardson to be postmaster at Bedford, Va., in place of T. W. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Gordon E. Gilly to be postmaster at Big Stone Gap, Va., in place of G. E. Gilly. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1918.

Wirt Dunlap to be postmaster at Blacksburg, Va., in place of Wirt Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Clarence W. Garrett to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Va., in place of C. W. Garrett. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

John W. Kellam to be postmaster at Onley, Va., in place of J. W. Kellam. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Thomas S. Burwell to be postmaster at Lexington, Va., in place of T. S. Burwell. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Frank L. Sublett to be postmaster at Harrisonburg, Va., in place of F. L. Sublett. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Boyd Boggess to be postmaster at Richlands, Va., in place of B. Boggess. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

James W. Sibert to be postmaster at Winchester, Va., in place of J. W. Sibert. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Alexander S. Hamilton to be postmaster at Warrenton, Va., in place of A. S. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1918.

William H. Maffett to be postmaster at Vienna, Va., in place of W. H. Maffett. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Augustus B. Buchanan to be postmaster at Tazewell, Va., in place of A. B. Buchanan. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Charles N. Davidson to be postmaster at Stonega, Va., in place of C. N. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Samuel M. Donald to be postmaster at Staunton, Va., in place of S. M. Donald. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1918.

Robert J. Northington to be postmaster at South Hill, Va., in place of R. J. Northington. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1918.

Levi B. Davis to be postmaster at Roanoke, Va., in place of L. B. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Henry C. Humphrey to be postmaster at Remington, Va., in place of H. C. Humphrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1919.

Jasper W. H. Lawford to be postmaster at Pocahontas, Va., in place of J. W. H. Lawford. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John W. Anderson to be postmaster at Pennington Gap, Va., in place of J. W. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired August 25, 1918.

Charles C. King to be postmaster at Pearisburg, Va., in place of C. C. King. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Leslie N. Ligon to be postmaster at Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Edward E. Miles to be postmaster at Onancock, Va., in place of E. E. Miles. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1919.

Charlie F. Kitts to be postmaster at North Tazewell, Va., in place of C. F. Kitts. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Laura L. Keeler to be postmaster at Middleburg Va., in place of L. L. Keeler. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1919.

George J. Russell to be postmaster at Marshall, Va., in place of G. J. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1918.

George C. Carter to be postmaster at Leesburg, Va., in place of G. C. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Asa A. Ferguson to be postmaster at Lebanon, Va., in place of A. A. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

John L. Pulley to be postmaster at Ivor, Va., in place of J. L. Pulley. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Aut B. Dye to be postmaster at Honaker, Va., in place of A. B. Dye. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

Charles F. Ratliff to be postmaster at Floyd, Va., in place of C. F. Ratliff. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Frederick A. Lewis to be postmaster at Emporia, Va., in place of F. A. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Albert N. Cocks to be postmaster at Disputanta, Va., in place of A. N. Cocks. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1918.

John S. Snavely to be postmaster at Chilhowie, Va., in place of J. S. Snavely. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Maurice A. Garrison to be postmaster at Cape Charles, Va., in place of M. A. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William A. Byerly to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Va., in place of W. A. Byerly. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Margaret P. C. Smith to be postmaster at Yorktown, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Robert L. Aycock to be postmaster at Penniman, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Samuel T. Dove to be postmaster at Accotink, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

WASHINGTON.

Louis H. Gurnsey to be postmaster at Addy, Wash., in place of P. L. Paulsen, resigned.

Eliza F. Head to be postmaster at Cathlamet, Wash., in place of Thomas R. Arnold, resigned.

Arthur B. Cass to be postmaster at Connell, Wash., in place of J. E. Janosky, resigned.

Jacob H. Berge to be postmaster at Davenport, Wash., in place of Charles A. Ramm, resigned.

Vanira Chamberlin to be postmaster at Riverside, Wash., in place of H. T. Jones, resigned.

Fred B. Goldsworthy to be postmaster at Rosalia, Wash., in place of R. P. Turnley, jr., deceased.

Albert C. Sly to be postmaster at Stevenson, Wash., in place of Mae O. Gray, resigned.

Bertram R. Sturm to be postmaster at Toppenish, Wash., in place of Leonard Talbott, deceased.

James H. Adams to be postmaster at Waitsburg, Wash., in place of S. F. Patton, resigned.

Robert O. Logsdon to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of Gertrude Cosgrove, declined.

Christian Hansen to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of H. C. Dahlby, resigned.

William A. Lancaster to be postmaster at Fort Casey, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Mae C. Cook to be postmaster at Fort Flagler, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

John J. Carney to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Wash., in place of J. J. Carney. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Calvin W. Stewart to be postmaster at Tacoma, Wash., in place of C. W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

William Rouse to be postmaster at Stanwood, Wash., in place of William Rouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Fenton Smith to be postmaster at South Bend, Wash., in place of Fenton Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

James H. McCourt to be postmaster at Sequin, Wash., in place of J. H. McCourt. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Charles E. Hancock to be postmaster at Selah, Wash., in place of C. E. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Nelson Murray to be postmaster at Roy, Wash., in place of Nelson Murray. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

George T. Heslin to be postmaster at Newport, Wash., in place of G. T. Heslin. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

William E. Palmer to be postmaster at Naches, Wash., in place of W. E. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Constance G. Clark to be postmaster at Montesano, Wash., in place of C. G. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

Duncan L. Beckes to be postmaster at Lynden, Wash., in place of D. L. Beckes. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Talleyrand Bratton to be postmaster at Goldendale, Wash., in place of Talleyrand Bratton. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1918.

Edward J. Byrne to be postmaster at Garfield, Wash., in place of E. J. Byrne. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William F. Roberts, jr., to be postmaster at Elma, Wash., in place of W. F. Roberts, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

Lawrence N. Sill to be postmaster at Coupeville, Wash., in place of L. N. Sill. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Roger E. Williams to be postmaster at Concrete, Wash., in place of R. E. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Stonewall J. Craig to be postmaster at Clarkston, Wash., in place of S. J. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1919.

Elmer McBroom to be postmaster at Chehalis, Wash., in place of Elmer McBroom. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

William R. Whitlock to be postmaster at Black Diamond, Wash., in place of W. R. Whitlock. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

George D. Shannon to be postmaster at Anacortes, Wash., in place of G. D. Shannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1919.

John F. Moyer to be postmaster at College Place, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Emery C. Queen to be postmaster at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., in place of W. Jack Hunter, resigned.

Francis M. Peters to be postmaster at Bluefield, W. Va., in place of Floyd J. Brown, deceased.

Harry Brooke to be postmaster at Bridgeport, W. Va., in place of William M. Davis, resigned.

Henry S. Percival to be postmaster at Holden, W. Va., in place of Bertha W. Smith, declined.

Ethel M. Zimmerman to be postmaster at McMechen, W. Va., in place of Otis M. Carroll, resigned.

Gaylord E. Berry to be postmaster at Madison, W. Va., in place of Henry M. Walker, resigned.

Walter E. Stout to be postmaster at Parkersburg, W. Va., in place of Simms Powell, removed.

Worth D. McClung to be postmaster at Richwood, W. Va., in place of Fred Amick, resigned.

William A. Burgess to be postmaster at Saint Albans, W. Va., in place of Guy F. McComas, resigned.

Arthur J. Duncan to be postmaster at Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of A. D. Smith, jr., resigned.

James B. Ballard to be postmaster at Dunbar, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Edward P. Boggess to be postmaster at Lumberport, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Hardin D. Carroll to be postmaster at Mason Town, W. Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1918.

William A. Stackpole to be postmaster at Pine Grove, W. Va., Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Abner Nut Harris to be postmaster at Thorpe, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1917.

Hayes Sapp to be postmaster at Newburg, W. Va., in place of Hayes Sapp. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Alex L. Hatfield to be postmaster at Matewan, W. Va., in place of A. L. Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

James F. Beatty to be postmaster at Mannington, W. Va., in place of J. F. Beatty. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1919.

William G. Bayliss to be postmaster at Macdonald, W. Va., in place of W. G. Bayliss. Incumbent's commission expired September 16, 1918.

Fred S. Hathaway to be postmaster at Grantsville, W. Va., in place of F. S. Hathaway. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1919.

Owen J. King to be postmaster at Elkins, W. Va., in place of O. J. King. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1918.

C. Forrest Hull to be postmaster at Durbin, W. Va., in place of C. F. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

George H. Merchant to be postmaster at Cairo, W. Va., in place of G. H. Merchant. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Robert G. Oxley to be postmaster at Athens, W. Va., in place of R. G. Oxley. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

William N. Cole to be postmaster at Williamson, W. Va., in place of W. N. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1918.

William W. Irwin to be postmaster at Wheeling, W. Va., in place of W. W. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1918.

Charles Lively to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of Charles Lively. Incumbent's commission expired December 29, 1918.

Daniel J. Moran to be postmaster at Thomas, W. Va., in place of D. J. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Robert E. Hedrick to be postmaster at Franklin, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Andrew J. Taylor to be postmaster at Ansted, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

Morgan T. Morrison to be postmaster at Sutton, W. Va., in place of M. T. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Margaret McGugin to be postmaster at Ravenswood, W. Va., in place of Margaret McGugin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Frederick H. Mahey to be postmaster at Rainelle, W. Va., in place of F. H. Mahey. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Phillip E. Nixon to be postmaster at Paw Paw, W. Va., in place of P. E. Nixon. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

Turner A. Wamsley to be postmaster at Parsons, W. Va., in place of T. A. Wamsley. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1919.

James A. Pyles to be postmaster at New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. A. Pyles. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

WISCONSIN.

Tracy M. Page to be postmaster at Bangor, Wis., in place of E. R. Peck, resigned.

Carrie V. Richer to be postmaster at Delafield, Wis., in place of Annie W. Bartholomew, resigned.

Charles A. L. Varney to be postmaster at Greenwood, Wis., in place of K. W. Baker, resigned.

Ivy R. Carman to be postmaster at Minocqua, Wis., in place of A. J. Bolger, removed.

Peter Sievers to be postmaster at North Milwaukee, Wis., in place of William J. Tobin. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1918.

Libbie M. Bennett to be postmaster at Pewaukee, Wis., in place of Agnes Scholl, resigned.

Thomas J. Bergen to be postmaster at Prairie du Chien, Wis., in place of A. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

John J. Kaiser to be postmaster at Stratford, Wis., in place of J. J. Kaiser. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Howard J. Barry to be postmaster at Sun Prairie, Wis., in place of H. J. Barry. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Henry B. Kaempfer to be postmaster at West Bend, Wis., in place of H. B. Kaempfer. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Albert A. Pagel to be postmaster at Schofield, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Carrie A. Anderson to be postmaster at Weyerhauser, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Charles J. Janisch to be postmaster at Waterloo, Wis., in place of C. J. Janisch. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Carrie M. Hogan to be postmaster at Turtle Lake, Wis., in place of C. M. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Robert A. Grignon to be postmaster at Suring, Wis., in place of R. A. Grignon. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Herman A. Ohm to be postmaster at South Milwaukee, Wis., in place of H. A. Ohm. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

John Coppes to be postmaster at South Kaukauna, Wis., in place of J. Coppes. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

John A. Stewart to be postmaster at Seymour, Wis., in place of J. A. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Frank J. Haas to be postmaster at Richland Center, Wis., in place of F. J. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Francis H Metcalf to be postmaster at Reedsburg, Wis., in place of F. H. Metcalf. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

George H. Herzog to be postmaster at Racine, Wis., in place of G. H. Herzog. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

William F. Gruenewald to be postmaster at Oshkosh, Wis., in place of W. F. Gruenewald. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Benjamin S. Shove to be postmaster at Onalaska, Wis., in place of B. S. Shove. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

William Denomie to be postmaster at Odanah, Wis., in place of W. Denomie. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Charles T. O'Brien to be postmaster at Necedah, Wis., in place of C. T. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Levi Lane to be postmaster at Oconto Falls, Wis., in place of L. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Francis J. Eagan to be postmaster at Muscoda, Wis., in place of F. J. Eagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Asa H. Craig to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of A. H. Craig. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Edward F. Butler to be postmaster at Mosinee, Wis., in place of E. F. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Nina M. Yeager to be postmaster at Montfort, Wis., in place of N. M. Frankland. Name changed by marriage.

George Crawford to be postmaster at Mineral Point, Wis., in place of George Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Thomas F. Powers to be postmaster at Mauston, Wis., in place of T. F. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired October 22, 1918.

Dorothea Devlin to be postmaster at Loyal, Wis., in place of Dorothea Devlin. Incumbent's commission expired October 21, 1918.

Alexander Buchanan to be postmaster at Lakemills, Wis., in place of Alexander Buchanan. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Michael J. Rice to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of M. J. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1918.

Jeremiah J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Janesville, Wis., in place of J. J. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1918.

William Alexander to be postmaster at Hayward, Wis., in place of William Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1919.

Francis M. Porter to be postmaster at Elkhorn, Wis., in place of F. M. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

Ida Englesby to be postmaster at Eleva, Wis., in place of Ida Englesby. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Christian A. Hoen to be postmaster at Edgerton, Wis., in place of C. A. Hoen. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1918.

John A. Kuypers to be postmaster at De Pere, Wis., in place of J. A. Kuypers. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1919.

Frank H. Kellner to be postmaster at Denmark, Wis., in place of F. H. Kellner. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

John D. Burns to be postmaster at Colfax, Wis., in place of J. D. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1918.

Alexander W. Horn to be postmaster at Cedarburg, Wis., in place of A. W. Horn. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

Thomas N. Curran to be postmaster at Campbellsport, Wis., in place of T. N. Curran. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1919.

Andrew Crahen to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Wis., in place of Andrew Crahen. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

Edward Cody to be postmaster at Antigo, Wis., in place of Edward Cody. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1919.

James E. Wall to be postmaster at Oxford, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1919.

WYOMING.

Ira S. Bowker to be postmaster at Newcastle, Wyo., in place of G. H. Greedy, resigned.

Ruby E. Rimington to be postmaster at Guernsey, Wyo., in place of Ethel A. Berry, resigned.

Thomas H. Baxter to be postmaster at Jackson, Wyo., in place of Sara McKean, resigned.

Alvah J. Macy to be postmaster at Moorcroft, Wyo., in place of C. E. Russell, resigned.

Arlan W. Coons to be postmaster at Basin, Wyo., in place of A. W. Coons. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1919.

John McNamara to be postmaster at Kemmerer, Wyo., in place of J. McNamara. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1918.

Thomas W. Keenan to be postmaster at Pinebluff, Wyo., in place of T. W. Keenan. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1919.

Sherman D. Canfield to be postmaster at Sheridan, Wyo., in place of S. D. Canfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1919.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 17, 1919.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

H. Percival Dodge to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

CLASS 2.

Richard C. Bundy to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 2.

CONSUL.

CLASS 8.

Keith Merrill to be consul of class 8.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Vernon A. Bullard to be United States attorney, district of Vermont.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Hilary P. Jones to be a rear admiral.

Capt. Charles P. Plunkett to be a rear admiral.

Capt. Richard H. Jackson to be a rear admiral for temporary service.

Capt. Archibald H. Scales to be a rear admiral for temporary service.

Capt. Victor Blue to be a rear admiral for temporary service.

Capt. Frederic B. Bassett, jr., to be a rear admiral for temporary service.

Capt. Joseph Strauss to be a rear admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *July 17, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite and ever-blessed God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for life and its manifold blessings; and we most earnestly pray that we may strive daily to honor and dignify our life in a faithful and conscientious service to Thee and our fellow men. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

S. 2254. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to send representatives to the world cotton conference to be held at New Orleans, La., October 13 to 16, 1919, inclusive.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2254. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolutions:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War; and

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive, for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Tao Hung Chang and Zeng Tze Wong, citizens of China.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reference of House joint resolution 57 be taken from the Committee on Public Lands and referred——

The SPEAKER. That is not in order to-day, under the special rule.

Mr. GARLAND. Very well, I withdraw the request.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The business before the House is the unfinished business from Tuesday last, the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill on the veto message of the President. When the House adjourned the yeas and nays had been ordered on the substitute of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may we have that motion reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection the motion will be again reported.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The question is on the adoption of the Good substitute. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 1, nays 383, not voting 46, as follows:

YEAS—1.

Good

NAYS—383.

Ackerman	Ellsworth	Lankford	Riordan
Alexander	Elston	Larsen	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Esch	Layton	Robsion, Ky.
Anderson	Evans, Mont.	Lazaro	Rodenberg
Andrews, Md.	Evans, Nebr.	Lea, Calif.	Rogers
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nev.	Lehlbach	Romjue
Anthony	Ferris	Lesher	Rose
Aswell	Fess	Lever	Rowan
Ayres	Fields	Linthicum	Rowe
Bacharach	Fisher	Little	Rubey
Baer	Flood	Lonergan	Rucker
Bankhead	Focht	Longworth	Sabath
Barbour	Fordney	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Barkley	Foster	Lufkin	Sanders, La.
Bee	Frear	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Begg	French	McAndrews	Sanford
Bell	Fuller, Ill.	McArthur	Saunders, Va.
Benham	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Scott
Benson	Gallagher	McDuffie	Sears
Black	Gallivan	McFadden	Sells
Blackmon	Gandy	McGlennon	Sherwood
Bland, Ind.	Ganly	McKenzie	Shreve
Bland, Mo.	Gard	McKeown	Siegel
Bland, Va.	Garland	McKinley	Sims
Blanton	Garner	McLane	Sinclair
Boies	Garrett	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnott
Booher	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sisson
Bowers	Godwin, N. C.	McPherson	Smith, Idaho
Box	Goldfogle	MacCrate	Smith, Ill.
Brand	Goodwin, Ark.	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Goodykoontz	Madden	Smithwick
Brinson	Gould	Magee	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Major	Steagall
Browning	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Stedman
Buchanan	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Steele
Burdick	Griest	Martin	Steenerson
Burke	Griffin	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Burroughs	Hadley	Mead	Stephens, Ohio
Butler	Hamill	Merritt	Stevenson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Caldwell	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Kans.	Haskell	Monahan, Wis.	Sumners, Tex.
Campbell, Pa.	Hastings	Mondell	Sweet
Candler	Haugen	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Cannon	Hawley	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Cantrill	Hayden	Mooney	Taylor, Tenn.
Caraway	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Carew	Hernandez	Moore, Pa.	Thomas
Carss	Hersey	Moore, Va.	Thompson, Ohio
Carter	Hersman	Moores, Ind.	Thompson, Okla.
Casey	Hickey	Morgan	Tillman
Chindblom	Hill	Morin	Tilson
Christopherson	Hoch	Mott	Timberlake
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Mudd	Tincher
Clark, Mo.	Houghton	Murphy	Tinkham
Classon	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Towner
Cleary	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Treadway
Coady	Hudspeth	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Cole	Hulings	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Collier	Hull, Iowa	Nicholls, S. C.	Venable
Connally	Humphreys	Nichols, Mich.	Vestal
Cooper	Husted	Nolan	Vinson
Copley	Hutchinson	O'Connell	Voigt
Crago	Igoe	Ogden	Volstead
Cramton	Jacoway	Oldfield	Walsh
Crisp	James	Oliver	Walters
Crowther	Jefferis	Olney	Ward
Cullen	Johnson, Ky.	Osborne	Wason
Currie, Mich.	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Watkins
Dale	Johnson, S. Dak.	Padgett	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Watson, Va.
Darrow	Jones, Pa.	Park	Weaver
Davey	Jones, Tex.	Parker	Webb
Davis, Minn.	Juul	Parrish	Webster
Davis, Tenn.	Kahn	Pell	Welling
Dempsey	Kearns	Peters	Welty
Dent	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Whaley
Dewalt	Kelly, Pa.	Platt	Wheeler
Dickinson, Mo.	Kendall	Porter	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou	White, Me.
Dominick	Kennedy, R. I.	Quin	Williams
Donovan	Kettner	Ragsdale	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Kiess	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Kincheloe	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, Pa.
Doughton	Kinkaid	Raker	Wingo
Dowell	Kitchin	Ramsey	Winslow
Drane	Kleczka	Ramseyer	Wise
Dunbar	Knutson	Randall, Wis.	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kraus	Rayburn	Woods, Va.
Dupré	Kreider	Reavis	Wright
Dyer	LaGuardia	Reed, N. Y.	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan	Lampert	Rhodes	Young, Tex.
Edmonds	Langley	Ricketts	Zihlman
Elliott	Lanham	Riddick	

NOT VOTING—46.

Ashbrook	Denison	Goodall	Johnston, N. Y.
Babka	Eagle	Greene, Vt.	King
Britten	Echols	Hamilton	Lee, Ga.
Browne	Emerson	Heflin	McClintic
Brumbaugh	Fairfield	Hicks	McKiniry
Costello	Fitzgerald	Hull, Tenn.	Mann
Curry, Calif.	Freeman	Ireland	Mason
Neely	Reber	Slemp	Upshaw
O'Connor	Reed, W. Va.	Small	Woodyard
Purnell	Rouse	Smith, N. Y.	Yates
Radcliffe	Schall	Stiness	
Randall, Calif.	Scully	Sullivan	

So the substitute was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. MASON with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. YATES with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. MANN with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. REBER with Mr. FITZGERALD.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. REBER. I desire to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present in the Hall when his name was called?

Mr. REBER. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to answer "present."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall when his name was called?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can not vote.

Mr. HAYDEN. But I am entitled to answer "present."

Mr. MCKINIRY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request. I desire to answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no authority to grant it.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MONDELL moves, as a substitute to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], to recommit the bill H. R. 4373 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to forthwith report the same back to the House with the following amendment: On page 43, line 5, strike out the figures "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$8,000,000."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not debatable. The previous question has been ordered on the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the substitute and on the original motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first put the request of the gentleman from Wyoming that he may address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Was not there a motion made for the previous question the other afternoon which would cut off another amendment?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Iowa——

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and on the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming and on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I would like to ask the Chair if a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is to instruct the committee to report a provision in the bill appropriating $8,000,000 for vocational education instead of appropriating $12,000,000, as the original Buchanan motion provides?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if my motion is adopted it will make $14,000,000 available for this purpose——

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, which I think is entirely proper for the information of the House and not for myself, I know. If the motion made by the gentleman from Wyoming——

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. There is no motion of the gentleman from Wyoming before the House.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of the House without being interrupted by some gentleman who does not know anything about the proceedings [applause], I was just about to ask the Chair if the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming was adopted then the original Buchanan amendment as substituted would be voted on? Is that correct? It is in the nature of an amendment——

The SPEAKER. It is a substitute.

Mr. GARNER. Well, a substitute. And if the substitute to the original amendment is adopted then the original amendment as substituted must be voted on by the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. GARNER. The parliamentary inquiry is this, Mr. Speaker: If the House adopts the substitute of the gentleman from Wyoming, it will then have to adopt the amendment as substituted, so those voting against the proposition of the gentleman from Wyoming would still have an opportunity to vote if it was substituted?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the House that the Chair does not think it is proper procedure for gentlemen, under guise of parliamentary inquiry, to engage in debate. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to say——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. GARNER (continuing). That I desired to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas demands the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker——

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 184, not voting 44, as follows:

YEAS—202.

Ackerman	Cramton	Garland	Jefferis
Andrews, Md.	Crowther	Glynn	Johnson, S. Dak.
Andrews, Nebr.	Currie, Mich.	Good	Johnson, Wash.
Anthony	Curry, Calif.	Goodykoontz	Jones, Pa.
Bacharach	Dale	Gould	Juul
Baer	Dallinger	Graham, Pa.	Kearns
Barbour	Darrow	Graham, Ill.	Kelley, Mich.
Begg	Davis, Minn.	Green, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.
Benham	Dempsey	Greene, Mass.	Kendall
Bland, Ind.	Denison	Griest	Kennedy, Iowa
Boles	Dickinson, Iowa	Hadley	Kless
Bowers	Dunbar	Hamilton	Kinkaid
Brooks, Ill.	Dunn	Hardy, Colo.	Kleczka
Brooks, Pa.	Dyer	Haskell	Knutson
Browning	Edmonds	Haugen	Kraus
Burke	Elliott	Hawley	Kreider
Burroughs	Ellsworth	Hays	LaGuardia
Butler	Esch	Hernandez	Lampert
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Hersey	Langley
Cannon	Fess	Hickey	Layton
Chindblom	Focht	Hill	Lehlbach
Christopherson	Fordney	Hoch	Longworth
Classon	Foster	Hulings	Luce
Cole	Frear	Hull, Iowa	Lufkin
Cooper	French	Husted	Luhring
Copley	Fuller, Ill.	Hutchinson	McArthur
Crago	Fuller, Mass.	James	McFadden
McKenzie	Nolan	Sanford	Treadway
McKinley	Ogden	Sells	Vaile
McLaughlin, Mich.	Osborne	Shreve	Vare
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Paige	Sinclair	Vestal
McPherson	Parker	Sinnott	Voigt
MacCrate	Peters	Smith, Idaho	Volstead
MacGregor	Platt	Smith, Ill.	Walsh
Madden	Ramsey	Smith, Mich.	Walters
Magee	Ramseyer	Snell	Ward
Mapes	Randall, Calif.	Snyder	Wason
Merritt	Randall, Wis.	Steenerson	Watson, Pa.
Michener	Reavis	Stephens, Ohio	Webster
Miller	Reber	Strong, Kans.	White, Kans.
Monahan, Wis.	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	White, Me.
Mondell	Rhodes	Summers, Wash.	Williams
Moore, Pa.	Ricketts	Sweet	Wilson, Ill.
Moores, Ind.	Riddick	Taylor, Tenn.	Winslow
Morgan	Robsion, Ky.	Temple	Wood, Ind.
Morin	Rodenberg	Thompson, Ohio	Woodyard
Mott	Rogers	Tilson	Yates
Mudd	Rose	Timberlake	Young, N. Dak.
Nelson, Wis.	Rowe	Tincher	Zihlman
Newton, Minn.	Sanders, Ind.	Tinkham	
Newton, Mo.	Sanders, N. Y.	Towner	

NAYS—184.

Alexander	Dooling	Lazaro	Robinson, N. C.
Almon	Doremus	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Anderson	Doughton	Lesher	Rowan
Aswell	Dowell	Lever	Rubey
Ayres	Drane	Linthicum	Rucker
Bankhead	Dupré	Lonergan	Sabath
Barkley	Eagan	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Bee	Evans, Mont.	McCulloch	Saunders, Va.
Bell	Evans, Nev.	McDuffie	Scott
Benson	Ferris	McGlennon	Sears
Black	Fields	McKeown	Sherwood
Blackmon	Fisher	McKiniry	Siegel
Bland, Mo.	Fitzgerald	McLane	Sims
Bland, Va.	Flood	Maher	Sisson
Blanton	Gallagher	Major	Small
Booher	Gallivan	Mansfield	Smithwick
Box	Gandy	Martin	Steagall
Brand	Ganly	Mays	Stedman
Briggs	Gard	Mead	Steele
Brinson	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Garrett	Montague	Stevenson
Burdick	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Sumners, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goldfogle	Mooney	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Caldwell	Griffin	Moore, Va.	Thomas
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Murphy	Thompson, Okla.
Candler	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, Mo.	Tillman
Cantrill	Harrison	Nichols, Mich.	Upshaw
Caraway	Hastings	O'Connell	Venable
Carew	Hayden	O'Connor	Vinson
Carss	Hersman	Oldfield	Watkins
Carter	Holland	Oliver	Watson, Va.
Casey	Howard	Olney	Weaver
Clark, Fla.	Huddleston	Overstreet	Webb
Clark, Mo.	Hudspeth	Padgett	Welling
Cleary	Humphreys	Park	Welty
Coady	Igoe	Parrish	Whaley
Collier	Jacoway	Pell	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson, Ky.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Wilson, Pa.
Cullen	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Wingo
Davey	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Wise
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Woods, Va.
Dewalt	Kitchin	Rainey, J. W.	Wright
Dickinson, Mo.	Lanham	Raker	Young, Tex.
Dominick	Lankford	Rayburn	
Donovan	Larsen	Riordan	

NOT VOTING—44.

Ashbrook	Fairfield	Kettner	Radcliffe
Babka	Freeman	King	Reed, W. Va.
Britten	Goodall	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Browne	Greene, Vt.	Little	Schall
Brumbaugh	Heflin	McClintic	Scully
Costello	Hicks	Mann	Siemp
Dent	Houghton	Mason	Smith, N. Y.
Eagle	Hull, Tenn.	Neely	Stiness
Echols	Ireland	Nicholls, S. C.	Sullivan
Elston	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter	
Emerson	Kahn	Purnell	

So the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. RADCLIFFE (for Mondell substitute) with Mr. SMITH of New York (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. MCLANE.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer "present."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is sorry, but the gentleman can not be recorded.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now comes on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to recommit as amended by the substitute just adopted by the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Upon that the gentleman from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the motion as amended will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 40, as follows:

YEAS—390.

Ackerman	Dyer	Knutson	Rainey, H. T.
Alexander	Eagan	Kraus	Rainey, J. W.
Almon	Edmonds	Kreider	Raker
Anderson	Elliott	LaGuardia	Ramsey
Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	Lampert	Ramseyer
Andrews, Nebr.	Elston	Langley	Randall, Calif.
Anthony	Esch	Lanham	Randall, Wis.
Aswell	Evans, Mont.	Lankford	Rayburn
Ayres	Evans, Nebr.	Larsen	Reavis
Bacharach	Evans, Nev.	Layton	Reber
Baer	Ferris	Lazaro	Reed, N. Y.
Bankhead	Fess	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes
Barbour	Fields	Lehlbach	Ricketts
Barkley	Fisher	Lesher	Riddick
Bee	Fitzgerald	Lever	Riordan
Begg	Flood	Linthicum	Robinson, N. C.
Bell	Focht	Lonergan	Robsion, Ky.
Benham	Fordney	Longworth	Rodenberg
Benson	Foster	Luce	Rogers
Black	Frear	Lufkin	Romjue
Blackmon	French	Luhring	Rose
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Rowan
Bland, Mo.	Fuller, Mass.	McArthur	Rowe
Bland, Va.	Gallagher	McCulloch	Rubey
Blanton	Gallivan	McDuffie	Rucker
Boies	Gandy	McFadden	Sabath
Booher	Ganly	McGlennon	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Gard	McKenzie	Sanders, La.
Box	Garland	McKeown	Sanders, N. Y.
Brand	Garner	McKinlry	Sanford
Briggs	Garrett	McKinley	Saunders, Va.
Brinson	Glynn	McLane	Scott
Brooks, Pa.	Godwin, N. C.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sears
Browning	Goldfogle	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sells
Buchanan	Good	McPherson	Sherwood
Burdick	Goodwin, Ark.	MacCrate	Shreve
Burke	Goodykoontz	MacGregor	Siegel
Burroughs	Gould	Madden	Sims
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Magee	Sinclair
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Maher	Sinnott
Byrns, Tenn.	Green, Iowa	Major	Sisson
Caldwell	Greene, Mass.	Mansfield	Small
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Griffin	Martin	Smith, Ill.
Candler	Hadley	Mays	Smith, Mich.
Cannon	Hamill	Mead	Smithwick
Cantrill	Hamilton	Merritt	Snell
Caraway	Hardy, Colo.	Michener	Snyder
Carew	Hardy, Tex.	Miller	Steagall
Carss	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Carter	Haskell	Monahan, Wis.	Steele
Casey	Hastings	Mondell	Steenerson
Chindblom	Haugen	Montague	Stephens, Miss.
Christopherson	Hawley	Moon	Stephens, Ohio
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Mooney	Stevenson
Clark, Mo.	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Classon	Hernandez	Moore, Pa.	Strong, Pa.
Cleary	Hersey	Moore, Va.	Summers, Wash.
Coady	Hickey	Moores, Ind.	Sweet
Cole	Hill	Morgan	Taylor, Ark.
Collier	Hoch	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Connally	Holland	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooper	Houghton	Mudd	Temple
Copley	Howard	Murphy	Thomas
Crago	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Thompson, Ohio
Cramton	Hudspeth	Nelson, Wis.	Thompson, Okla.
Crisp	Hulings	Newton, Minn.	Tillman
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Cullen	Humphreys	Nicholls, S. C.	Timberlake
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Tincher
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Nolan	Tinkham
Dale	Igoe	O'Connell	Towner
Dallinger	Jacoway	O'Connor	Treadway
Darrow	James	Ogden	Upshaw
Davey	Jefferis	Oldfield	Vaile
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Vare
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Olney	Venable
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Vestal
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	Overstreet	Vinson
Dent	Jones, Pa.	Padgett	Voigt
Dewalt	Jones, Tex.	Paige	Volstead
Dickinson, Mo.	Juul	Park	Walsh
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Parker	Walters
Dominick	Kelley, Mich.	Parrish	Ward
Donovan	Kelly, Pa.	Pell	Wason
Dooling	Kendall	Peters	Watkins
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Watson, Va.
Dowell	Kiess	Porter	Weaver
Drane	Kincheloe	Pou	Webb
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Quin	Webster
Dunn	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Welling
Dupré	Kleczka	Ragsdale	Welty
Whaley	Wilson, Ill.	Wise	Yates
Wheeler	Wilson, La.	Wood, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
White, Kans.	Wilson, Pa.	Woods, Va.	Young, Tex.
White, Me.	Wingo	Woodyard	
Williams	Winslow	Wright	

NOT VOTING—40.

Ashbrook	Fairfield	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.
Babka	Freeman	Kettner	Rouse
Britten	Goodall	King	Schall
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Browne	Heflin	Little	Slemp
Brumbaugh	Hersman	McClintic	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Hicks	Mann	Stiness
Eagle	Hull, Tenn.	Mason	Sullivan
Echols	Ireland	Neely	Sumners, Tex.
Emerson	Johnston, N. Y.	Purnell	Zihlman

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. HERSMAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, as directed by the House, the Committee on Appropriations reports back the bill with the amendment as adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reports that in obedience to the direction of the House he reports back the bill with the amendment as instructed by the House. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 43, line 5, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$8,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment to the bill I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 55, as follows:

YEAS—372.

Ackerman	Caraway	Edmonds	Haskell
Alexander	Carew	Elliott	Hastings
Almon	Carss	Ellsworth	Haugen
Anderson	Carter	Elston	Hawley
Andrews, Md.	Casey	Esch	Hayden
Andrews, Nebr.	Chindblom	Evans, Mont.	Hays
Anthony	Christopherson	Evans, Nebr.	Hernandez
Aswell	Clark, Mo.	Evans, Nev.	Hersey
Ayres	Classon	Ferris	Hickey
Bacharach	Cleary	Fess	Hoch
Bankhead	Coady	Fields	Houghton
Barbour	Cole	Fisher	Howard
Barkley	Collier	Fitzgerald	Huddleston
Bee	Connally	Focht	Hudspeth
Begg	Cooper	Fordney	Hulings
Bell	Copley	Foster	Hull, Iowa
Benham	Crago	Frear	Humphreys
Benson	Cramton	French	Husted
Black	Crisp	Fuller, Ill.	Hutchinson
Bland, Mo.	Crowther	Fuller, Mass.	Igoe
Bland, Va.	Cullen	Gallagher	Jacoway
Blanton	Currie, Mich.	Gallivan	James
Boies	Curry, Calif.	Gandy	Jefferis
Booher	Dale	Ganly	Johnson, Ky.
Bowers	Dallinger	Gard	Johnson, Miss.
Box	Darrow	Garland	Johnson, S. Dak.
Brand	Davey	Garner	Johnson, Wash.
Briggs	Davis, Minn.	Garrett	Jones, Pa.
Brinson	Davis, Tenn.	Glynn	Jones, Tex.
Brooks, Ill.	Dempsey	Godwin, N. C.	Juul
Brooks, Pa.	Denison	Goldfogle	Kearns
Browning	Dewalt	Good	Kelly, Pa.
Brumbaugh	Dickinson, Mo.	Goodwin, Ark.	Kendall
Burdick	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Kennedy, Iowa
Burke	Dominick	Graham, Pa.	Kennedy, R. I.
Burroughs	Donovan	Graham, Ill.	Kiess
Butler	Dooling	Green, Iowa	Kincheloe
Byrnes, S. C.	Doughton	Greene, Mass.	Kinkaid
Byrns, Tenn.	Dowell	Griest	Kitchin
Caldwell	Drane	Hadley	Kleczka
Campbell, Kans.	Dunbar	Hamill	Knutson
Campbell, Pa.	Dunn	Hamilton	Kraus
Candler	Dupré	Hardy, Colo.	Kreider
Cannon	Dyer	Hardy, Tex.	LaGuardia
Cantrill	Eagan	Harrison	Lampert

Lanham	Mooney	Ricketts	Thomas
Lankford	Moore, Ohio	Riddick	Thompson, Ohio
Larsen	Moore, Pa.	Riordan	Thompson, Okla.
Layton	Moore, Va.	Robinson, N. C.	Tillman
Lazaro	Moores, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.	Tilson
Lea, Calif.	Morgan	Rodenberg	Timberlake
Lehlbach	Morin	Rogers	Tincher
Lesher	Mott	Romjue	Tinkham
Lever	Mudd	Rose	Towner
Linthicum	Murphy	Rowan	Treadway
Lonergan	Nelson, Mo.	Rowe	Upshaw
Longworth	Nelson, Wis.	Rubey	Vaile
Luce	Newton, Minn.	Rucker	Vare
Lufkin	Newton, Mo.	Sabath	Venable
Luhring	Nicholls, S. C.	Sanders, Ind.	Vestal
McAndrews	Nolan	Sanders, La.	Vinson
McArthur	O'Connell	Sanders, N. Y.	Volgt
McCulloch	O'Connor	Sanford	Volstead
McDuffie	Ogden	Scott	Walsh
McFadden	Oldfield	Sears	Walters
McGlennon	Oliver	Sells	Ward
McKenzie	Olney	Sherwood	Wason
McKeown	Osborne	Shreve	Watkins
McKiniry	Overstreet	Siegel	Watson, Pa.
McKinley	Padgett	Sims	Watson, Va.
McLane	Paige	Sinclair	Weaver
McLaughlin, Mich.	Park	Sinnott	Webb
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Parker	Sisson	Webster
McPherson	Pell	Small	Welling
MacCrate	Peters	Smith, Idaho	Welty
MacGregor	Phelan	Smith, Ill.	Whaley
Madden	Platt	Smith, Mich.	Wheeler
Magee	Porter	Smithwick	White, Kans.
Maher	Quin	Snell	White, Me.
Major	Radcliffe	Snyder	Williams
Mansfield	Ragsdale	Steagall	Wilson, Ill.
Mapes	Rainey, H. T.	Stedman	Wilson, La.
Martin	Rainey, J. W.	Steele	Wilson, Pa.
Mays	Raker	Steenerson	Wingo
Mead	Ramsey	Stephens, Ohio	Winslow
Merritt	Ramseyer	Stevenson	Wise
Michener	Randall, Calif.	Strong, Kans.	Wood, Ind.
Miller	Randall, Wis.	Strong, Pa.	Woodyard
Minahan, N. J.	Rayburn	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Monahan, Wis.	Reavis	Sweet	Yates
Mondell	Reber	Taylor, Ark.	Young, N. Dak.
Montague	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.	Young, Tex.
Moon	Rhodes	Temple	Zihlman

NAYS—1.

Buchanan

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Clark, Fla. Langley

NOT VOTING—55.

Ashbrook	Flood	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.
Babka	Freeman	Kelley, Mich.	Rouse
Baer	Goodall	Kettner	Saunders, Va.
Blackmon	Gould	King	Schall
Bland, Ind.	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Britten	Griffin	Little	Slemp
Browne	Heflin	McClintic	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Hersman	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Dent	Hicks	Mason	Stiness
Doremus	Hill	Neely	Sullivan
Eagle	Holland	Nichols, Mich.	Summers, Wash.
Echols	Hull, Tenn.	Parrish	Taylor, Colo.
Emerson	Ireland	Pou	Woods, Va.
Fairfield	Johnston, N. Y.	Purnell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. WOODS of Virginia.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas with Mr. RAKER.

Mr. BAER with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. POU.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. REED of West Virginia, is absent from the city. I desire to announce that if he were present he would vote for the passage of this bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSEN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a portion of a letter, and also remarks of my own, on conditions in the Near East.

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

Mr. MONDELL. On what subject?

Mr. LARSEN. On conditions in the Near East.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COPIES OF THE PEACE TREATY.

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up concurrent resolution No. 5, providing for the printing of 50,000 copies of the treaty with Germany, 40,000 of which are to go to the Senate and 10,000 to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of concurrent resolution No. 5. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, that is not a fair divvy between the Senate and the House.

Mr. KIESS. I realize that the proportion is the wrong way, but because of the fact that the Senate has to deal entirely with the peace treaty and that it is not a matter for the House, the committee consented to that division, thinking 10,000 copies would be enough for the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that this is a Senate concurrent resolution, and that it has not yet come over from the Senate. Therefore the gentleman withdraws his request.

NEAR EAST RELIEF.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill S. 180 from the Speaker's table and put it on its passage in lieu of bill H. R. 412, which has been reported from the Judiciary Committee and is on the House Calendar, No. 36.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to lay before the House the bill S. 180, to incorporate Near East Relief.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not feel at liberty to do that under the rule already existing.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, is not the bill S. 180 accompanied by the House bill 412 subject to being called up?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it can not under the terms of the rule under which the House is operating making the prohibitory enforcement bill in order.

Mr. WALSH. And if the Chair will permit me to state, the rule requires that the Senate bill must come over after the House bill has been reported, which is not the case.

The SPEAKER. It can not come up except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARD. Is it the ruling of the Chair that it can only come up so long as the pending rule prevails?

The SPEAKER. That is all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a request for unanimous consent. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH] was called out while we were taking the vote on the passage of the sundry civil bill, but is now present. Inasmuch as there is no opposition to the bill, I ask unanimous consent that he may be recorded in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that that can not be done by unanimous consent.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING BEVERAGES.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GOOD in the chair.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I rise for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CULLEN. I want to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill if he can give us any information when we may possibly arrive at a vote?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CULLEN. The reason I ask is that I am gathering some statistics relating to the loss of revenue in the State of New York, which I would like to have incorporated in the RECORD. I have not received it up to this minute, and the question in my mind is whether I will be able to get those statistics into the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman can get them in now if he asks permission.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, so far as it relates to this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose there was an amendment pending to section 2 of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Page 2, line 18, after the word "conduct," strike out the words "prosecution of."

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, if it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Strike out lines 17, 18, and 19 on page 2 of the bill. Strike out the comma after the word "offenders" and insert a period.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is that we may strike from the bill the provision authorizing agents and inspectors of the Internal-Revenue Department to conduct the committing trial of offenders to be bound over to the grand jury before the United States commissioner.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that it lowers the dignity of the United States courts to permit any individual to appear and conduct an examination in the absence of the United States attorney or his assistant. Not only does it lower the dignity of the court itself, but it reverts in many instances to injury both to the Government and the defendant, for this reason: An inspector is not acquainted with the rules of law and the rules of evidence, and might introduce before the commissioner evidence illegal in its character, so that without foundation in law men might be bound over to the grand jury where there is no possibility and no probability of an indictment by the grand jury, and the twofold purpose results—one is an innocent man is bound over because some one is not acquainted with the rules of evidence and the provisions of the Criminal Code and conducts the examination in such a manner as to bring out testimony that is not legal.

Upon the other hand, in many instances the examining trial is reduced to writing. The testimony in many of the States of the Union of witnesses taken at the examining trial operates as the appearance under the Constitution that holds that a party must be confronted by witnesses. The Government, in the absence of a trained lawyer or a man experienced in the law and in its procedure, finds itself with testimony taken at an examining trial, where the witness leaves the State and is no longer available, of such a meager character that the Government is deprived of the testimony that would have resulted in the conviction of the defendant.

Mr. Chairman, a prohibition law ought not to be any different from any other law. I am opposed, I will frankly state to the House, to the enactment and continuance of war-time prohibition, as I am opposed to the continuance of all these war-emergency measures that were put upon the people in order that the war might be successfully conducted, and for that period only. So far as my State is concerned, prohibition has been adopted by the constitutional vote of the people of that State. Therefore, it is a moot question there; but I do not desire to vote for a code for the enforcement of the new constitutional provision of the country that is not based on a rule of sane reasoning and procedure. I submit to the House that while it might be done ordinarily, it is a dangerous precedent to turn over the committing examination of a citizen of this country for violation of the Federal law of the land to a man not trained in the law and not holding a license from the constituted authorities of his State.

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

Mr. BEE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Texas is aware of the fact that in most of the Federal districts in this country there is a district attorney, with one or two assistant district attorneys, and that they have their offices at the headquarters of the Federal court, which is usually in the largest city in the district. Some of those districts may extend over two or three hundred miles, and it would be physically impossible for the assistant district attorneys or the district attorney to attend these examining trials. What provision would the gentleman make in a case of that kind for some one to represent the Government?

Mr. BEE. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How many United States commissioners have you in the same district where you have one district attorney and several assistant district attorneys?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is a United States commissioner wherever there is a Federal court held.

Mr. BEE. Therefore, if you have a Federal court, where you have the Federal court do you not have an officer detailed?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all. There is no assistant district attorney detailed for the office where there is a commissioner. The assistant district attorneys remain in the office of the district attorney. The commissioners are scattered about over the State at places where the Federal courts are held twice a year or more frequently, or not so often, as the case may be; but there is no regular assistant district attorney stationed at every place where the court is held.

Mr. BEE. Of course, I do not know the procedure elsewhere, but in my district we have a district attorney and the court is held at four different places. We have a United States assistant district attorney at each one of those places, and wherever there is a commissioner there ought to be some one to represent the peace and dignity of this great Government and not have it turned over to some individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is to perfect the paragraph. The so-called substitute is to strike out the paragraph, and the question will therefore first occur on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is a strange proposition to present. If the gentleman's motion was carried, he would not accomplish what he seeks at all, because under the general practice these agents would carry on these committing trials just as they are doing everywhere and in every State. I do not believe there is any law anywhere that requires an attorney admitted to practice law to appear before a committing magistrate.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Just a moment. The object of this provision which the amendment proposes to strike out is to limit these men by placing them under the control of the district attorneys. That is all. If there should be any that were not carrying on these prosecutions in a proper fashion, the United States attorney could refuse to have them appear before these courts and prosecute.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I did not understand that the gentleman asked me to yield.

Mr. GARD. I was merely suggesting a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that he can not take another gentleman off the floor with a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARD. I have no desire to take the gentleman off the floor.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We had this matter under consideration when the bill was up on Saturday, and my understanding was that this section had been fully considered, and that there was no serious objection to it. Certainly there is no objection to it upon the ground suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE], and in view of the great amount of time that has been taken on this bill and the very liberal discussion allowed, coupled with the further fact that this is not a matter of vital consequence one way or the other, I move that all debate upon the section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. The Chair suggested a while ago that the question for the consideration of the committee was the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. The so-called substitute of the gentleman from Texas is to strike out the section. I am informed—and I am merely stating this for those who may not have heard the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota—that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] and others desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to strike out can not be a substitute, because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky was to insert certain words. The motion of the gentleman from Texas is to strike out all of the section after the end of line 16. After the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky is acted upon, then the question will recur upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. The only Member rising in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas was the chairman of the committee, Mr. VOLSTEAD, who in effect stated that he did not consider the amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. The parliamentary inquiry is this, Mr. Chairman. [Cries of "Vote!"] That is not going to stop me when I want to address the Chair. Is such a motion in order until a Member of this Congress who desires to be heard in opposition to the amendment has been given opportunity to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it is in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota to close debate upon section 2 and all amendments thereto.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 76, noes 13.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. Whenever the gag rule is going to be applied they will not gain any time by it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-two Members are present, a quorum. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That any room, house, building, boat, vehicle, structure, or place of any kind where intoxicating liquor is sold, manufactured, kept for sale, or bartered in violation of the war prohibition act, and all intoxicating liquor and all property kept and used in maintaining such a place, is hereby declared to be a public and common nuisance, and any person who maintains or assists in maintaining such public and common nuisance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $100 or more than $1,000, or be imprisoned for not less than 30 days or more than 1 year, or both. If a person has knowledge or reason to believe that his property is occupied or used in violation of the provisions of the war prohibition act and suffers the same to be so used, such property shall be subject to a lien for any may be sold to pay all fines and costs assessed against the occupant of such building or property for any violation of the war prohibition act, which said lien shall attach from the time of the service of summons on the owner or his agent; and any such lien may be established and enforced by legal action instituted for that purpose in any court having jurisdiction.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, line 4, page 3, by striking out the first "or" and inserting "nor."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after the figures "$100," strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nor."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, on page 3, line 10, I move to strike out the word "any" and insert "and." It is a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the word "for," strike out the word "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the word "jurisdiction," insert "any violation of this title upon any leased premises by the lessee or occupant thereof shall, at the option of the lessor, work a forfeiture of the lease."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I accept that.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I think the chairman has that covered in another section, and I reserve the point of order, so that the chairman may explain that after the explanation by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It does not apply to this title.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of that amendment comes by reason of the fact that it is undertaken here to make the lessor of a building liable if intoxicating liquors are sold or used on the premises contrary to law, and, of course, as a fundamental proposition of justice you can not hold a man legally liable unless he is in some way responsible for the wrongful act. The lessor of premises has not the right to terminate the lease and hence no control over the conduct of the lessee unless he is given that power by law. This provides the same provision that is carried in the second division of this bill, but it is not applicable here because by the language there it is confined to that particular section and hence would not have reference to this. Without such a provision I doubt the validity of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order made on this section? If not, the Chair will put the question. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the word "jurisdiction" insert, "provided that in no case shall any lien attach exceeding in amount the equitable holding of such owner."

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, it is clear that in the matter of a mortgaged piece of property a great many people who have had nothing to do with the commitment of any crime and who are only guilty of owing property should not have their interests in the property jeopardized by this law, and I take it for granted that the gentlemen do not want to do any such thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman understand as a matter of law that a lien can attach to a man's property beyond what he possesses in it, whether it is equitable or legal?

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will wait a minute I will show you the difficulties you are getting into. If a piece of property is tied up by a mortgage or a deed of trust there would be a great deal of difficulty at the time of expiration.

Now, I wish to have the attention of the gentlemen for a minute. I do not intend to take but a minute or two to explain this amendment. You will notice that a mortgage or a deed of trust about to expire, with the difficulties pending against the property on account of the violation of this war prohibition act, that it would be next to impossible to renew the lease or the mortgage, and now I take it for granted that you gentlemen have no desire to ruin anybody, that you want to sit here and play fair. If you play fair, what you ought to do is to tie up the owner of the equitable title in the property to the extent of his equity only. You should do no more than that, and I take it for granted that that is all you intend to do. My amendment provides that no lien shall attach in excess of the amount that the owner has as an equitable interest in the property.

I do not think there is anything unfair in it, and it would settle in the mind of any financial man to whom you might apply for a renewal of your loan exactly the amount of the difficulty in which the property is involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I wish to invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that the lien which is created in line 9 of page 3 of the bill does not make it a first lien. Therefore the lien retained in this bill would be subject to the lien the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. JUUL. Correct; but you have not defined in this bill what the lien amounts to. I am defining what the lien amounts to when an applicant comes to the bank and wants to renew the loan on his property during the term of his difficulty. The limitation would be equal to the owner's equity.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Do you expect that one could procure a renewal of the lien while a suit to enforce a forfeiture for the wrongful use of the property is pending?

Mr. JUUL. I wish to tell the gentleman that I think it would be very difficult. With possibly a first, second, and sometimes a third mortgage on a piece of property, I think it would be extremely difficult to go to any financial agent in the city in

which I reside and renew a mortgage unless you are able to assure him of exactly the difficulties you were in by virtue of the passage of this act. My amendment provides that your difficulty is no greater than your equity, title, or interest in the property, and I can not see why any gentleman should sit on this floor and be unreasonable to the extent of refusing this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be possible under his amendment for the owner of property to mortgage it for its full value so as to escape the large penalty which would accrue by reason of this Government lien?

Mr. JUUL. I wish to say to the gentleman that that would not be possible at all, because, at least in my State, the mortgage would have to be a matter of record. And I wish to say to the gentleman that one of my reasons for asking for this amendment—and, mind you, you are serving your own people in passing it——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JUUL. I ask for a minute and a half more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for a minute and a half more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. Now, if——

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his colleague have three additional minutes.

Mr. FESS. I object. He has not asked for it.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JUUL. I wish to say here that according to the provision at the bottom of page 4 and in the top line of page 5 the owner is brought into court and is asked to give bonds in the full value of the property; of course he can not do that. He does not own the full value of the property. Therefore I am desirous that you define the extent of the difficulty the owner has gotten into by limiting the amount of the lien to the amount that the owner whom you are hailing into court owns in that property. Now, do you want more than that?

I submit my amendment to your tender mercies.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the amendment——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This proposition I do not think dangerous to anybody. It does not involve the lien beyond the equity that the man has. It would simply be whatever interest the person had, or in case there was an owner who suffered or permitted the property to be used for the purpose, it might attach to his interest as well as the other. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

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

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] moves that all debate upon this amendment be now closed.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask, since I want to vote understandingly on the amendment, unanimous consent that it be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the gentleman's request as soon as he has put the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 31.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks for tellers. All in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Ten gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have been disappointed with the attitude taken by those who have framed this bill and are now forcing it through the House. The principle of prohibition has won a great victory in the United States. In 45 States the legislatures have voted to ratify an amendment to the Constitution making it unlawful to manufacture or sell intoxicating liquors. It is a great experiment, one that no other great Christian nation ever tried. The enactment of statutes by which such an amendment to the Constitution is to be enforced becomes a serious as well as important matter. Surely it is a time when all right-thinking persons can afford to sit down and consider calmly and carefully what are the best means for working out satisfactorily under the amendment a most complicated social and economic problem.

Unfortunately we have seen no such attitude on the part of the proponents of this bill. Instead of considering calmly the kind of provisions that might work the least hardship, this bill seems almost fanatical in its methods and apparent purpose to make law abiding just as difficult and law breaking just as certain as possible.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order. He is not speaking to the word "jurisdiction."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am doing nothing more than what is usually done in debate under the five-minute rule. At any rate, I am discussing the bill. I have not heretofore taken one single minute of time since the discussion of this bill began.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point.

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman. The spirit of some of those who are demanding the most extreme legislation is well characterized by Clarence Day, jr., in some verses printed in the New Republic, entitled:

SIC SEMPER DISSENTERS.

In the town of Hottentottenville an aged Hottentot,
  Whose name was Hottentotten-Tillypoo,
Was feebly hottentottering around a vacant lot,
  With a vacant look upon his higgaboo.
Now "higgaboo" is Hottentot, as you may know, for "face,"
And to wear a vacant look upon your face is a disgrace.
But poor old Mr. Tillypoo, he had no other place
  Though I understand it grieved him through (and thru).

He was grubbing up potatoes in an aimless sort of way
  (Which really was the only way he had),
And an officer was watching him to hear what he might say,
  And arrest him if the thing he said was bad;
For it seems this wretched Tillypoo had gone and had the thought
That his neighbors didn't always do exactly as they ought;
And as this was rank sedition, why, they hoped to see him caught;
  For it naturally made 'm pretty mad.

So the men of Hottentottenville, they passed a little law,
  Which they called the Hotta-Shotta-Shootem act,
Which fixed it so the postman was a kind of Grand Bashaw,
  Who determined what was false and what was fact.
And the postman sentenced Tillypoo, and wouldn't hear his wails,
But kept him twenty years apiece in all the local jails,
And said he couldn't vote no more, and barred him from the mails,
  And expressed the hope that this would teach him tact.

Well, the last I heard of Tilly, he was trying not to think,
  And he'd tied a piece of string around his tongue,
And he never went within a mile of either pen or ink,
  And he always stood when any song was sung.
And maybe you are thinking that his fate was rather tough,
But what I say is, not a bit, they didn't do enough;
When anybody differs with you, dammit, treat 'm rough;
  Why, they ought to be bub-boiled alive and hung.

Why should a bill for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and a bill to perpetuate war-time prohibition be attached to each other like Siamese twins? Is it not because of the fact that so-called war prohibition is not able to stand upon its own merits? Everyone knows that war-time prohibition was from the beginning one-third fraud and two-thirds fake. It was not put into operation until the war was over, and there never was any substantial ground for it as a war measure.

The eighteenth amendment stands upon entirely different ground. In the way and manner provided in the Constitution itself it was submitted and ratified. It is now an integral part of the Constitution we have sworn to support and defend. My own State of Connecticut, in the proper exercise of its rights, did not ratify this amendment; but the amendment being ratified in the orderly, constitutional way, the people of Connecticut are now just as ready, just as zealous, as the people of any other State for the proper enforcement of its provisions.

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

Mr. TILSON. May I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. As one of the representatives of Connecticut in this body I am ready to vote for a reasonable law to enforce the eighteenth amendment, and, as I said at the outset, I am deeply disappointed that the proponents of this bill have seen fit to couple together two matters that do not belong together and otherwise endeavor to make it difficult or impossible to support the bill. Is it vain to hope that even yet the advocates of this bill will relent so as to permit the passage of a law than can and will be enforced? [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if the word "person," on page 3, line 6, has any limitation? I notice on page 7 it is defined as meaning "natural persons," and so forth. Would "persons" include executors, administrators, and trustees within the meaning of this act?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The Federal statutes define a person as a company, firm, or corporation.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. But not as a trustee?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. On line 13 of page 3 your committee provides only that the summons shall be served "on the owner or his agent." Now, we all know that the owner is responsible for his agent. But suppose A dies and leaves an estate to B, and C is executor. B lives in England and knows nothing about his property, and his property is used in violation of the provisions of this act. We all know that an executor is an officer of the court. On whom would you then serve the summons?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think I would leave it to the court to determine. It would probably be served by publication, he being a nonresident.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. You provide that it shall be served on the owner.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. You serve it on the owner by publication. If he could be reached, you would serve it in person; and if not, you would serve it upon him by publication.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Suppose the owner lived abroad?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It would be the same as in any other case.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Why not provide for the service of summons on the fiduciary? It seems to me the door has been left open for fraud. A fiduciary who knowingly leases property contrary to this bill should be held responsible. This section only makes the owner or his agent liable.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment and ask to be recognized to present the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Page 3, line 6, after the word "person," insert "as the owner or fiduciary." In line 7, after the word "property," insert "or property held by him in any form of trust whatsoever." And on line 13, after the word "summons," insert "on the fiduciary or."

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

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, my impression——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. My impression, Mr. Chairman, is that that is entirely unnecessary, and besides I do not think it would be fair to charge the estate in that fashion for the misconduct, for instance, of some fiduciary officer of the class that might come under this provision. I do not think we ought to try to make this so extreme that people would object to it on that account. [Laughter.] I think we cover enough ground in this for war-time prohibition, and I do not think we should go any further.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee, I will withhold my remarks until I offer my amendment.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I propose an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, let us have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Can not a man on this side be recognized once in a while?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be given an opportunity.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, after the word "both," in line 6, on page 3, the remainder of the section.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Page 3, line 6, after the word "both," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. Is this amendment in order before an amendment to perfect the text?

The CHAIRMAN. If there are any amendments to perfect the text, it will be in order to offer them before the vote is taken on the motion to strike out.

Mr. GARD. I desire to offer an amendment to perfect the text, but I do not want to interfere with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Is my amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. If there is any amendment to perfect the text, that can be offered before the vote is taken on the motion to strike out.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been recognized to offer an amendment, which he has offered. He has a right to be heard on his amendment, and he can not be taken from the floor by anyone seeking to offer other amendments. When he has concluded it will be competent for any Member to offer a perfecting amendment, and such amendment will be voted on first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Chair had not ruled that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was not entitled to five minutes to discuss his amendment. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] announced that he had an amendment to perfect the text, and the Chair announced that amendments to perfect the text would be in order before the vote was taken on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARD. I may have an opportunity to offer my amendment later?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the people of this country have risen in their might and their strength and are determined to wipe out drunkenness and carousing, and I do not believe there is a gentleman on the floor of this House who is opposed to that proposition.

It is our duty to pass a proper enforcement law, but in this proposed enforcement act there are different provisions to which I take exception. One is the section that I propose to strike out by the amendment which I have just offered. I do not think it is at all within reason to subject every man's real estate to levy and sale because somebody has violated a law on that piece of property. If you own an apartment house occupied by many tenants, should you be liable for violations of law by some of your tenants? If you own a farm, should you be responsible for violations of law committed by tenants or any person that might visit or trespass upon that farm? If, by the savings of a lifetime, you or any thrifty son of toil accumulates a home and that home be rented, should that modest home be put in jeopardy because of a violation of law by that tenant? A thousand crimes, a thousand violations of the law, can be committed on your property to-day without subjecting it to levy and sale to satisfy a fine that may be imposed upon the offenders.

I say it is entirely wrong to make this an exception, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. LAYTON. In such a case is not the language of this bill and the spirit of it a very definite statement that the owner

of the property is in collusion with the tenant, and is not that the part of it which you seek to strike out?

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. It should be only where he is in collusion. The language which I seek to strike out is as follows:

If a person has knowledge or reason to believe that his property is occupied or used in violation of the provisions of the war prohibition act and suffers the same to be so used, such property shall be subject to a lien for and may be sold to pay all fines and costs assessed against the occupant of such building or property for any violation of the war prohibition act, which said lien shall attach from the time of the service of summons on the owner or his agent; and any such lien may be established and enforced by legal action instituted for that purpose in any court having jurisdiction.

Now, many cases might arise in which a man owning property could be put on the defensive and be obliged to defend himself, at an enormous expense, to save his property.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. No; I will not yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to say that the language used in this section and that which the amendment seeks to strike out is in effect like the language used in the red-light law for the District of Columbia which is now in force, and that is almost identically copied from the law of Iowa. It has been very effectual in its operation here, and I am informed also in the State of Iowa, and it has worked no wrong upon anybody who was not guilty and did not have guilty knowledge, and I do not believe it should be stricken out.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROOKS], and what I wish to say regarding it will be from a very different viewpoint. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says, in discussing his amendment:

That the people of this country are determined to wipe out drunkenness and carousing.

I do not believe there is a Member here who is opposed to stamping out drunkenness. He also says:

I do not think it is at all within reason to subject every man's real estate to levy and sale because somebody has violated a law on that piece of property.

Now, the gentleman appears to have a great deal of sympathy for the man who owns property, because he says:

If by the savings of a lifetime you or any thrifty son of toil accumulates a home and that home be rented, should that modest home be put in jeopardy because of a violation of law by that tenant?

I agree with him that it should not. I do not believe that the property of any man should be jeopardized by the passage of this act. However, I suppose he is going to vote for this bill.

I am of the opinion that the Members here, who are anxious for this bill to become a law, care very little for property rights, because they propose to wipe out thousands of millions of dollars' worth of property belonging to men who have spent their lives in the liquor business, and who, by their thrift and labor, have been able to accumulate a certain amount, which you now propose to destroy without any consideration for them or compensation for the loss they suffer. The man who owns a house or any other building may have the same placed in jeopardy by the passage of this bill if some one has violated the law upon it, but the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property that men own who have been in the liquor business for years, as has been said in partnership in a way with the Government, to whom they have paid billions of dollars in revenue, does not seem to excite any interest or consideration here whatever, and gentlemen who favor the passage of this bill apparently do not care how much property belonging to them or what kind is destroyed.

I do not hesitate to say that I have some regard, respect, and sympathy for the people who will be ruined by the enactment of this law. If there was any decency or fairness left in the framers of this proposed legislation, they certainly ought to compensate these men for the loss of stock, leases, and the destruction of their business; but instead of that you propose to wipe them out without any regard or thought for their future welfare. To destroy property in the name of the State, without reimbursing the owners, is a dangerous practice.

You seem to think it a joke to injure, ruin, and make worthless their holdings and wreck a business long legalized. Never before in the history of the Government was such a tyrannical reform attempted. Home rule, self-government, and the liberty of the people is to be destroyed, and persecution is to be the order of the day, but before long you will find that you have gone too far. You have the votes to do it, but might is not right; you should be fair and just in this matter.

I believe in temperance; I believe in proper laws to regulate the sale of liquor, and it can and ought to be regulated; but there has never been any effort since I have been a Member of Congress to pass laws for its regulation. What the men want who are behind this prohibition movement is to force prohibition upon the country, regardless of consequences, because they have learned the practical and up-to-date way of doing it. The legislative agents, or the lobby, of the prohibition combine that has been forcing this law through Congress have studied the practical methods adopted by the great combinations and corporations, and because of this they have been able to secure favorable legislation in nearly every legislative body in the United States; they are up to date in practical politics and through their browbeating, bulldozing, and threatening tactics this well-financed antisaloon lobby have scared men in political life everywhere in this country into believing that all of the good people in this country are in favor of this kind of legislation; that all of the church members of the country are demanding it. My, how human nature has changed, if that is so. I think this legislation is wrong and when enforced it will put more men out of politics than any law that was ever passed.

I am opposing this bill to-day—although you have the votes to pass it—because it is unjust, unfair, and un-American, and the most malicious assault on personal liberty that could be made. Fair-minded people, regardless of their views on prohibition, are against it. If it goes into effect, thousands upon thousands of men directly employed in the liquor business, as well as thousands of others in business dependent upon the liquor trade, will be thrown out of employment at a time when the Army is being demobilized and work is hard to obtain. Is it any wonder we have unrest, disaffection, and discontent in the country? We are fighting this measure because it is wrong; and you may think you are winning a great victory by passing it, but the fight has only commenced. It will be denounced in every section of the United States before long, and the men in politics who are responsible for this legislation will be driven from office and power. [Laughter.]

My friend from California [Mr. RANDALL], the prohibitionist, is laughing at that statement. Well, he may laugh about it; he can afford to laugh; he was elected as a Prohibitionist; but let me remind the House that "those who laugh last laugh longest."

Mr. UPSHAW. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman who depends upon the keg of liquor should be put out of politics?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Oh, that is cheap talk; we hear that line of talk from men who think they are making friends by going around speechifying and pretending to work for the general welfare of the people and the good of the public.

Unto those who talk and talk,
This proverb should appeal:
The steam that blows the whistle
Will never turn the wheel.

Men who do the greatest good for the community in which they live, as a rule, do not blow about it. Professional agitators shout about anything they think will make them popular. [Laughter and applause.]

I voted against the so-called prohibition amendment to the Constitution, to take effect January 1, 1920, when it was before this House for passage. I do not believe in this kind of legislation or the way it was put over. At the time of its passage it was understood that men in the liquor business would have one year after the ratification of the article by the States to wind up their business, and it was so stated at that time by the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He said:

While we prohibitionists desire to have the country go dry, we do not propose to let our zeal in that great cause destroy our sense of justice, and I for one was willing to advocate the right of the brewers and distillers to have one year to wind up their business. We have distinguished precedents for this in the action of nearly all the dry States. Most of the States give them a year in which they may wind up their business. I think it a perfectly fair amendment, and I will be very glad to vote for it, and I hope the dry Members will vote for it. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 17, 1917, p. 432.)

In view of this understanding, men in the liquor business withdrew large quantities of liquor from the bonded warehouses, upon which they paid a tax of $6.40 a gallon, and the retailers throughout the country now have large stocks of liquor on hand, many having already paid a license to conduct their business for a year believing they had that length of time to wind up their affairs before the constitutional amendment would be enforced January 16 next.

I have many letters from men in the business in Chicago that will show the injustice of this law. Let me read you a letter

from a firm in my district, through whose efforts has been built up one of the largest businesses of the kind in the United States:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 27, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS GALLAGHER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With the war-time prohibition bill of November 21, 1918, apparently going into effect July 1, 1919, we respectfully call your attention to the injustice of this untimely legislation.

We are holders of large stocks of whiskies of various ages that are doomed to remain unsold in the United States bonded warehouses. Many others find themselves similarly situated, and, in fact, records seem to indicate that 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 gallons of whiskies will be denied an outlet of sale by the arbitrarily setting of this date of prohibition. These spirits were distilled according to specific laws passed by Congress compelling distillers to carry stocks for bottled-in-bond purposes four years in advance of public sale. These liquors, suddenly cut off from public sale after having been brought into existence under Government permission and approval, are virtually confiscated and places an unprecedented loss on their owners.

In addition to this, the Government will sustain a loss in tax at $6.40 per gallon, or approximately $400,000,000, not to mention a further loss through income and profit taxes that will be consequently charged off by owners.

Can Congress, in justice to the business interests of both the people and the Government, consistently deny the owners of these liquors the right to dispose of their stocks before the coming into effect of the Federal prohibition amendment?

We ask you in true-spirit fairness to give this subject, so vital to the welfare of business during these critical moments, your worthy consideration, and only ask sufficient time to tax pay and dispose of distilled spirits now in bond.

Trusting that you will do all in your power to impress on Congress the necessity of legislation to that effect, we remain,

Yours, respectfully,

MORAND BROS.,
S. J. MORAND, *President.*

Here is another statement from a business concern in Chicago that will no doubt prove interesting, if reason and fair dealing has anything to do with the passage of this bill:

CHICAGO, *May 29, 1919.*

Hon. THOMAS GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Permit us to present for your consideration the following facts: At the present time we have a floor stock of liquors which cost us over $50,000; paid in revenue and war taxes, $150,000; still owing additional war taxes due in September, $150,000; total cost of floor stock, $350,000. In other words, for our floor stock the Government receives $300,000. Besides we own bonded goods at cost price of $60,000, on which we must pay the Government about $400,000 before we can get a dollar of our investment.

Our situation is typical of hundreds of others throughout the country.

Is it fair or just that our entire investment, made in good faith and under Government sanction and approval, should be wiped out next July 1 without any chance of redress? Is it consistent with just principles of Government to arbitrarily destroy the property of its citizens without just compensation?

We do not protest against constitutional prohibition. All we ask is protection against the ruinous operation of a war measure which has now ceased to have merit or reason. In fairness and plain justice we ask you to use every honorable means to bring about the repeal of the act of November 21, 1918, or in some manner make it lawful to dispose of liquors now on hand until constitutional prohibition becomes effective.

Respectfully, yours,

EITEL BROS.

A few months' time means a great deal to liquor dealers under the circumstances and would help them to dispose of their stocks, upon which they have paid the Government tax.

We were told that war-time prohibition was necessary to control the food cereals of the country; that it was a food-conservation measure to help us win the war. It was made a law when more than 4,000,000 men were in the service of the country at home and abroad, at a time when we were shipping rye, corn, and barley abroad for the use of foreign brewers. Every sane person, whether he is in favor of prohibition or not, knows that this was not a war measure. The war is over and peace has been declared, and to force this war-time prohibition act upon the country a few months after it was understood that one year was to be allowed those in the liquor business to close up their affairs is indefensible and unjust. Is the Government willing to back up this fraud? I do not believe it. The President is against it; he has said so. Let me read you his message to Congress May 20, 1919:

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the act approved November 21, 1918, entitled "An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

WOODROW WILSON.

In the face of this fact, do you believe for a moment the President will sign the bill that you are now attempting to pass? He will veto it, and he ought to veto it.

It was stated here in debate that Illinois is for prohibition, that the legislature of the State ratified the constitutional amendment. That is so, but it has never been approved by the people themselves.

The question was submitted last spring to the people of Chicago, that contains nearly one-half of the population of the State, and the people voted against prohibition by a large majority. In the dry districts of Chicago, where there are no saloons, the vote was against prohibition. Even Hyde Park voted wet, and Lake View voted wet; in wards where the saloon keepers have little or no influence they were carried by the wets. One hundred and twenty-four thousand seven hundred and thirty-one women voted wet, while 76,325 women voted dry. Nearly 400,000 men and women voted against prohibition, and less than 159,000 voted for it. I merely cite these figures to show you that national prohibition has been fastened upon the people through the activities of prohibition agents without ever giving the public a chance to express their wishes upon it.

Listen to what the New York World in an editorial, April 27, 1919, says:

Neither of the great parties, Democratic or Republican, ever advocated national prohibition. No Congress was ever elected on that issue. No President ever championed it. No Democratic or Republican candidate for President ever championed it. It was never put forward by the leaders of either party. The Congress that submitted it was elected in 1916, but neither the Democrats nor the Republicans had a word to say about prohibition in their national platforms. Neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Hughes ever mentioned the subject. When Congress submitted the amendment to a country whose attention and energies were all absorbed in the greatest war of all history it submitted an amendment on which the American people had never been permitted to go to the ballot box.

We are now called upon to pass a bill to provide for the enforcement of war-time prohibition and to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages under the constitutional amendment that will be more drastic and unreasonable than any legislator ever dreamed of when he voted for the ratification of the amendment. You propose now to make prohibition a political issue that will remain with us for years to come, and it will plague every man who is responsible for forcing this unwise, unfair, and drastic act upon the people without their consent, and every man responsible for it will have to answer to the people, who will not forget it.

As John J. McKenna, the poet of Archey Road, says in Public Safety:

WE CAN'T FORGET IT.

July the first will soon be here,
When they'll shut off our wine and beer.
Why have they pulled that awful stunt
To hang crêpe on that glorious month
In which we won our freedom?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at the end of five minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I gave notice that I had an amendment that I wanted to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota by making it 10 minutes, and that the gentleman from Ohio have 5 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that that is not in order.

Mr. IGOE. Then I move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota by making it 15 minutes, so that three gentlemen who I see have arisen may have 5 minutes each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes had it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify my motion by making it 10 minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE]. I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again put the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to amend the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were 65 ayes and 20 noes.

So the motion to amend the motion of Mr. VOLSTEAD was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota as amended.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is limited on this section and all amendments thereto to 15 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. McPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment and have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike out the language after the word "the" in line 13 and the words "or his agent" in line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "entry and indexing of judgment."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the members of the Judiciary Committee to this language, which I think should be changed in the interest of justice as affecting the transfer of property. It in no way affects the fact that a lien may attach, but provides that instead of being a secret lien, such as there is now, by which no person purchasing property could be safeguarded, the lien attaches from the time of the indexing and the judgment in such cases. At the present time it provides that the lien attaches from the time of the service of the summons on the owner or his agent. No one seeking to buy property would have any notice at all of the service of summons on the owner or his agent, since the service of the summons is entirely a personal service, whereas the making of the index judgment is a public record of which every man is bound to take notice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not required that any legal notice of service by an officer must be returned to the court from which it issues and is a matter of record?

Mr. GARD. No; the return is made by the sheriff. The summons is given to the sheriff and the sheriff makes the return, but there is no record of the return except possibly his memoranda. But in this instance on the files of the clerk's or the recorder's office, whichever it may be, there is a permanent public judgment which all persons would be bound to observe. As I say, it makes no difference in reference to the lien; it provides that the lien may be taken, but it safeguards the interest of those who might be innocently and legitimately interested in the purchase of the property.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that in New York there is no way of ascertaining that the summons has been served, by way of public record, until the recovery of the judgment, unless it be revealed by the individuals who begin the suit?

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, any owner of property under the language of the gentleman's amendment might sell it to anyone else and thereby defeat even the lien on the judgment.

Mr. GARD. Oh, no.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 3, line 13, after the words "of the," strike out the words "service of summons on the owner or his agent" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "filing of notice thereof for record in the public office wherein are kept the records of the title to such real estate."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as to this language and the impracticability of giving notice of lien thereunder. In most of the States, as I understand it, there is no record in the office where land titles are kept of the service of a summons. The return of the service of summons is filed in the office of the clerk of the court. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, under it the lien will not become effective on property until the judgment is entered. The purpose of my amendment is to make the lien effective as soon as the legal notice is filed in the recorder's or registrar's office, where are kept the records of the title to real property.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman does away with all of the summons. What does the gentleman mean by "legal notice."

Mr. BARBOUR. Whatever legal notice is required in the State where the notice is to be given—a notice of attachment——

Mr. BLANTON. Should you not retain the words "of the service of summons on the owner or agent"? You do away with those words.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do away with those words so far as they affect the title to real property. You can not protect an innocent purchaser of real property if you put a lien on a man's property simply by service of summons on him.

Mr. BLANTON. You leave no provision here for the summons.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then put one in. I drew this amendment very hurriedly.

Mr. BLANTON. Which the gentleman from Ohio had in.

Mr. BARBOUR. If it is necessary, in order to get jurisdiction of the defendant, it should be in, but I think this other amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What the gentleman means by legal notice in the amendment he offers is the same as they do in some of the States by summons.

Mr. BARBOUR. I mean lis pendens or notice of attachment or notice of lien.

Mr. RAMSEYER. In my State we do not know of any such thing as a summons. It is always a service of notice.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then you have no summons there.

Mr. RAMSEYER. We have no summons.

Mr. BARBOUR. The amendment offered may not cover that point.

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

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. VENABLE. Would not the situation be met by requiring the clerk of the Federal court to keep a record of lis pendens, upon which there should be immediately on the issuance of the summons a notice of the fact that the summons has been issued?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; if that would give notice to the purchaser of real property.

Mr. VENABLE. It will, because the purchaser of real property is under a legal duty to go to the official records, wherever they are maintained, to determine whether or not there is anything on file which affects the title of the property.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; if you give notice to the purchaser of the property that there is a lien, I do not care what form it takes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, the last amendment offered somewhat lessens the danger that threatens innocent owners of property. The provision in the bill which provides that immediately on the commencement of suit a lien shall attach, although no notice of the suit be made a public record, will grievously affect a number of real estate owners, especially in many of the cities of the country. I am glad the gentleman has offered an amendment that at least will make it possible for innocent mortgagees, lessees, and grantees to discover that a lien is claimed upon the property of the owner who is charged with having violated the act, but the amendment does not go far enough. Upon the filing of an information or announcement of a suit charging that an owner has had reason to believe that contraband liquors are kept or stored upon his property, though that owner might be ever so innocent of the charge made against him, his property would be subject to a lien under the bill as now framed and that lien would be pending until the suit was tried and decided in his favor. The bill provides the lien attaches from the time of the beginning of the suit, notwithstanding that no notice of the pendency of the suit is to be filed in a public office, and so the owner would have to wait until the suit is terminated in his favor before he could get rid of the lien that is attempted to be imposed upon his property. This unfair and oppressive situation would, I am afraid, be frequent in cities, particularly in those of the first class and particularly in New York. I speak advisedly as one who as a lawyer has had large experience in the passing of titles to property in my city.

Under the bill as framed, I repeat, if through the malice or exploitation of spies or others or even through some error an action against an owner under the provisions of the bill be commenced, there is no provision under which he could rid his property of the lien or even through bond discharge it until after trial, which in many jurisdictions would be long after the suit was begun—some months, some years. And so the owner would be hampered and frequently prevented from raising a loan by way of mortgage or conveying his property.

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

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In a moment; and if, perchance, he shall, before the Government suit is commenced, have made a contract to convey, and the vendee would want to get out of the contract or not care to have himself saddled with the lien, after taking the deed, that vendee would be relieved from the

contract, and the owner, however innocent of actually violating this prohibition statute, would lose the benefit of his sale. Such a condition, I submit, works hardship and oppression and creates an injustice which never should find place in any law governing a free people.

Now, I want this House in fairness to consider the immense value of property in New York which seriously might be affected by this section. I want you to understand that many an owner of an apartment house in New York, any house, if you please, in which there is no shop, no saloon, no boarding house, in which there is no hotel, would be at the hazard of being affected as I have indicated. This bill is manifestly unfair. I do not rise for the purpose of protecting guilty men; I do not rise for the purpose of trying to allow men to evade the law. If the purpose is to have liens imposed upon the property wherein liquors are found, very well; but I want this House to safeguard the interests of innocent owners and the property rights of parties in interest, and not go further than they think they ought to go in practically confiscating the property of innocent people. I want the rights of real estate owners and lessees safeguarded. I do not want this House in the spirit of fanaticism to run away with itself in trying to hamper owners of real estate to obtain mortgages or to convey their property to bona fide purchasers. If the owner is guilty, very well; let the judgment recovered against him constitute the lien.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, may I have three minutes more? I ask unanimous consent that I may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. But two minutes remain of the time fixed for closing debate.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to speak for three minutes. Is there objection——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is that time to be taken in addition to the 15 minutes fixed?

The CHAIRMAN. It will take the remainder of the 15 minutes and 1 minute more.

Mr. DEWALT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask for three minutes, not to be counted as part of the time already fixed.

Mr. DEWALT. If the ruling of the Chair is that it will take all of the time, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I did not ask to have it taken as a part of the 15 minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. The Chair so rules.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It is a question of whether the committee will give unanimous consent to add three minutes to the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, has my request been objected to?

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, conceding, for the purpose of argument——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It has been suggested that I respectfully suggest to the Chair that before the Chair says that my request has been denied it is due to me, as well as it is due to the members of the committee, that the request be put by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The request was put by the Chair, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania objected.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest for a moment, the gentleman from New York preferred an original request for three minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked what would be the effect of that and the Chair ruled then and there, very properly, that would consume the balance of the 15 minutes and 1 minute more, but then the gentleman from New York asked to have his request modified to 3 minutes, not to take up the 2 remaining minutes of the time fixed by the House, but that it should be in excess of that and not interfere with that, and I do not think that request was ever put to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. And thereupon the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] demanded the regular order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The regular order was, if the amended request of the gentleman from New York should be granted, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to be fair in the matter——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the gentleman from New York makes the request that he be allowed three minutes, not to be taken from the time fixed by the committee, is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I think after these various objections I shall withdraw my request, and I will address this House at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, conceding for the purpose of argument what I am not willing to concede as a fact, that a person who has knowledge or has reason to believe that his property is occupied thus unlawfully could be punished in the way determined by the provisions of this section, let us see what the effect of this would be upon other parties who are interested in this property and are certainly entirely innocent. Now, I will give a concrete example. The gentleman from Kentucky owns a property worth $10,000. Upon that property he has given a mortgage of $2,000 which is a first lien. Subsequent to that first lien there are three judgments, one held by you, another by a second gentleman, and another by a third. Then comes this process by which a subsequent lien to the first mortgage and these three judgments is entered. We will say that the lien is for $200, being the fine and the cost, and, in the enforcement of the lien, what are all these people required to do?

Now, in the first place, the man who owns the property is obliged to protect it, we will say; and he would undoubtedly try to protect it by bidding to the value of the property if he had the money. But here is a first mortgage creditor, and he is protected because he has the first lien, but according to the laws of almost all the States all of the judgments would be discharged. And every one of these subsequent judgment creditors would be obliged to do what? To bid to the amount of his judgment in order to protect himself, and to bid to the amount of the two prior judgments in order that he might be protected; and would also be required to raise the cash to pay all the prior judgments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to explain this matter for just one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for one minute more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving my right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already put the request and there was no objection.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, the effect of that judgment——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. DEWALT. Now, the effect of that is merely this, that if the first mortgage is $1,000 and the first judgment is $1,000 and the next judgment is $1,000 and the next judgment is $1,000, the man who has $1,000 judgment will be obliged to provide himself with $4,000, the amount of these liens, in order to protect his judgment. In other words, all the innocent people other than the owner of the property must protect themselves by getting money enough to bid in that property. You say this lien shall be enforced and shall be a lien in what court? It must be a lien in the Federal court. And I take the position that the lien in the Federal court does not become effective or capable of enforcement until that lien is recorded in the county in which the property lies. Now, that is certainly true, and therefore it can not become effective simply by the service of the summons.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me the chairman of the committee is pursuing a wrong policy. Members of this House who are able lawyers want to discuss some of the important features of this bill, and it seems to me that it is not the proper course to pursue to cut off further debate. But in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York, who represents, in part, the great city of New York, and other gentlemen here, it seems to me on an important matter of this kind there should be more debate. However, I am not going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I want to say that it did appear to me quite singular that whenever the chairman of the committee who has this bill in charge sees fit to limit debate he rises and moves to limit debate, and when any gentleman here, not for the purpose of delay but for the purpose of calling the attention of this House to some provision which he desires to perfect, rises on the floor, objection is made to his either having an extension of time or the privilege to complete a sentence. I object to that kind of procedure. Like the gentleman from Missouri, I do not like to object to the request that is already made, but I do want to give notice now that if this policy is pursued I will object to unanimous consent being carried hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No; I do not object.

Mr. JUUL. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. BLANTON. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment in the third degree and is not in order at this time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] offers a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No; the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be an amendment in the third degree and would not be in order at this time.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. WALSH. That, of course, would be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]?

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, my motion is a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JONES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania: Page 3, line 13, after the word "the," in line 13, strike out all of the balance of line 13 and the words "or his agent," in line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the words "filing of notice of the commencement of the suit in the office where the record of the transfer of the real estate is kept."

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is exhausted on this section and all amendments thereto. The question now recurs on the amendment to the substitute.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute as amended.

The substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as amended by the substitute.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read as modified by inserting the words "on the owner or his agent."

I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry as to what we are voting on; whether it is this part of the section that has already been stricken out or not, and what is the status of the amendment I proposed; and also I ask unanimous consent to correct my amendment by allowing the words "on the owner or his agent" to remain in the language.

The CHAIRMAN. Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, the Chair will state that the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] offered a substitute to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. To that substitute the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JONES] offered an amendment. The amendment was agreed to, and the committee has now agreed to the substitute as amended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JONES], and the motion now recurs on the original amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may we have that reported?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor, and has asked that the amendment be read by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARD. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be reported again, with the addition of the words "on the owner or his agent."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment?

Mr. GARD. Yes, in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman reduce his amendment to writing and send it to the Clerk's desk? Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may we first have the amendment as it exists at this time reported to the House, so that we will know what we are doing?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as it has been agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARBOUR offers as a substitute for Mr. GARD'S amendment the following: Page 3, line 13, after the words "of the" strike out the words "service of summons."

Mr. WALSH. That is not what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asked to have reported.

Mr. GARD. We have asked to have the language of my amendment reported.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, as adopted by the committee.

Mr. WALSH. He asked to have the Jones amendment reported.

Mr. SABATH. The substitute as amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the substitute as amended by Mr. JONES.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute as amended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JONES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania: On page 3, after the word "the," on line 13, strike out all the balance of line 13 and the words "or his agent," in line 14, and insert in lieu thereof "filing of notice of commencement of the suit in the office where the record of the transfers of real estate is kept."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to modify his amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Is the Chair able to advise the committee which word "the" in line 13 is included in the Jones amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was of the opinion that it was the second word "the."

Mr. WALSH. Which one?

The CHAIRMAN. The second word "the." But the amendment itself does not so state.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will allow me to suggest, the amendment does state it. It says after the words "of the." There is only one instance where the words "of the" occur in that line.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what the committee is seeking to get, and certainly what I want to get—and I think that was the request preferred on my right—is how will the substitute of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] read after the amendment has been written into it as proposed by him and acted upon by the committee? How will the substitute read as an entity, as a complete proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the substitute as amended.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, would it not be better to read the substitute first, and then the amendment, to see how it is modified?

Mr. WALSH. I am going to object to the reading of what has already been adopted. It has been voted on, and now the only thing that has not been read is the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] that he be permitted to modify his amendment? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, as I understood from the reading at the desk the modification that the gentleman wants to make would destroy it.

Mr. GARD. I do not ask for the modification. I think it is carried in the original. I ask that my amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks that his amendment be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: On page 3, line 13, strike out the language after the word "the," and the words "and his agent" on line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "entry and indexing of judgment."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio as modified by the substitute.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: On page 3, line 16, after the word "jurisdiction," insert "if the amount of the proposed lien is less than $3,000, action to enforce same shall be prosecuted in the State courts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment to strike out all after the word "both," in line 6, page 3. What has become of that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment will be put by the Chair as soon as the perfecting amendments have all been acted upon.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERSMAN: Add, at the end of section 3, the following:

"*Provided, however,* That neither the provisions of this section nor of Title I of this act shall apply to the manufacture or sale of wine containing not more than 11 per cent of alcohol by weight."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment which I wish to offer.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 3, line 12, after the word "act," insert "occurring after the passage hereof."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. STEVENSON) there were—ayes 60, noes 54.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROOKS] so long ago that we have almost forgotten it. What has become of that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is now in order. The vote could not be taken on that amendment until all amendments to perfect the text had been disposed of. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROOKS] to strike out all the remainder of section 3 after the word "both," in line 6, page 3.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 48, noes 67.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania and Mr. VOLSTEAD.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 57, noes 77.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the United States attorney for the district where such nuisance as is defined in this act exists, or any officer designated by him or the Attorney General of the United States, may prosecute a suit in equity in the name of the United States to abate and enjoin the same. Actions in equity to enjoin and abate such nuisances may be brought in any court having jurisdiction to hear and determine equity causes. The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under this section shall be concurrent with that of the courts of the several States.

If it be made to appear by affidavit, or other evidence under oath, to the satisfaction of the court, or judge in vacation, that the nuisance complained of exists, a temporary writ of injunction shall forthwith issue restraining the defendant or defendants from conducting or permitting the continuance of such nuisance until the conclusion of the trial. Where a temporary injunction is prayed for, the court may issue an order restraining the defendants and all other persons from removing or in any way interfering with the liquor or fixtures, or other things used in connection with such alleged illegal sale of such liquor. No bond shall be required as a condition for making any order or issuing any writ of injunction under this act. If the court shall find the property involved was being unlawfully used as aforesaid at or about the time alleged in the petition, the court shall order that no liquors shall be sold, bartered, or stored in such room, house, building, boat, vehicle, structure, or places of any kind, for a period of not exceeding one year, or during the war and the period of demobilization. Whenever an action to enjoin a nuisance shall have been brought pursuant to the provisions of this act, if the owner appears and pays all costs of the proceedings and files a bond, with sureties to be approved by the clerk of the court in which the action is brought, in the full value of the property, conditioned that he will immediately abate said nuisance and prevent the same from being established or kept therein a period of one year thereafter, the court, or in vacation the judge, may, if satisfied of his good faith, direct by appropriate order that the property, if already closed or held under the order of abatement, be delivered to said owner, and said order of abatement canceled, so far as the same may relate to said property; or if said bond be given and costs therein paid before judgment on an order of abatement, the action shall be thereby abated as to said room, house, building, boat, vehicle, structure, or places only. The release of the property under the provisions of this section shall not release it from any judgment, lien, penalty, or liability to which it may be subject by law.

In the case of the violation of any injunction, temporary or permanent, granted pursuant to the provisions of this act, the court, or in vacation a judge thereof, may summarily try and punish the defendant. The proceedings for punishment for contempt shall be commenced by filing with the clerk of the court from which such injunction issued information under oath setting out the alleged facts constituting the violation, whereupon the court or judge shall forthwith cause a warrant to issue under which the defendant shall be arrested. The trial may be had upon affidavits, or either party may demand the production and oral examination of the witnesses. Any person found guilty of contempt under the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment of not less than 30 days nor more than 12 months, or by both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 4, line 12, after the word "with," strike out "such alleged illegal sale of such liquors" and insert "the violation constituting the nuisance."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I offer that, on the authority of the committee, to correct the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 4, line 23, after the word "owner," insert the words "lessee, tenant, or occupant."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 5, line 4, after the word "thereafter," insert the words "or during the war and period of demobilization."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in line 17, on page 5, I move to strike out the word "act" and insert the word "title."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 5, line 17, strike out the word "act" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in line 18, on page 4, after the word "be," I move to insert the word "manufactured."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a further amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 4, line 18, after the word "be," insert the word "manufactured."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 3, line 24, after the word "causes," insert "in all equity cases in this act provided the defendant shall have the right to demand a jury to pass on all matters of fact."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat encouraged by the statement made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. VOLSTEAD] that he wanted to put mercy and justice into this act. I want to point out that all through this bill provision is made for actions in equity—that is, injunctions, restraints—and in every way giving administrative and prosecuting officials the right to go into court and obtain writs before the defendant has an opportunity to be heard.

I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee wants to be fair and at least give the defendant a chance to be heard. In most of the equity cases which will arise from this act there is no law involved; it will be almost entirely questions of fact. The testimony of officers and agents and police as to what occured will have to be determined, and it is but fair to permit such questions to be decided by a jury. In all Federal statutes and the Federal criminal code the defendant is entitled to a trial by jury, and is entitled to have the facts passed upon by a jury. Also, in injunction cases, under the Federal act applicable to labor cases, a trial by jury is provided.

In this bill, in the case of a temporary injunction, not even a bond is necessary. Application might be made for an injunction on an affidavit, and even if the affidavit does not contain sufficient facts to sustain a permanent injunction, the defendant would have no redress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman's amendment was adopted, would it not be possible where a man had been convicted of a criminal offense of conducting a nuisance to demand a jury trial and have a second jury trial on the question of an injunction, and perhaps get a verdict of not guilty, and nullify the first?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. "A" might be found guilty of a certain act, but this equity action lies not against "A" but against "B," the owner of the premises. You would have a different action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily; it might lie against the man who committed the crime if he was the owner of the property.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, where there is a different state of facts or a different defendant is the gentleman willing to provide a trial by jury?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not be in favor of a trial by jury in an equity case involving the abatement of a nuisance, whether the man who conducted the nuisance has been convicted in the criminal court or not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is not the purpose of this bill to get away from a trial by jury?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman point out in the bill where a defendant is entitled to a trial by jury?

Mr. BARKLEY. All defendants charged with violating the law have a trial by jury. After the trial by jury if the district attorney wants to abate the nuisance he would have an equity proceeding.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If it were true that the man must first be convicted of a crime before he resorted to the equity action——

Mr. BARKLEY. But that is not true.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know it, and that is why it is vicious. You do not intend to resort to criminal action, but you want to go right into the equity court for enforcement of a criminal statute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Sections 1 and 2 provide for a trial by jury in all criminal cases.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But is it not true that you can resort to the equity proceeding without going into the criminal court?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true under State laws already enforced in many of the States.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that either is wrong.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think it is right that a defendant should be taken into the equity court without first taking him into the criminal court and there convicted. I earnestly believe you do not intend to resort to criminal action, but want to go right into the equity court and hold him up in that way. How simple it will be to obtain a temporary writ, make it permanent, and if at any time, even years thereafter, another alleged offense is committed, a man can be hauled up for contempt without any chance of a defense as to the merits of the case and imprisoned, and kept in prison according to the whims of a judge.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, no one in this committee is more heartily in sympathy with the principles and general purposes of this bill than myself, and no one possesses less sympathy for the people who in contumacious violation of this positive statute, and of the amendment to the Federal Constitution, will hereafter knowingly or negligently allow property owned by them to be used in contravention of this act. But I can not agree, Mr. Chairman, that in dealing with highly technical details, such as are found in the section just passed, we should be hurried to a final action fruitful of possible hardships. Other provisions of a technical character will confront us hereafter, and they should be carefully and thoughtfully considered. The section just concluded relates to situations that will arise under the registry laws of the States, a highly technical body of law. I undertake to say that the amendment just adopted will fail to give in a number of States of this Union, any protection whatever to an innocent vendee.

The gentleman who drafted this amendment may think that he has made adequate provision for an innocent purchaser, but certainly he fails to do so, so far as such purchasers in my State are concerned.

I think the gentleman who has charge of this bill, Mr. VOLSTEAD, when a section like this is under consideration and a real difference of judgment with reference to a highly technical subject is developed, ought to allow more time for real consideration and debate than was afforded in this instance. It has frequently been within my observation that during the progress of considering a bill, when a highly technical amendment was under consideration, the chairman of the committee would ask that the section be passed by for the time being, in order that in conference with the advocates of amendment, some amendment adequately covering the entire situation could be drafted.

I tried to have the substitute as it was amended read in its final form, so that I could apprehend its meaning.

My request to this end was shut off on objection by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have tried privately to secure a copy of the amended substitute, and if it has been correctly given to me, then I undertake to say that in Virginia at least, an intending purchaser will not be sufficiently protected against the liens that will be made effective under this section as amended. This situation ought not to exist. The registry laws of the States are largely different. This act should contain some general provision, wisely and carefully drawn, under which every situation in every State likely to arise as to intending purchasers of property that may be impressed by a lien pursuant to the terms of this statute, may be justly and adequately met, so that innocent purchasers may not suffer. As a friend of this bill, and speaking as such, I ask the gentleman who has charge of this measure to give a reasonable time for consideration of amendments dealing with difficult and perplexing subjects, and not to hastily cut off debate. Technical details should be carefully worked out, in a comprehensive way, and by carefully drawn amendments, that will provide against all situations of difficulty hereafter likely to arise in the enforcement of this act. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. REAVIS: Page 6, line 3, after the word "not," strike out the rest of line 3 and the figures and word "$500 nor"; and, in line 4, strike out the last word of the line and the words "than 30 days nor" in line 5.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is to bring this bill within the well-defined policy of the Judiciary Committee of eliminating a minimum fine. It was my understanding—and I had the impression at the time the bill was presented to the House—that it had been agreed upon in the committee that all of these provisions with reference to minimum fines had been stricken from the bill. That was done on page 20 of the bill, and on page 21 of the bill, and I think, to make the matter harmonious, it ought to be done at this place. For many years, at least ever since I have been in Congress, it has been the policy of the Judiciary Committee, at the request of the Federal judiciary, to eliminate the minimum fine and minimum penalty, to leave something to the discretion of the court, who have all of the facts and circumstances of the case before them, to determine anything up to the maximum that would be a just penalty to inflict upon the accused. I do not know that it would ever occur under this section, although

the possibilities of such occurrence are here. There might be a case where the minimum fine and minimum imprisonment provided by this section would work a hardship. There might be a case where the man would be guilty of nothing more than an indiscretion, and in such event the court having jurisdiction of the trial, knowing all the facts and circumstances, ought to be privileged to fix the punishment commensurate with the offense. It would not only work for justice to eliminate the minimum fine and penalty from this bill but it would make the provisions of the section harmonious with the general policy of the Judiciary Committee in cases of like character, which policy has been adopted at almost the unanimous request of the Federal judiciary of the country.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, if we are to enforce this law we must have minimum penalties. I have joined with my friend in striking out minimum penalties in a number of bills and would generally follow that policy, but in this bill we are dealing with a business that is pursued for profit, and unless you impose a penalty that is large enough to make it unprofitable it will continue to go on. [Applause.] This is not a new question. Every State that is attempting to enforce laws of this kind has been compelled to put into them minimum penalties. Turn to the liquor and prohibition statutes anywhere and you will find in almost every one of them a minimum penalty of considerable size. That is true not only in prohibition statutes but even under the ordinary license statute. I have had occasion to examine the Pennsylvania statutes, and I find there that $500 is the minimum for selling without a license. It is necessary, and that is the reason why it is written into these statutes. We can not enforce this kind of a law without making it unprofitable, and that is the reason why we must insist on it.

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

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if in this very bill the committee of which he is the chairman did not strike out the minimum penalties in three other sections in the bill in answer to that general policy?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. For the first offense, but for a second and subsequent offense we wrote minimum fines and inflicted, in addition to that, imprisonment, and where it was stricken out it was against my judgment, except in section 30. I could not prevent the committee from doing so. This does not punish for a single sale. This is a case where a man runs a saloon, where he makes a nuisance of himself. That is the instance in which we apply this minimum penalty. When a man does that, he has no business to ask mercy. If he is trying to profit by this kind of violation of law he ought to be punished, and the courts ought not to be permitted to put him in jail for a day or to impose a penalty of $1—as I have been told in some sections they do and will be sure to do—if this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time is exhausted upon this amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it was Shakespeare who said, "Heat not a furnace for thy foe so hot that it do singe yourself." The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] pointed out to the committee that there is a great deal of danger if you write this legislation in too radical and in too drastic a manner. The other day I spoke in general debate and called to the attention of the House the fact that lawlessness had been increasing in the District of Columbia in spite of the prohibition law. The Evening Star of this city took exception to my statement. Now, I do not want to disparage the conditions at the Nation's Capital. I believe Washington is one of the best governed cities in this country. But I desire to place in the RECORD in addition to the editorial from the Star of July 14 the news items concerning the crimes which were reported that very day here in Washington and which appeared in the same edition of the Star that carried the editorial. The Washington Times, of that same evening, also reported these crimes, and in addition the cases of drunkenness that had come up in the police court of the District that very morning. These newspaper articles speak for themselves. I also desire to call to your attention that the superintendent of police has asked for more policemen. And the citizens have organized a sort of vigilance committee under the name of Home Defense League. This despite the fact that Washington is bone dry and that since July 1 even Baltimore has gone on the water wagon. I want also to call your attention to the drastic character of the bill with regard to the quantity of alcohol that can be used in various liquors. I have here from the Department of Agriculture a letter, written by the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, showing that in such home-made liquors as hard cider, elderberry wine, blackberry cordial, cherry bounce, peach bounce, and cordials of that kind there is anywhere from 4 to 40 per cent of alcohol.

Mr. BUTLER. And makes you very drunk, too.

Mr. KAHN. I suppose it does. Now, do you propose to write a law which will submit your mothers, your sisters, your wives, and the wives of the farmers of this country to be hauled to jail for violating this drastic law? I ask that that letter from the Department of Agriculture be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks that the letter referred to be read in his time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1919.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your telephonic request of July 14, the following data on the alcoholic content of the beverages mentioned are given. A list of references is also appended. Reference to this list is made by number under the headings given below. These beverages as made in the home vary according to the formula used. It is generally true that the formulas used in the home are quite variable, so that the alcohol content given must necessarily be approximate.

Hard cider: The alcoholic content of the undiluted, fermented juice of cider apples may run as high as 8 per cent by volume (8). This alcohol content is produced by fermentation of sugar naturally present in the apples. Adulterated ciders have been analyzed in the bureau which ran as high as 10 per cent alcohol by volume and over (11). This excessive alcohol was produced by added sugar before fermentation.

Elderberry wine: As made in the home this article varies much in alcohol content depending on the formula used. The natural sugar of the berries (4 to 6 per cent sugar) is deficient for wine-making purposes. Sugar is therefore added in varying amounts. In addition to the alcohol produced by the fermentation of the sugar naturally present in the berries and the sugar added, most of the formulas call for an addition of alcohol or brandy (4, 5, and 9). By fermenting natural elderberry juice only about 3 per cent alcohol by volume would be formed (8). This content is increased by fermenting added sugar and by the addition of alcohol. An approximation of the alcohol content of most elderberry wines would be from 7 to 20 per cent by volume.

Blackberry cordial: As made in the home this product may be fermented or may depend entirely on added alcohol, according to the formula used. The product as made by the formula given in the National Formulary, 1916, page 7, is recognized as the official formula (10). This formula would yield a beverage with an alcohol content varying from 20 to 30 per cent by volume. If, however, the alcohol content is dependent on the fermentation of the natural juice of the blackberry, the alcohol content would be 3 to 5 per cent by volume. This is usually augmented by fermentation of added sugar or a straight addition of alcohol in some form.

Cherry bounce: This class of beverage is made from fruit or juice with rum added (1) or by adding alcohol or brandy to alternate layers of crushed fruit and sugar. As generally made it is not fermented. If it depended on the natural sugar content of cherries for its alcohol content, only about 4 to 7 per cent alcohol would be produced. Its alcohol content, therefore, depends on the extent to which the added alcohol is diluted by the fruit juice. Cherry bounce varies in alcohol content between the approximate range of 30 to 40 per cent by volume.

Peach bounce: This article is made in practically the same manner as cherry bounce, and the alcohol content when made as above would be about the same.

As general information, it may be stated that sugar will produce, when completely fermented, approximately one-half of its weight of alcohol. By complete fermentation of sugar only about 16 per cent by volume of alcohol can be produced. In order, therefore, to make a beverage containing more than 16 per cent by volume of alcohol it is necessary to add alcohol, usually in the form of a distillate. The production of alcohol from natural fruit is limited by the sugar content of the juice of the fruit, which may be augmented first by the addition of sugar and, secondly, the addition of alcohol.

Respectfully,

P. B. DUNBAR, *Acting Chief.*

(Attached: List of references.)

LIST OF REFERENCES.

1. "Beverages, Past and Present," by Edward R. Emerson (1908).
2. "Beverages," by Harvey W. Wiley (1919).
3. "Scientific American Cyclopedia of Formulas" (1915).
4. "Fruit Wines," by Brannt.
5. "Encyclopedia of Practical Cookery."
6. "Marion Harland's Cook Book."
7. "Household Gem Cyclopedia."
8. "Analyses in the Bureau of Chemistry."
9. "Brandies, Gins, Rums," by a practical chemist.
10. "Service and Regulatory Announcement," Bureau of Chemistry, No. 14, Opinion 138.
11. "Service and Regulatory Announcement," Bureau of Chemistry, No. 4, Opinion 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks by inserting the newspaper clippings in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial from Washington, D. C., Evening Star, July 14, 1919.]

PROHIBITION AND "CRIME."

Representative KAHN's figures showing that "crime" has increased in Washington since the local prohibition law went into effect are not conclusive. They undoubtedly show a greater number of cases in the police court and a larger amount of money collected from fines, but they fail to take into account the increase in population due to the war and they do not show the character of the cases brought into

court. Until they can be analyzed to show proportion to the number of people in the District and to indicate the nature of the charges brought against defendants they are of no value in establishing an actual increase of what is broadly termed crime.

It is well known that a large percentage of the police court cases during the past 18 months are incident to the enforcement of the prohibition act. It was inevitable, with "wet" territory close at hand, that there should be much running of liquor into the District. The early efforts at enforcement were handicapped by lack of juries in the police court, which slowed the disposition of cases. Until the "bone-dry" amendment was extended to apply to the District, convictions were hard to obtain. When that law was made to apply to the District the wartime prohibition act was soon to take effect, and the result was a rush to bring liquor into Washington in anticipation of the drought after July 1. This fact alone would account for a material percentage of the increased number of court cases.

Washington is not crime ridden. It is an exceptionally peaceful, quiet, and safe place. The police are inadequate in numbers, and the problems here presented are difficult. Nevertheless, there is a small percentage of crime; and even in the extraordinary conditions that have prevailed during the past year and a half the city has been well ordered. Prohibition brought work for the police, undeniably, but the work has been as well done as the circumstances permitted. Nor are the police court records for the past few months a measure of the value to the community of the dry law, in the enforcement of which the passing conditions were a severe handicap.

—

[From the Evening Star, July 14, 1919, Washington, D. C.]

(News items.)

W. U. WILL PROBE ALLEGED ASSAULT—SEEK GROUNDS TO PRESS CHARGES IN BEHALF OF "MESSENGER GIRL."

Investigation into a reported attack upon a Western Union messenger girl while in the subway connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol Friday afternoon was taken up by Western Union officials to-day with intent to press charges against the alleged assailant of the girl.

According to reports, the girl was coming through the subway with messages on Friday afternoon when a white man stopped her and attempted to make an engagement for the evening. On her refusal, Capitol police say, he grabbed her and attempted to force personal attentions on her. She screamed, and the approach of footsteps caused him to release her.

The girl rode up into the Capitol building in the same elevator with the man. She did not make a complaint until some time later, and a detective from the police headquarters in the Capitol was assigned to the case.

BEGIN PROBE AT ONCE.

When the matter was brought before H. F. Taff, general superintendent of this district of the Western Union Co., this morning, he declared that an investigation would begin at once.

W. R. Williams, district manager, and a superintendent of delivery, under whose jurisdiction the girl was working, went to the Capitol this morning to investigate the charges.

"If we find any basis whatever for prosecution," declared Mr. Williams, "we will press charges. The company intends to look after the interests of its woman employees, especially, to the fullest extent. If we get this man and have any sort of a case whatever, we will press the charges to the finish. We believe that an example should be made of the man, in order to safeguard the interests of the other messenger girls in the employ of the company. The company will take up the fight on the verification of any charges."

DESERTED FOR SEVERAL MINUTES.

During late hours of the afternoon the subway between the Senate Office Building and the Capitol is often deserted except for a few pedestrians passing at short intervals of time between the offices. At some periods as much as 5 or 10 minutes elapses before anyone passes. It was in one of these periods of desertion, it is declared, that the alleged attack was made.

Police at the Capitol on finding reluctance on the part of the girl to press charges declared that they would make an examination of the charges at any rate, and assigned a detective to the work. The man who grabbed the girl is not believed to have been an employee of the Capitol by them. It is said, however, that he had been seen loitering in the vicinity of the subway several times.

—

COLORED MAN FATALLY SHOT OVER CRAPS GAME—ALLEGED ASSAILANT OF "PEP" JACKSON THIS MORNING THOUGHT TO HAVE LEFT CITY.

Richard Jackson, colored, familiarly known to his friends as "Pep" Jackson, is dead of a bullet wound in his stomach, and the police are looking for James Porter Marshall, also colored, as his alleged slayer. The shooting took place about 2.15 o'clock this morning in the home of Jackson, 2025 Virginia Avenue, the wounded man dying at Emergency Hospital three hours later.

Several acquaintances of "Pep" Jackson assembled at his house last night and participated in games of cards and craps, according to witnesses' statements to the police, and Marshall, angered by the loss of his money, is alleged to have left the house, returned a few minutes later, and fired two shots, without giving Jackson the slightest opportunity to defend himself.

"GUESTS" FRIGHTENED AWAY.

Frightened at the sight of the weapon and reports of the shots, three of Jackson's guests quickly made themselves scarce. They remained out of sight until they were satisfied that the armed man was where he could not shoot them. Then they went to the assistance of their dying companion.

Mrs. Jackson, aroused by the reports of the pistol shots, hurried to the lower floor and found her husband on the floor giving evidence of intense suffering. Detectives from police headquarters and the third precinct police reached the house before the wounded man was taken to the hospital.

WOULD NOT NAME SLAYER.

Efforts to have him name his slayer proved unsuccessful. Several times he was asked if he would tell who shot him, the police stated, and each time his answer was in the negative.

"No" was his response to the question put by a detective.

"Let me alone," he added, "I'm suffering."

Surgeons from Emergency Hospital gave the wounded man first aid. He died without making a statement of the affair.

Information obtained by the police early to-day suggested the probability of the alleged slayer having left the city shortly after the shooting. Marshall, who resided at 621 New Hampshire Avenue, formerly lived at 201 West Sixty-first Street, New York City, the police learned. He came here several years ago.

DESCRIPTION OF MARSHALL.

Detective Edward Weedon, night chief of detectives, sent several members of the detective force to the scene of the crime. It is thought two upper gold teeth of Marshall's will assist in his capture. He is 33 years old, has what the police term reddish-yellow skin, and smooth face. He wore a brown suit with a green stripe and a yellowish panama hat.

Jackson's body was taken to the morgue to-day. An autopsy performed by the deputy coroner showed the cause of death, and Coroner Nevitt arranged to hold an inquest later.

—

WATCHES, CASH, CHECKS, THIEVES' MAIN BOOTY—WOMAN ROBBED IN THEATER, WHILE HOME, STORES, AND HUCKSTER WAGON ARE LOOTED.

Watches, cash, and checks formed the principal objects of loot in robberies during the past 36 hours in thefts totaling several hundreds of dollars.

Police were told that Mrs. Ella Louise Yeager, of the Bristol apartments, was the victim of a theft in a downtown moving-picture theater, losing a United States pay check for $25 and $12 in cash. The money and check was in a long tan leather purse, which Mrs. Yeager laid on an adjoining seat, from which it disappeared.

Alexander Petion, a roomer at 722 Fifth Street, reported stolen from his room yesterday a gold watch valued at $50. Another watch theft was reported by Max Ladle, of 1427 Fifth Street, who told the police that a gold hunting-case watch and chain had been stolen from him while at Eaton Hill, Anacostia, yesterday.

James Maladets, of 919 Twenty-second Street, reported to the police that $85 in bills and four checks had been stolen from his huckster wagon in front of 1775 California Street.

Theodore Petty, proprietor of a barber shop at 802 M Street, told the police that on Saturday night a boy was given $75 to take to his home and that the boy failed to do so.

George F. Morris, manager of a store at Connecticut Avenue and Van Ness Street, reported that his store had been broken into Saturday night and $25 in cash and cigars and cigarettes to the value of $10 had been stolen. Twelve gallons of gasoline had also been stolen from the tank in front of the store.

Fifty dollars in silver was stolen from the store of Lewis Cohn at 408 Twenty-sixth Street by a "jimmy thief," according to a report received by the police last night.

—

THIRTY-FIVE "DRUNKS" ARRESTED IN DRY WASHINGTON.

More than 35 cases of intoxication were recorded on the police-court blotter to-day. This is the largest number which has been in court since July 1. Twenty-six persons were locked up, while the others forfeited collateral of $50.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not want to take up any of the valuable time of this House, but for a moment or two I desire to answer the statement that has just been made by my good friend from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN submitted certain figures to the House relative to the increase in cases in the police courts of Washington, which he contended showed an increase in crime in this city under prohibition.

I desire to say that those figures do not correctly represent the situation, and I wish to take direct issue with the gentleman from California and show that there has been a very great decrease in crime in Washington under prohibition, in spite of the great increase in population during the war and the general social unrest growing out of the war, which is apparent in all centers of population, whether under prohibition or not, and which unrest is made more difficult to handle wherever the saloon and drinking places openly and publicly exist.

In answer to the gentleman from California I wish to first quote from the 1918 report of the superintendent of police of Washington, Maj. Pullman, who says:

> In actual figures, from November 1 to July 1, under license, there were 6,771 arrests in the eight months' period. In the same period under prohibition there were only 2,863 arrests, a decrease of 3,908 cases, or nearly 58 per cent decrease for the eight months.

[Applause.]

Regarding the police-court records which were quoted in the attempt to show that prohibition is not effective and beneficial in Washington, I wish to say that these figures are absolutely refuted by the statistics, which show a most marked decrease of almost 200 per cent in the total number of crimes for which prisoners in the District receive sentence, in the reduction of commitments to the workhouse, and in the figures showing the result of war emergency prohibition.

In the year ending June 30, 1917, the total number of crimes for which prisoners received sentence in the Washington courts was 6,222. This was the last year of the open saloons in Washington. In the year ending June 30, 1918, the number was 3,537, and in the year ending June 30, 1919, the number was 2,511. [Applause.] For violations of the excise and kindred laws, the number of cases for the year ending June 30, 1917, was 3,524; for the year ending June 30 1918, was 1,976; and for the year ending June 30, 1919, was 1,184. It should be remembered that this reduction occurred during war conditions, when the population of Washington was increasing by leaps and bounds.

When general war-time prohibition went into effect on July 1 last, figures show that there was a considerable decrease noticeable at once in arrests in Washington for violation of the liquor laws. Liquor could not be obtained, so readily at least, in Baltimore and other near-by points, and immediately the number of arrests in Washington dropped. For the first 13 days of July, 1918, the number of arrests in Washington for violation of the liquor laws was 223. For the first 13 days of July, 1919, the number of similar arrests was 129. [Applause.] For the first 13 days of June, 1919, the number of such arrests was 242. With the coming of war emergency prohibition on July 1 there has been a reduction in the violations of the liquor laws in comparison with a similar period during any one of the preceding six months.

Concerning the police court cases there has been an increase in the number of cases and the amount collected in fines. This is readily explained and does not indicate increased crime or drunkenness in Washington since prohibition became effective in the District of Columbia in the fall of 1917.

In the District of Columbia branch of the police court are tried all offenses against municipal regulations, and the figures presented can by no process of reasoning be accepted as an indication of any marked increase in crime.

The increase in the number of cases filed and in the amount collected in fines and forfeitures is the natural result of the tremendous increase in population and the resultant increase in the number of arrests for violations of the various municipal regulations and also to the increase in the number of arrests made for violations of the Sheppard law.

A large proportion of the increase is accounted for by reason of the fact that the increase in population brought about a great influx of vehicles, and numerous arrests for violations of the traffic regulations resulted.

While the figures in the United States branch of the police court for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, also show a considerable increase when compared with those of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, such increase can be largely accounted for by reason of the fact that all informations for violations of the Reed bone-dry amendment and for selling liquor within 5 miles of a military reservation are filed in the United States branch of the police court.

The great increase in the amount of fines imposed and collected is also accounted for by the fact that the fines for violations of the kind mentioned were in most cases very heavy, and in many cases were paid.

Mr. Chairman, I rose at this time only with the object of defending the good name of the District of Columbia. After the statements by the gentleman from California on this floor last Saturday the big newspapers all over the country carried it in great headlines that the District of Columbia was overrun with crime, and that there was more crime here at this time than there ever was before in the history of this city.

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

Mr. COOPER. I have only five minutes and I wish the gentleman would excuse me. We all know war conditions have brought an increase of population into this city. We know that war conditions have brought an increase of crime all over this country. It is not only true in the city of Washington to some extent, and it is admitted that there have been some very serious crimes committed here in this city in the last six months.

But that in no way can be attributed to prohibition of the liquor traffic in the city of Washington. And of the number of cases which the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] referred to, in the police court, I was told by Maj. Pullman that not one of those 17,000 cases which he referred to was a criminal offense except those for violation of the liquor law [applause]; that they were all misdemeanors for violation of the traffic laws, of the health code, and the building code, and so forth. He informed me that the District police court did not try criminal cases except bootlegging cases and violations of the liquor law. I desire to say a word about Maj. Pullman and the police force of this city. The people of the District are proud of Maj. Pullman, for he is one of the most efficient and capable officials in the country, and he has surrounded himself with a high-class force of officers, and I, with many other Members of Congress, heartily commend him for the splendid, efficient service they are performing for this city. [Applause.]

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

The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, will you please have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

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

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. REAVIS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 57, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], a member of the committee, offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 5, line 18, after the word "thereof" strike out the words "may summarily try and punish the defendant" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"May try the accused, or upon demand of the accused a trial may be by jury, in which latter event the court may impanel a jury from the jurors then in attendance, or the court or the judge thereof in chambers may cause a sufficient number of jurors to be selected and summoned, as provided by law, to attend at the time and place of trial, at which time a jury shall be selected and impaneled as upon the trial for misdemeanor, and such trial shall conform, as near as may be, to practice in criminal cases prosecuted by indictment or upon information."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the language which I have placed in this amendment is the verbatim language adopted by the Sixty-third Congress of the United States in 1914, appearing in volume 38 of the Statutes at Large of the United States at page 739. The policy which led to the enactment of this legislation, which is still upon the statute books, was the policy of giving every laboring man a square deal before court and jury. Therefore, it was written into the law as it appears in section 21 of this act:

That any person who shall willfully disobey any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of any district court of the United States or any court of the District of Columbia * * * shall be proceeded against for his said contempt as hereinafter provided.

And the provision affecting the phrase "hereinafter provided" is that—

In all cases within the purview of this act such trial may be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury.

Now, the subsequent language which I have adopted here is the exact verbatim language of this particular section, concerning the way in which trial for contempt may be had by a jury, to wit, by impaneling of juries from the jurymen in term or by selection by the court. The whole question resolves itself down to this, gentlemen of the committee, whether we are to adopt in this law the language which the Congress of the United States has heretofore adopted in regard to all courts or whether we are to revert to the old process of dealing summarily in all questions of contempt.

It has been my idea that the Congress once having definitely established the fact that no matter with what offense a man may be charged upon contempt, that upon that charge he may present to the court—referring to the charge against him—a demand for a trial by jury, and thereupon he may have that trial by jury, and that there should be no recision from that established principle of legal procedure here at this time.

I know my attitude has been to attempt to write here a reasonable code for the enforcement of the law. I want to be a party to such a code as will carry out the meaning and intent of the terms of war-time prohibition, if that is to be considered, and of the eighteenth constitutional amendment, and I know that should be considered. And in doing that I want to apply to this act as nearly as I can the existing laws of the United States of America. This is an existing law. It provides that a man charged with contempt of court may have a right to trial by jury. This includes in the list of those cases men who may come to the bar of justice if upon contempt for a violation of this war-time prohibition act. And I say right here, I intend to offer this amendment in the same language when I reach the section carrying into effect the constitutional prohibition. I think that is a matter where the fairness of the legislative body of the United States, heretofore evidenced, as it has been evidenced and heretofore carried out, as it has been carried out since 1914, should be continued and should not be abridged, and the guaranteed right of trial by jury should not be denied.

Mr. VOLSTEAD, Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. JUUL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone who has had any experience with liquor laws and is in

favor of enforcing the law would offer such an amendment. Turn to the statutes in the various States where they have attempted to enforce prohibition, and you will find that enforcement by injunction is the method that they practically all rely on.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No; I will not yield. I decline because I have only five minutes.

Not very long ago New York—I do not know just how long ago—passed a local option law. The old State of New York, a section from which so many arguments for constitutional liberty have come on this floor in connection with this legislation—old New York wrote the provision for an injunction into its statutes and took the jury trial away in these cases. The only way you can enforce a prohibition statute, the only way it has been found practical to enforce it, is by injunction. There is no other crime where so much ingenuity is displayed in trying to evade, in trying to defeat, the statutes as in the illegal sale of liquor. And with a jury there is always the appeal to the man who is a neighbor that sympathizes with the lawbreaker. In cities like New York, Chicago, and many other places, a law such as this amendment would make it would be a farce, and you know it.

I am going to be frank with you. If we mean to enforce this law, if we mean to write upon the statute books something that will honestly and fairly mean prohibition of the liquor traffic, we ought not to flinch from using the necessary means. The courts have repeatedly held that it is legal to enforce such laws by injunction. We are not depriving anyone of a jury trial guaranteed to him by the Constitution. Are we to take the method for enforcement that has always been a failure or the method that is known to be successful? That is the question. If anyone can point out to me a single instance where they have been able to enforce this kind of a law without this remedy, I would like to know where it is.

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

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman speaks of intrusting the jury with the determination of facts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to intrust such a question to 12 jurors in his State?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I challenge the gentleman to point out a single instance in a wet locality where it is possible to enforce this law without this remedy. It is a question of whether we believe in prohibition or not. I appeal to the Members in favor of prohibition to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SABATH. I propose to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio by striking out all after the word "jury."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offers an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], which the Clerk will report. Will the gentleman state his amendment?

Mr. SABATH. For that purpose, Mr. Chairman, I will move to strike out the last two words.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], notwithstanding the objection of the chairman of the committee [Mr. VOLSTEAD], should prevail. All that that amendment aims to do is to secure for a man who is held in contempt by any judge the right of trial by jury.

Now, some of you older Members will recall that for years we tried to bring about legislation that would eliminate these abuses on the part of judges, who, without reason and frequently without justification, would hold men guilty of contempt of court without giving them any chance or opportunity to be heard, and after many years we finally succeeded in passing the act in which that great power, which had been abused by a majority of Federal judges, was taken away, and the right of trial by jury given rightfully to such accused defendants.

Now, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the committee, has so little confidence in the citizenship of America, that he has so little confidence in the people and citizens in his own State and in his own district, as not to trust them to pass honestly and fairly upon the question of whether a man is actually guilty or not of an offense or any violation of any injunction which may issue in his district or in his State. I myself have the utmost confidence in the citizenship of the people, not only of the gentleman's State but of our entire country. If you prohibitionists are afraid to leave the question of guilt to a jury of 12 men and depend upon some prohibition judge to enforce it, then indeed you yourselves realize that the law is unfair, unjust, and incapable of enforcement.

Now, I repeat, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of this committee, should take the position that he has taken. The right of trial by jury ought not to be denied to a man accused of any offense or crime. That has been granted to him, and it should not be taken away from him. For that reason I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I take it that every man in the House is in favor of the enforcement of the law on this amendment, and if this war-time prohibition proposition is not cut out of the bill they are also in favor of the enforcement of that law. The eighteenth amendment was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the American States and of the American people. If it is good, the people will know it. If it is bad, the best way to get rid of it is to enforce it. So, good or bad, it should be enforced—honestly, fairly, and reasonably. I am in favor of giving these men the right of a trial by jury. [Applause.] The right to trial by jury is one of our most ancient and fundamental rights, and has been ever since Runnymede. In fact, the barons who made Magna Charta always claimed that that great paper merely set forth their immemorial rights.

Lord Henry Brougham said that all the machinery of law and legislation was consummated in getting 12 good men into a box, and I believe it. I take it that I have had as much experience in trying criminal cases as any man in the House. All of this talk of not being able to enforce prohibition laws is tommyrot, absolutely. I enforced it when I was prosecuting attorney. We had one of the most stringent local-option laws that was ever put on the statute books of any State in the Union, and I can prove that by appealing to Judge ALEXANDER and all the rest of these Missourians here. He was a circuit judge at the time. I enforced that law just as I would have enforced any other law.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the law had not been stringent. Would you have enforced a lax law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would have enforced whatever law there was, whether it was stringent or not stringent. [Applause.]

The truth is that I voted against the adoption of the local-option law in my county because my predecessor, as prosecuting attorney, and myself had both enforced the old dram-shop law, and we had broken up every blind tiger, blind pig, speakeasy, or whatever you choose to call it in the county, and I did not think we needed the new law. I knew that the stiff penalty in the local-option law would make it harder for me to enforce it than it was to enforce the old law. That is, I knew it would be harder to secure convictions. But I only had to crack two of them to break it up entirely. I sent one fellow to jail for 12 months and fined him $300, and stuck the next bootlegger for six months, and that was the end of it. They quit. And, the truth is, the best thing that the temperance people could have done 10 or 15 years ago was to have elected prosecuting attorneys who had the courage and the honesty to enforce the laws as they found them on the statute books.

I will tell you about judges. You can take the most mild-mannered and tender-hearted man you ever saw, make him a judge for life, and his disposition to tyrannize over people will grow with what it feeds on. [Applause.] I will give you the finest example of that in all history. Robespierre, one of the bloodiest despots that the sun ever shone on, when he was a young man was very modest, unassuming, tender-hearted. He was a criminal judge, and he resigned his office rather than pass sentence of death on a man who had been convicted. Yet he lived to cut off the heads of two or three hundred people every morning before breakfast, who had committed no crime whatever, with as little compunction as though they were flies instead of human beings. The English law will not allow a butcher to sit on a jury in a capital case, because the English people hold that the shedding of the blood of lower animals hardens the hearts of men, and that butchers would be very free about shedding the blood of human beings brought before them if they were sitting as jurors.

While I am at it, I want to make another remark or two. I am willing to trust the American jury. [Applause.] There has never been devised by the wit of man a better way to administer justice than that. Of course, juries go wrong sometimes. We all know that. They have brought in verdicts against me sometimes, not only in criminal cases but in civil cases, that made me doubt their sanity; but the same rule that applies to them applies to the judges also. Everybody knows that who has practiced law any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Judges are just as apt to go wrong as juries are. I lay that down as a proposition that I can prove by all the Supreme Court reports, not only the Supreme Court of the United States but of every State in the Union. Somewhere from one-fourth to one-half of all the cases that are tried in the nisi prius courts are reversed in the superior courts, and the juries could not do worse than that. The juries are picked from the best men in the community. Lawyers on both sides examine them thoroughly on their voir dire to ascertain whether they have formed or expressed any opinion and ask them some other questions that are pertinent in determining their qualifications. Of course, once in a while you run across a fellow who does not know which side he is on. There used to be a very smart man in the county in which I now live who was a great wag. He was summoned to serve on a jury and was examined on his voir dire. He swore that he had not formed or expressed an opinion about the case. Col. Thomas L. Anderson, a fine man and an ex-Member of Congress, took him in hand to cross-examine him. He said, "My friend, you say you have formed no opinion in this case?"

"No; I have formed no opinion."

"Have you talked with anybody who pretended to know the facts of this case?"

"Yes; both the plaintiff and the defendant told me all about it."

Col. Anderson asked, "How does it happen, then, that you have not formed an opinion?"

"They are both such infernal liars that I would not believe either of them on oath." [Laughter.]

I want to say this to the gentlemen who are running this thing, that you can make this law so stringent that you will hurt your own case. [Applause.] There is not any question about that.

The average citizen out in the country and a good many legislators have the idea that the severer you make the penalty the better law you get. That is not true at all. You can make the penalties so stiff and severe that men will get out of convicting a man if they can without committing perjury. All these things that irritate the people without contributing to the main cause of reasonable enforcement of the prohibition amendment are simply holding up, militating against, the enforcement of the law.

The idea that a man shall not have a particle of whisky or anything of that kind that will make a man drunk in his own house will prove to be a hindrance to the enforcement of this law. I do not want any whisky in my house; I have not got any either. I do not need it. I can not drink it without the risk of getting drunk, so I quit it. [Laughter.] I do not keep it around. I never did keep it around. [Laughter] I repeat that every man in this House that is honest is in favor of the reasonable enforcement of this law.

They had up a great hullabaloo the other day—the question of whether one-half of 1 per cent or 2.75 per cent was intoxicating. I do not believe there is any sense in Congress fixing the amount of alcohol in intoxicating liquor. The question, in my judgment, is for the courts to decide. I will tell you how to find out exactly whether 2.75 per cent beer is intoxicating. If these fellows will send every Member of the House a quart of 2.75 per cent beer and require him to drink it in 30 minutes, then he can tell whether it is intoxicating or not. [Laughter and applause.]

When I was a prosecuting attorney they adopted a local-option law, and all the druggists in the county joined in a letter to me to find out what they could do and what they could not. After a week's study I decided that they could not sell any intoxicating liquor except the alcohol of commerce for medicinal, art, and mechanical purposes.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I studied the question conscientiously and read every decision rendered that I could find, and I put a tailpiece to it, that if these proprietary or patent medicines contained more than 3 per cent of alcohol they were barred. It got so that the druggists would not buy from the drummers until the drummers came to me and submitted their formulas, and the result was that I knew more about proprietary medicines at the end of my term of office than any other man in the county.

One fellow sent me a bottle of malt extract. I did not have any chemical apparatus to analyze it, and so I drank it to observe the symptoms. [Laughter.] I wrote him and told him it was barred. [Great laughter.] It had about as much alcohol in it as bock beer. At that time keg beer had 3 per cent alcohol and bock beer had 5 and whisky had 21¼.

One day I had been at the extreme end of the county trying a case, and came back in the afternoon, got my mail and started home. An old druggist named Clark—no kin of mine—came out and said: "Hey, you were not here to-day. There was a drummer here, and I ordered three cases of rock and rye; what about it?" I said, "Doctor, you have drunk a great deal of whisky, and I have drunk more than was good for me. Suppose that you were put on the witness stand as an expert and was asked what kind of tipple is rock and rye?" He said he would swear it was a pretty damn good tipple. [Laughter.]

We should take out of this bill everything that is calculated to be unnecessarily irritating and pass a good enforcement law and enforce it. The United States Government has plenty of men roaming around over the country to catch fellows who violate the law.

They tried it in Iowa once when they passed a search-and-seizure law, and it created such an upheaval that at the next election—they went around and searched people's houses, dragging women out of bed and examining the bed to see if they had intoxicating liquors in the bedtick—that at the next election, for the first time after the Republican Party was organized they elected Gov. Boies, a Democrat, and reelected him governor two years later.

Neither the Democrats nor the Republicans want to put oppressive features in the bill—features so irritating and obnoxious as to create open revolt against its enforcement.

Where there is an item that I think is oppressive I am going to vote against it, and wherever I think it is not oppressive I am going to vote for it, because we want to enforce this law; but I insist on the right of trial by jury. [Applause.]

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been listening to arguments upon this prohibition bill more or less for the last 30 or 40 days. I have heard it stated a great many times by gentlemen that they are in favor of a law that would enforce the constitutional amendment, but they immediately follow up that statement with an argument or a suggestion to weaken the law. I have heard gentlemen on this floor make the argument, when it seemed to suit them, in striking out a minimum fine that certainly we could trust the judges, and thus weaken the law. When that is passed and it comes to the question of an injunction, as, for instance, against a black drunken devil who will rape a white woman in the city of Washington, they want a jury trial and can not trust the judge. That is the attitude of the gentlemen who are not in favor of a strict enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

From my experience upon the bench in Iowa, where we have a drastic law governing the sale of intoxicating liquor, we have the enforcement of that law by injunction, and we are pretty well able to enforce it. Yet it is the hardest kind of a law to enforce that was ever written upon the statute books, because the men who are violating it are without principle whatsoever. They do not care for humanity. They care for the dollar that it will bring, and the courts have recognized the fact that they have to take hold of the enforcement of this law with a firmer grip, in behalf of the people and in behalf of sobriety and decency, than is usual in the execution of the ordinary criminal statutes. [Applause.] While it is true they did elect a Democratic governor in the State of Iowa, as ex-Speaker CLARK says, it was at a time when the Republican Party in the State became a band of cowards politically. But after the election of a Democratic governor for two terms the Republican Party went back into power and it enacted the most stringent law governing the sale of intoxicating liquors that Iowa or any other State ever had, and it has been enforced to the letter so far as it is possible to enforce it. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not desire to take very much of the time of the committee in the discussion of this bill, because I believe that no argument or discussion here will change a single vote on this question. It is a question that has been debated and argued for several decades. The country at large has spoken in no uncertain tones, and no doubt Congress, as well as the country, is now ready to accept the situation of the abolishment of the saloon and the liquor traffic.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, if the country has spoken in such absolute and uncertain terms——

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. We are ready for a saloonless Nation. Forty-five out of the 48 States have ratified the prohibition amendment, and I understand that 15 States have already passed prohibitory laws in which they prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor or beverages containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, and that 13 other States have passed prohibitory laws in which they prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor or beverages containing any quantity of alcohol. Thus it is seen that a big majority of the legislatures of the United States have gone on record for prohibitory legislation that is fully as drastic, if not more drastic, than the legislation which is contemplated in the bill under consideration.

I am, therefore, in favor of the bill as it now stands. We can not make the enforcement code too drastic if we are to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcohol. The only way to prohibit is to make a law that will prohibit it from being manufactured and sold. [Applause.]

But what I particularly arose to address myself to at this time is to the statement that was made the other day on the floor of the House by the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and reiterated to-day, who attempted to draw the conclusion in his speech that crime has increased rather than decreased during the dry régime in Washington, D. C., and that this is indicative of what would be expected to happen all over the United States if the dry bill as proposed should be enacted. I am very sorry that it becomes necessary for me to contradict my distinguished friend and gentleman from California, for whom I have the very highest respect, but I believe that he has been very much misled in his information as to the applications of the facts and figures which he gives. This is a direct reflection on the District of Columbia. I think that we should be very careful to be fair and square in all our arguments. I feel that in this debate too much of insincere propaganda and insincere hypocritical statements have been proposed by the advocates of John Barleycorn. It is to be expected that the representatives of the brewers and distillers would, in a most vigorous manner possible, defend their business, but I do not believe that as Representatives in Congress we should allow ourselves to make statements that are not warranted by the facts merely for the sake of making them in the interest of the liquor traffic.

I believe that as Members of Congress we should be careful to ascertain the truth and make the truth known, no matter where it hits. Now, it is very evident that the overwhelming evidence by courts and medical authorities and police records all over the country show conclusively that crime is increased where alcoholic liquors or beverages are allowed to be sold, and that crime, insanity, and disease are always resultant of the liquor traffic, and that a decrease in crime, insanity, and disease is a direct result from prohibition wherever it is in effect and enforced.

As a direct refutation of the statement of the gentleman from California concerning the ill effects of prohibition in the District of Columbia I wish to read a statement on page 13 of the report of Raymond W. Pullman, superintendent of the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia, in which he says:

BENEFITS OF PROHIBITION.

When the Sheppard prohibition bill for the District of Columbia passed there was in the minds of many the belief that there would be no appreciable decrease in drunkenness because of the operation of the new law. Even the enemies of prohibition soon learned, however, that not only was there a great decrease of drunkenness, ranging from 50 to 76 per cent, under the amount of drunkenness during the same periods under license, but also that there was a great falling off in cases of disorderly conduct, assault, housebreaking, carrying of concealed weapons, cruelty to animals, and other offenses often growing out of intoxication. In actual figures, from November 1 to July 1, under license, there were 6,771 arrests in the eight months' period. In the same period under prohibition there were only 2,863 arrests, a decrease of 3,908 cases, or nearly 58 per cent decrease for the eight months. Persons who are open minded and who have given a reasonable amount of time to observing the operation of the law, even many of those who at first opposed the enactment of the Sheppard law, will now agree that the prohibition legislation has been a blessing and is perhaps the principal factor which has contributed to the lack of serious disorder or riots of any kind in the National Capital during the entire period of the war. In spite of the fact that through the interpretation of the law in the courts it is possible for persons to bring in as much liquor as they desire, providing they say it is for their own personal use, there has been a great improvement of conditions as a result of the operation of the law. While there naturally has been bootlegging with the liquor brought into the District of Columbia under the cover of the law, yet conditions are so greatly improved that there has been absolutely no trouble in handling the vast crowds which have swarmed the streets of the city during the war period. Hundreds violating the law have been arrested by the Metropolitan police.

I also wish to protest against the slander that has been attached to labor by the statements that have been made on this floor by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that the laboring men are overwhelmingly in favor of the liquor traffic. I do not believe that this is true. I believe that the labor element of our country is in favor of law enforcement, and in favor of removing the breeder of poverty, disease, and evil which King Alcohol has proven to be in our country. I also wish to protest against the slanderous statement that has been attached to our brave soldiers. The statement has been made in the progress of this debate that our returning soldiers are in favor of the saloon and the liquor traffic. I believe this is a base slander upon our brave soldiers who have offered their lives upon the altar of our country for its freedom and liberty. It is my judgment that the returning soldier is in favor of the removal of the liquor traffic. He is in favor of the highest and best ideals of our country, and that he will be against the greatest evil to-day that is sapping the very vitals and fundamentals of our Government, its happiness, and prosperity. I also rise to protest against the statement made by Mr. GALLIVAN, in which he accuses the drys of Congress as having their cellars and offices filled with booze enough to last for 20 years. Statements of this kind can not be regarded as arguments, and can bring about no good, and anyone knows that they are not in harmony with the facts.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill as it is drawn. I do not believe that we can make it too drastic. We must be sure that the liquor seller and bootlegger shall be dealt with in the most drastic manner possible, because if you do not, it is my experience of 22 years of fighting for the enforcement of the liquor laws in our own State that you open the way for lawlessness and the breaking of our prohibitory statutes wherever you make it possible to handle liquor at all, and that if you would change from one-half of 1 per cent to 2¾ per cent, you immediately open the door to all sorts of evasions of the law, and there is absolutely no way to get at the truth of the situation and bring conviction to the violator of the statutes.

John Barleycorn is dead. He has been convicted at the bar of justice of an awakened American citizenship. He has been consigned to the gallows and hung for his unspeakable crimes of the past. He is legally buried—forever buried—and there is very little use for the advocates of the liquor interests to try to resurrect him now. He can not be resurrected.

I therefore plead for an enforcement code that will make it possible to enforce our laws as they should be enforced—a code that will lead to a better citizenship, to better homes, to a happier condition of labor, and a nobler and better understanding of liberty and freedom. We must never forget that license is never liberty, and that the greater the liberty the more restricted it is. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line. I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the ex-Speaker of this House, upon the question of the propriety of this provision and of certain other provisions of this bill, but I do find myself in disagreement with him, and therefore I am compelled to state the reasons why I believe the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Ohio and championed by the gentleman from Missouri ought not to be adopted. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are providing here for the punishment of men who violate an injunction which has been issued by a court. This does not provide for the original trial of men who are charged with a violation of this law. I take it for granted that there would be very few injunctions ever issued except against habitual criminals. If a man is once tried for selling liquor against the law and is fined or imprisoned, and thereafter ceases to violate the law, there would be no occasion to have an injunction issued against him or against his place of business; but the object of this bill is not only to make it possible to enforce the law but to put teeth in it that will enable the officers to enforce it, and one of the sharpest teeth that can be put in a statute of this kind for the enforcement of prohibition is to provide for an injunction law by which men may be enjoined from the commission of crimes habitually.

Now, some man might be tried and convicted by a jury for violating this law. He might a second time be tried and convicted by a jury, and thereafter being a habitual criminal or habitually using his business place or some other place for the

illegal sale of liquor, then being a habitual criminal, the court issues an injunction against him against the further commission of the crime, and then he, under this amendment, either by summoning bystanders who are in the courtroom at the time or going out on the streets and dragging in other men, his case is entitled to a trial by jury, and that one man on that jury could nullify the act of a half a dozen other juries which have convicted him upon the evidence submitted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman know that some of the States, at least, have a statute which fixes a penalty for one offense and a higher penalty for another offense, and after the second conviction under the law he would be considered as a habitual criminal and have the butt end of the statute?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand if a man is convicted of a felony once and is convicted a second time he might be sent to the penitentiary for life upon conviction for the third offense, providing the previous convictions are set out in the indictment and are proved. But that does not meet the situation here. Some of these offenses will not be felonies; they may be misdemeanors, and they are misdemeanors. The mere selling of liquor in violation of the law is not necessarily made a felony.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a man can not be sent to the penitentiary for life or get the butt end, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, merely for the repetition of a misdemeanor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that I may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that he have three additional minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to refer to another suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri, not because it is important with respect to this amendment but because it does come up a little later in Title II, which is intended to enforce national prohibition. The gentleman said he does not think we ought to fix the alcoholic limit or any alcoholic content as being intoxicating, but it should be left to the courts or juries of the various States. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that his own State has a statute which fixes one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol as making liquor intoxicating. [Applause.] If we did not fix the alcoholic content either at one-half of 1 per cent or some other per cent, under the practice that is in vogue in the Federal courts it will be left to the laws of the various States, and we might have a jury in Kansas say that one-half of 1 per cent is intoxicating, and we might have a jury in New York say that 5 per cent is not intoxicating, and the Supreme Court might be compelled to hold both decisions to be legal, and we would have no standard applying to the whole country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But when these various decisions go to the Supreme Court of the United States, would not the decision of the Supreme Court settle it for all time?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all, because the decision of the Supreme Court will be based upon the law of the States in the case where tried unless Congress itself fixes the standard.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. And also upon the evidence which would be offered in each case?

Mr. BARKLEY. And also upon the evidence offered in each case. What I am very anxious about at this time is the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio which gives a man the right to bring in a jury in cases of injunction where the court has based its injunction upon evidence either adduced before it or upon numerous trials already had in court where men have been convicted of crime. And if you give them the right to trial by jury in such cases you thereby take away from this law one of the provisions that will enable the Federal officers to enforce it, and therefore I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to know if there is any way by which we can reach an agreement as to time for debate on this section?

Mr. GARD. We can not hear what the gentleman says over here.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I would like to know if there is some way of reaching an agreement as to the length of time to be devoted to this section. We have been discussing it now for quite a long time. Would 10 minutes more be satisfactory?

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this section which I desire to offer, and I believe is in line with the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia and ought to have discussion on the floor.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that in 30 minutes all debate upon this section and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time be equally divided between those in favor and those opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is to me a very remarkable exhibition. The last two gentlemen who rose, opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], based their opposition on some strange grounds. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be unfair to the arguments of either of the gentlemen, but, as I recall it and understood it, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BOIES] based his opposition to this amendment on the ground that violators of this law, those to whom it was intended to apply, were such natural liars and criminals that they were not entitled to the essence of justice or a trial by jury. And the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARCLAY] based his argument on the ground that parties to be charged with violation of this law being habitual offenders ought not to be entitled to drag a jury in in order to have a jury trial.

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

Mr. HARDY of Texas. No; I have not the time.

Three or four or five years ago we came into power in this Congress largely because we denounced the tyranny of government by injunction, and we demanded for all persons who were charged with contempt of court, when committed outside of the court, that they be given the right of a trial by jury. When we came into power we passed this law, applying to all contempt proceedings (Stat. L., vol. 38, p. 739):

> In all cases within the purview of this act such trial may be by the court, or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury; in which latter event the court may impanel a jury from the jurors then in attendance, or the court or judge thereof in chambers may cause a sufficient number of jurors to be selected and summoned, as provided by law, to attend at the time and place of trial, at which time a jury shall be selected and impaneled as upon a trial for misdemeanor; and such trial shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice in criminal cases prosecuted by indictment or upon information.

When I campaigned the country and when I helped pass that law I said that as I believed in justice and equality before the law I believed that every citizen had the right to a trial by jury when his life or liberty was involved. [Applause.] We all then believed it. And yet gentlemen tell me to-day that if a man is a habitual criminal, or is charged with a violation of prohibition laws, he has not the right to a trial by jury on a question of fact involving his guilt or innocence. It is a strange thing when those who claim the heritage of law procedure handed down to Anglo-Saxon peoples from Alfred the Great get into a legislative body and denounce the proposed provision for a trial by jury as being a weakening of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I have prosecuted criminals, those who had violated local-option statutes, and I have spent days and nights in the prosecution of them, but I have never asked more than an honest jury to determine whether or not they were guilty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will be glad to do so if the gentleman will give me two and one-half minutes.

Mr. SABATH. How much time did the gentleman have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think he could have had five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the Chair, I do not think the gentleman from Texas occupied five minutes. I know the Chair is sincere, but the gentleman talked only a little over two minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, he has not talked for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed five minutes by the clock.

Mr. GARD. Then the hands must have been rather elastic.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two minutes more, not to be taken out of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] be given two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is that in addition to the 30 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. To be taken out of the 30 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think under the circumstances I would be justified in asking that, because there is a serious difference of opinion among the members of the committee whether he talked five minutes or not, and I think the gentleman from Texas should be given the benefit of the doubt. And I therefore ask unanimous consent that he be given an additional two minutes, not to be taken from the 30 minutes of time allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed two additional minutes, not to be taken from the 30 minutes for debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which asks that a man charged with violating even a temporary order of a court, issued upon an ex parte affidavit, may have a jury trial is a simple appeal to the old love of freedom that once spread all over this land, and that ought to be able to stand in the heart of an American Congress, no matter how hard the wind blows, how fierce the tide rolls, in any particular direction. [Applause.] And if there be a sentiment in this country that demands that liberty perish in order that some law may be strenuously, if not justly, enforced, for God's sake let the American Congress stand against it and say that the trial by jury of any citizen accused of crime for which he may forfeit his life, his liberty, or his property shall remain sacred. [Applause.] That is, as it always has been, the bulwark of human liberty. We owe to all our people high duties—none higher than the duty to hold sacred the right to a trial by jury for any man, high or low, rich or poor, who is accused of crime. That is all I am asking you to do now.

I return the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I just want to take about two minutes. I happen to have been prosecuting attorney for eight years in Ohio under some liquor laws very similar to the law we are trying to enact here. I defended—and I am not bragging about it—about 150 men charged with bootlegging. The first acquittal I got happened to be in a case where the prosecution was conducted by Wayne B. Wheeler, of the Anti-Saloon League, and I was elected prosecuting attorney for both my second term and third term with the opposition of the officials of the Anti-Saloon League. But I want to state to you gentlemen, and particularly to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], that if you give a fairly good lawyer a bootlegging case, and if he can not hang a jury or acquit his client, he is not much of an attorney. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; gladly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had a case before a jury and sent a man to jail for 12 months and fined him $300 for bootlegging, and hung on to him in the Supreme Court. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. During the eight years that I was prosecuting attorney I convicted 104 men that were sent to the penitentiary, and 98 of those men would never have been sent to the penitentiary if it had not been for intoxicating liquor. That is the reason why I am on this side of this question to-day.

I want to say this, that in those liquor cases in which I defended—and I am not bragging of it—I reached the conclusion that any man who wants, honestly, to stand for the strict enforcement of the liquor law does not want to turn around and give a jury trial to a man charged with violating the liquor laws of the State or Nation, either one. If you do that you will make a farce of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that under this amendment a man may be convicted 12 times for the violation of this law?

Mr. FOSTER. I am addressing myself to the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. What he said was true, but my experience of eight years in that office and eight years out of it has convinced me that in liquor cases we can more safely trust a court on questions of fact than a jury. I venture to say, with all due respect to the membership of this House, that if we would go over both sides of this House and pick out 12 men generally from it who would serve as a jury, you could not either acquit or convict in a "bootlegging" case. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that a man may be convicted originally 12 times for the violation of this law?

Mr. FOSTER. With a jury?

Mr. BARKLEY. With a jury; and then some court might issue an injunction against him to try to get him to stop, and then if they can get one man hung on that jury you would lose the case?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. That applies also when men are charged with murder.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not a lawyer in Chicago who could act as prosecuting attorney or district attorney with a jury in cases of this kind and secure conviction, and the liquid gentleman from Illinois knows it. I am a new man here who does not know all the ins and outs of the workings of this House, but I know that a Chicago jury would not convict such a man in such cases.

Mr. SABATH. Have you ever heard of a jury acquitting a man of murder? Is it not understood that a jury enforces criminal statutes?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but it is known that every man who wants a jury trial wants it for the purpose of hanging the jury. That is true, and nobody knows that better than the gentleman himself.

The only reason why I appear to take so decided a stand on this question is that I had some knowledge of the facts as prosecuting attorney for eight years where dozens of fine young men were sent to the penitentiary who never would have gone but for this damnable thing of rum. Those who are in favor of the enforcement of national prohibition ought not to shut their eyes to the fact that the moment you adopt this amendment, or any amendment giving general jury trials to men accused of the violation of these proposed laws, thereby you are weakening the enforcement of this national prohibition law.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I should like to hear an argument on that side.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is it not a fact that the lawyers in criminal cases always ask for a jury trial rather than for trial by the court?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; and you get a jury trial. Is it not a fact that every attorney, including the gentleman who now addresses me, who wants to acquit a criminal being tried for a violation of criminal laws, wants a jury trial every time, and does not want to leave it to the courts?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Yes. If I was trying to get convictions, I would always want to leave it to the court; but if I wanted justice in the administration of the law, under the system which we have inherited from England, I would appeal to a jury for the trial of a man accused of crime. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. I will reply in this way—waiving you to one side and putting you in a class by yourself——

Mr. HARDY of Texas. No; I am in the same class with the gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking the average man, who gets in the habit of wishing for an acquittal when he, as an attorney, is representing a client, looks to a jury, does he not?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Why does your side grant a jury?

Mr. FOSTER. Not having answered my inquiry, I will put the gentleman back in the class with the rest of us, who, when defending criminals, seek jury trials rather than courts.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I heard the chairman of this committee ask that the time be allotted to those opposed to the bill and those for the bill. I assume that a Member can suggest some amendments to this bill even if he is not for or against every provision of it. There are certain technical provisions of this proposed law that we all ought to follow, and give to them, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] says, some thought and consideration. It is all right to have 12 hours' general debate, but when you come to a section to confine the debate to 20 minutes is positively ridiculous. For instance, on page 3 of this bill you provide for liens, but at no place within the first title do you provide any method whereby a lien can be lifted. I want to suggest, at the end of line 15, on page 5, the words "except as hereinafter provided," and then make a proviso, that whenever an action is brought to enforce the lien a bond may be given to the amount of $1,000, and thereupon the lien shall be discharged. The maximum lien is $1,000 and costs. Why should property, during the pendency of your foreclosure action, be tied up immediately after the issuance of the summons and the filing of your lis pendens, as provided by the amendment which you have adopted? Why should not

the bill provide some method whereby you can cancel the lien pending the action, and whereby the property may be made salable?

And then, in reference to the general proposition, if war prohibition is now to be enforced, why should not Title I be enacted and some attempt made to see how it operates before you start in to legislate permanently to enforce the constitutional amendment? Surely some evidence of how this law works would aid you to enact the permanent legislation for the enforcement of the constitutional amendment.

I could suggest something that might make the law more drastice. Just 200 years ago this year the Sultan Amurath, of Turkey, issued an edict which provided that the nose of any person who smoked tobacco should be cut off. If you want to enact these provisions, go ahead, but in all fairness and with the desire to perfect the legislation I make the suggestion that provision be made for the cancellation of the lien which you have created, and I submit that that provision ought to receive fair and reasonable consideration. I am not going to submit an amendment at this time, because I have not perfected one, but I leave it to the fairness of the committee for them to determine whether or not this law should contain a provision for the cancellation and discharge of the lien by the filing of a bond. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the chairman of the committee for the privilege of offering an amendment, and, if I am in order, I would like to offer it now.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. JUUL. May I offer my amendment and have it pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may have his amendment read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 1, after the word "value," insert "of the financial interest of such owner."

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, if I may take the time, with the permission of gentlemen, I want to say that the bill provides that the accused shall come in and file a bond with sureties to be approved by the clerk of the court in which the action is brought "in the full value of the property." I want to say to you gentlemen that if you insist on that language in the bill nine-tenths of all the men accused will languish in jail until the cases are tried, which in my county may mean from one to two years.

My amendment provides that the bond shall be given for the full value of the financial interest in the property of the party accused of committing the act. I want to say that any man being a nominal and equitable owner of a piece of property, valued perhaps at $100,000 or $150,000, whose equity may amount to $20,000 or $25,000, there is absolutely no way that such a man could stay out of jail if this language is enforced. It provides that he shall give bond to the full value of the property. He does not own the full value of the property, and in many instances the full value of the property is so gigantic and out of proportion to the offense that you are condemning the man to perpetual incarceration in jail until the case is tried. I doubt if you gentlemen want to do anything of that sort.

Now, the attention of the Chairman seems to have been diverted while I have been talking. I want his attention. You are providing in the bill, Mr. Chairman, in line 5, that the owner of the property shall come in when accused and file a bond to the full value of the property. I am trying to tell you that he may not own the full value of the property, and if you insist on that language as now contained in the bill, nearly every one accused, at least in my county, by virtue of this bill, will have to languish in jail until there is some method found to get him out.

A great flat or apartment building in Chicago may be valued at $150,000 to $200,000 and up. Some tenant may go astray and do something that he ought not to do, and then you compel the owner to come in and furnish bond to such an enormous amount that he will not be able to do it. He can come in and give bond to the extent of his holding in the building.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. How would it work out? Suppose a tenant who is holding from month to month—I am interested in the point the gentleman is making, and I think there is merit in it——

Mr. JUUL. Let me say that in many cases it will be the tenant that commits the offense. Violations will be for having liquor on the premises or selling same. The owner is called in to furnish bond and is accused of having knowledge of the action of this tenant. The bill provides that he is to give bond to the full value of the building. I maintain that he is unable to do it, and if the language is insisted on it will simply result, in every case where the man is the nominal owner of the apartment building, that he will have to languish in jail because he is unable to comply with the provisions of the law, and be unable to furnish a bond in the amount that this bill provides.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains of the time allotted?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the purpose of the measure before us is to secure the enforcement of national prohibition of the liquor traffic. I take it that it is our desire to pass a bill that will accomplish that purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not yield in five minutes. The gentleman will have his own time. Section 3 provides that "a place of any kind where intoxicating liquor is sold * * * in violation of the war-prohibition act" shall be deemed a nuisance. Section 4 provides that such a nuisance may be proceeded against in equity and an injunction may be secured in a proceeding prosecuted by the district attorney to the court.

After the preliminary hearing, and after the full hearing if the injunction is made permanent, then if the owner of that place continues to sell in violation of law he may be brought in for contempt of court. The trial of the contempt proceeding will be before the judge. Now, it is desired by some gentlemen here—and they protest their friendliness to this law—to have a jury. We all know, and we might as well be frank about it, that the object of having a jury in such a case is to make it more difficult to enforce the law to stamp out the sale of liquor. [Applause.]

Gentlemen remind me, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in his interesting remarks reminded me, of a friend of mine at home, a member of the supreme court, one of the finest gentlemen and best lawyers in the State. He has often told me of his experiences when Michigan had State-wide prohibition before, in the late seventies and the early eighties. Then the trial of offenders against the law was before a jury in a justice court. I think that would suit some of these gentlemen even better than what they suggest now. Mr. Justice Moore was then the prosecuting attorney of our county, then a lumber woods county. He said that he brought case after case before a jury in the justice court with 20 to 30 open saloons upon the streets of the little town of Lapeer, and he could not get a conviction in any of them.

The failure to enforce prohibition, not its actual operation, was the reason that State-wide prohibition was repealed in Michigan, and it was 40 years before we got it back again. Now, my friends, you might as well understand that people who have been through that kind of experience, having had that kind of an example before them, have reached the stage where in enforcing this law they want a law with teeth in it, a law that will secure results, a law that will stop the sale of liquor. A few months ago there came to this Chamber from the other body a bill known as the Reed amendment, a drastic bill, some of us thought at that time. Even the drys were alarmed that we were getting too drastic. We were afraid to pass that, afraid of the effect it would have on the sentiment in Michigan that was about to vote on the question, but the drys accepted the challenge of the wets and they passed a real measure, the Reed amendment, as to interstate shipment of liquors. In the State of Michigan, following that act of Congress, in a State where any percentage of alcohol is forbidden, in a State where the law has teeth in it, they adopted State-wide prohibition by a majority of about 70,000, and after it had been in effect a year they rejected even a proposition to sell beer and wine by a majority of 207,000. That is the result where you have an actual enforcement of prohibition, because it is only with actual enforcement that the sale of liquor is really stopped, and it is the use and sale of liquor that must be stopped in order to secure the results desired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make an announcement. A few moments ago he stated that there were five minutes remaining. The Chair overlooked the fact that the gentleman from New York failed to use about two minutes of his time. There are seven minutes remaining, and the Chair will now recognize the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, the specific proposition now under discussion is as to whether an infraction of an injunction order in a liquor case should be triable by jury. The General Assembly of Virginia a few years ago enacted into law provisions to the effect that a man charged with contempt of court, alleged to have been committed beyond the view of the

court, should be triable by jury. The court of appeals of that State held that a legislative enactment of the character mentioned was not binding upon the court; that the court had an inherent right and full power to enforce its judgments and decrees, and could not be restrained in relation thereto by any legislative enactment. To that view I heartily subscribe.

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

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Would the gentleman subscribe to that view speaking to a group of men who had been enjoined for strikes?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I hold to the opinion, absolutely, that the courts of this country are entitled to command respect for their judgments and enforce them, and whenever the time comes when the people lose confidence in the courts and will not observe the mandate of the law, or by legislative enactment undertake to circumvent judicial determination, then this country is in a fair way toward anarchy, and I insist that any man who teaches a contrary view is advocating a heresy and is contributing his mind and effort to the undoing of enlightened civilization.

Now, replying directly to the respectful inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from New York, I will say that the question we are discussing is limited to injunction to restrain the use of a building for "speakeasy" purposes—to restrain a common nuisance. The proposition does not include the question, Should the writ of injunction issue to restrain the liquor nuisance? That much is granted. I am only contending that where the injunction right exists that enforcement ought to take place. If the remedy exists, it should be enforced. Every right should be vindicated.

Furthermore, I know it to be true that judges have assumed jurisdiction in cases where jurisdiction was wanting—in labor disputes—and in such case judges have, by force of the power of their judicial position, arbitrarily and autocratically done injury to the men and also to society in general. It is unnecessary for me to say that a judge guilty of this kind of oppression should be removed from the bench.

The gentleman's inquiry has caused me to diverge, but before returning to the main subject I desire to notice a remark made by the erudite and polished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BOIES], who in debate, just a few minutes ago, said:

> When that is passed and it comes to the question of a black drunken devil who will rape a white woman in the city of Washington, they want a jury trial and can not trust the judge. That is the attitude of the gentlemen who are not in favor of a strict enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I want to say that I do not subscribe to the doctrine of the gentleman from Iowa. I hold that every man, black or white, charged with crime, it matters not how fiendish or monstrous that crime may be, has a right to challenge at the hands of the authorities administering the law a fair and just trial by jury under the Constitution and laws of the country. I am informed that the gentleman was formerly a judge upon the supreme bench of the great State of Iowa, and while his remarks—which I have quoted—are not now ex cathedra, and were uttered in the heat of debate, yet I would be grossly derelict to the cause of law and order did I not challenge an utterance of that character. And, furthermore, I would be unworthy of the respect and friendship of the thousands of colored constituents in the fifth congressional district of West Virginia, who have trusted me, did I not resent what I interpret as an aspersion doubtless inadvertently made—not as against a criminal individual but as against the black race. In my district there is to be found no greater percentage of crime among the colored people than among the white people. Our colored citizens are industrious, honorable, and patriotic. Cheerfully have they given of their means to every war cause, and they have bought freely of the war bonds and other Government securities. By personal effort in household economies, by increased labor in the coal mines and on the railroads, by the planting and cultivation of war gardens, by activities of their section of the Red Cross, by the efforts of their professional men—lawyers, doctors, dentists, and their ministers and teachers—and by their printing presses, and, last but not least, by their blood on the battle field, have they demonstrated their loyalty to their Government and their right to command the respect and confidence of the American people and of the world. Three thousand young colored men left their work on the three great railroads that traverse my district, and in the more than 400 mines—in the Pocahontas, Thacker, Wayne, Logan, and Wyoming coal fields, among the most celebrated in the world—to answer their country's call, and with thousands of their white comrades fought for the land of their birth under the starry flag, obediently to their country's call.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to resume discussion of the main subject, from which I have diverged—prohibition.

Although a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, but being a new Member I have been reluctant to intrude myself into these deliberations, for I realize that a new Member is not familiar with the rules and regulations governing debate and parliamentary procedure, but I have been trying to learn. At the committee hearings I sat and patiently listened to all that was said and done. Concerning the form of the prohibition bill, I found there were about three groups of people, each group representing a different school of thought. One group wanted the bill so carelessly drawn as that, if it were enacted into law, it would carry no force nor effect, would be innocuous and a dead letter. Another group were on the other extreme. With them everything must be subordinated to prohibition. The bill must be drastic, the penalties inflexible, men and business must be put in a strait-jacket, and all this without regard to public sentiment. The bill as brought to us carried provisions to the effect that it was unlawful to manufacture or sell grape juice or to manufacture or sell nonintoxicating malt drinks, of which there are dozens of kinds sold under various trade names, and also practically forbidding the manufacture, sale, and use of flavoring extracts, such as our mothers have used from the day we were born. The possession of the old cook book because, forsooth, it contained a recipe for making dandelion wine was a crime. It was even thought advisable to put the preachers under bond for the proper use of sacramental wine.

These were the views of the men obsessed with one idea. They would destroy legitimate business just because a drunken degenerate would take a dangerous chance in drinking a bottle of lemon extract for the intoxicating effect of the alcohol therein, necessary in the manufacture in order to hold the oil in solution. Such men as these would burn down the house in order to kill the rats.

Then, there was the third group—those who really had prohibition at heart. Men who had the sense to know that a law can only be enforced when it is supported by public opinion; that to make the law too vicious would render it obnoxious and militate against its enforcement; that in certain communities—hitherto wet and now forced to surrender to the binding force of national decision—a drastic law would meet with strong resistance. I say that the men who took this view, in my opinion, were the true friends of prohibition. I am frank to say that, according to my view, the bill—although vitally reformed in many particulars—is yet a little too strong, and I am willing to vote for such amendments as do not adversely affect the principle of prohibition.

In an address before the West Virginia Bar Association, delivered at Parkersburg in December, 1914, I incidentally mentioned that—

> Since our last meeting our friend (?) John Barleycorn has removed his domicile beyond the confines of this State. His principal habitat is now in the old Buckeye State. John is an outlaw, not only in this State but in other States of the Union, more recently the State of Virginia. Public opinion is against him, and in the not distant future he will be run down and annihilated. John has, hitherto, been much in evidence at our banquets. This year he will be conspicuously absent.
>
> While professing to be our friend, John was, in truth, a most subtle enemy. I think that I can with reasonable safety prophesy that in the future our banquets will be dry, even dusty. Rum has left us, we confidently hope, never to return. In its place may be found sobriety, industry, and good fellowship. The genial souls who gather at the board will depart therefrom with clearer minds, purer thoughts, and happier hearts than ever before. Time was that a lawyer might get on a spree, especially in term time, and add merriment to the proceedings. In the future, as now, conditions of this sort will not be tolerated. Although never a tetotaler, as I must confess, I was willing to forego what little pleasure I should get from an occasional drink, in order that temptation be removed from others. A majority of you gave voice to this sentiment at our Webster Springs meeting some four or five years ago, when you voted in support of a resolution to exclude wine from the banquet. This resolution was adopted, but did not prove effective, for the supply had already been laid in and it was deemed best to consume it in order to prevent others from doing so. I think that most of us, weak and erring, were particeps criminis. All this tends to show the fallibility of human nature, but men must be judged by their good points, not by their bad ones. It were needless to say, the resolution was expunged in order that the members be not stultified.

In a political address made at Hamlin, W. Va., September 3, 1918, in stating my position on the question of enforcement, I said:

> Having voted for the prohibition amendment, it was my pleasure, as a State senator, to support and vote for the administrative acts, original and as amended, carrying the will of the people into effect. The wisdom of this legislation is now apparent to all, in view of the greatly diminished number of inmates in our jails and penitentiary, of the greatly increased bank deposits, and of the domestic peace and tranquillity now abounding within our borders. What is good for a State is good for a nation and, therefore, I shall, in event I am elected, and the legislatures of the required number of States shall adopt the amendment as proposed during my term, be pleased again to assist in carrying the verdict of the people into judgment and execution by voting for the passage of such administrative acts as may be essential.

In my district there are many men who would enjoy the pleasure of taking a drink—and to be perfectly frank, I am of

that number—but these, almost without exception, would never consent to return to old conditions. On my trips through that great region I am constantly reminded of the great transformation that has taken place since State prohibition went into effect. In former days almost every village and mining camp had its saloon. Surrounding these, at morning and at evening, were to be found men drunk and disorderly. Now, all is changed. The people are orderly and go to church—men provide for their homes and educate their children, and have money in the bank. Crime has been lessened, public expense of enforcing the criminal law reduced, all the people happier.

In November, 1914, West Virginia, by a majority of 90,000, voted an amendment of her constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. In January, 1919, West Virginia, by the unanimous voice of the membership of her legislature, ratified the proposed eighteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating liquors.

The Federal amendment, proposed as aforesaid, having been adopted by reason of the ratification thereof by legislative action of more than the required number of the 48 States of the Union, therefore, in view of these and other considerations, I voted with the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary to report the bill to the House with favorable recommendation, and, in harmony therewith, I shall vote for the passage of the bill.

National prohibition in the United States of America marks a new epoch in the history of the world. Under the old régime, for 4,000 years the right to buy and use liquor has been without appreciable limitation. Now all is changed. We are entering a new era. What the physiological, metaphysical, sociological, and economical effect upon mankind will be remains for experience to determine. My opinion, for whatever it may be worth, is that never again in this country shall we see a lawful sale of liquors for beverage purposes. With the advent of national prohibition this country will be expected to develop a race of men strong physically and, therefore, of great longevity, powerful in their intellectual qualifications, supreme in their moral conceptions, and who, with dynamic power, will force America upon an economic plane high above and far ahead of any other nation of the earth. If we shall live to see the fulfilment of the prophecy, then, in justice, we shall be bound to admit that the pioneers, who led the crusade and won the battle, are entitled to the honor, although belated, that history inevitably accords to the world's great reformers.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, it would be well to understand the purpose of the amendment. There can be no proper legislation taking away from a man for any sort of crime, if it be a felony, the right to trial by jury. That is not the question here. Cases under this law which provides for the imprisonment as for a felony necessarily will give to every defendant the right to a trial by jury. Why should they not have it when the law of the land guarantees to even the wretch who goes about the streets of Washington assaulting women the right to a trial by jury? It is not an individual case, but it is the practice that every man in this land is entitled, before he is adjudged guilty of any crime, to be tried by a jury of his peers. That is the law, and all that you can do or all that you can write will not nullify it. What we are endeavoring is to try to see that that right shall not be nullified by the right which gives the enforcement of this law or any other law to a court under the guise of punishment for contempt. Why, everybody went to the country, we paid tribute to the liberties of the people of the United States in every branch of honest work when we said, as we did in 1914, that in the event a man is called upon to face a charge of contempt, preferred by a court for the violation of a labor injunction or anything of that kind, that he is entitled to a trial by jury. It was then stated that you could not enforce the law if you have that, but it is the law, and we are enforcing the law, and it is the policy of the United States of America to give every man a fair trial. It was only the thought that in these matters where prejudice and bigotry might appear, as they may appear in this or other matters, instead of vesting arbitrary power in one man it was best for the consideration of the common good to give that power to a jury should he demand it. That is the only proposition here—not to abridge the right of trial by jury, but give to whoever may be charged by a contempt here the same right as any man who may be charged by a contempt in the splendid law referred to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, that illustrates what a fine time a criminal would have with a judge like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Or with a jury made up of gentlemen like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were—ayes 70, noes 66.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] will take their places as tellers.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that motion can not be made while the committee is dividing.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. A motion for the committee to rise is in order at any time.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 101.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I make the point that that is dilatory, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARD. It is not only dilatory but it is out of order. We are in the process of a vote by tellers on another question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a right to demand tellers. Those in favor of tellers will rise and be counted. [After counting.] One gentleman has risen, and tellers are refused.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the other side.

The demand for the other side was refused.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD]. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and the gentleman from Ohio will take their places as tellers.

The question was taken; and the tellers reported—ayes 76, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] has offered an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JUUL: Page 5, line 1, after the word "value," insert the words "of the financial interest of such owner."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Is not the gentleman entitled to recognition on his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has been closed on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JUUL. I rise for the purpose of having the gentlemen on the floor know what is pending. I doubt very much if anyone knows what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on the section and all amendments thereto has been closed by order of the committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Strike out all after the word "punished," on line 3, page 6, and insert "by imprisonment of not less than 20 years," so as to read: "Any person found guilty of contempt under the provisions of this section shall be punished by imprisonment of not less than 20 years."

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GARD. For the purpose of speaking against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was limited by the action of the committee, and it has been exhausted. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That if any section or provision of this act shall be held to be invalid, it is hereby provided that all other provisions of this act which are not expressly held to be invalid shall continue in full force and effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section for the reason that it is repeated in section 38, on page 32.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Page 6, strike out all of section 6.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the provision to which the gentleman refers will not be applicable to this title at all. Certainly this section ought to be retained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Both of them say, "the provision of this act." Neither uses the expression of "title."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. But we have an express provision at the end of Title II that only puts into effect before the 16th of next January certain sections of Title II.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Section 6, which we are now considering, says:

That if any section or provision of this act shall be held to be invalid, it is hereby provided that all other provisions of this act which are not expressly held to be invalid shall continue in full force and effect.

Now, on page 32, section 38, is this language:

That if any provision of this act shall be held invalid, it shall not be construed to invalidate other provisions of the act.

So it seems to be a repetition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would it meet the views of both gentlemen if the word "act" was stricken out and the word "title" inserted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That would meet with my approval.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think it would make any difference if it was stricken out in both cases?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am not prepared to say as to that.

Mr. WALSH. I think the Supreme Court will find it absolutely unnecessary legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But there is no reason for it to be used twice.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is, if the gentleman will look at the section on page 32. It does not go into effect until the 16th of January next.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; if you strike it out here, there will be no provision applicable to Title I.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Oh, yes. In both cases the limitation refers to the word "act" and not to the word "title." In both places it relates to the entire bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The gentleman misunderstands me. Turn to the last section of the bill, and there you will find that Titles I and III and sections 1 and 40 of Title II of the act shall be in force from and after the approval of this act. The other sections of Title II shall take effect on or after January 16, 1920. Consequently, the provision on page 32 does not go into effect until January next. Hence, if you are going to leave anything that relates to war-time prohibition, you must leave in place section 6 on page 6.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. The gentleman is mistaken. Only one of these is necessary, because it relates to the question as to whether or not the bill is constitutional.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. If the gentleman cares to amend it by putting in the word "title" instead of "act" I will have no objection, and in that way we can get rid of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In order that the chairman of the committee may have further time to consider the matter, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, and then when we get to section 38, on page 52, I will move to strike that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That none of the provisions of this act shall be construed to limit or annul any order or regulation prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or disposition of intoxicating liquors within certain prescribed zones or districts, nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit the use of the power of the military or naval authorities to enforce the regulations of the President or Secretary of War or Navy issued in pursuance to law prohibiting the manufacture, use, possession, sale, or other disposition of intoxicating liquors during the period of the war and demobilization thereafter.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how long it is his purpose to continue in session to-night?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Until 9 o'clock, if the committee will stay. We have not been able to make much progress on the bill. We have had it under consideration now for two weeks.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman inform us what is to be done to-morrow?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. My understanding is that the Agricultural bill is likely to take considerable time, and I think we are all anxious to get through with this bill.

Mr. GARD. This is a matter of convenience to the Members of the House to know what the gentleman intends to do. I think there should be a fair representation of Members of the House present when we take up this important matter. Here we are with possibly 45 or 50 people present now.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Oh, I think there is a quorum in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. GARD. If we are going ahead to-morrow I can see no necessity for prolonging this to-night.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We will not be able to get much of to-morrow, as I understand it, because if we bring in the Agricultural bill that will occupy much of the time. I am in hopes that the committee will agree to go on until about 9 o'clock. I know many Members would like very much to finish this matter this week, and there is no possibility of that unless we do something of the kind I suggest.

Mr. GARD. I do not desire to appear in the rôle of an obstructionist. I simply want to know for the information of the gentlemen about me who desire to know for their own convenience.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a question. I would like to ask the chairman whether or not if the committee stays here and works until 9 o'clock the Chair is going to require the Member having the floor from now on to speak in order on the bill? If all the committee is going to do is to talk on matters outside of the bill, we will not save much time by working here until 9 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDERSON). The Chair would state that so far as he is concerned debate has proceeded in order, and if it does not proceed in order the gentleman from Texas, or any other gentleman exercising his right, can call the gentleman on the floor to order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING BEVERAGES.

That when used in Title 2 and Title 3 of this act (1) the word "liquor" or the phrase "intoxicating liquor" shall be construed to include alcohol, brandy, whisky, rum, gin, beer, ale, porter, and wine, and in addition thereto any spirituous, vinous, malt, or fermented liquor, liquids, and compounds, whether medicated, proprietary, patented, or not, and by whatever name called, containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume which are potable or capable of being used as a beverage.

(2) The word "person" shall mean and include natural persons, associations, copartnerships, and corporations.

(3) The word "commissioner" shall mean Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(4) The term "application" means a formal written request supported by a verified statement of fact showing that the commissioner may grant the request.

(5) The term "permit" means a formal written authorization by the commissioner setting forth specifically the things that are authorized.

(6) The term "bond" means an obligation authorized or required by or under this act or any regulation, issued in such form and for such a penal sum as may be required by a court, the commissioner, or prescribed by regulation.

(7) The term "regulation" shall include all regulations prescribed by the commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury for carrying out the provisions of this act so as to afford safety to the revenues and adequate protection against diversion of liquor for illegal uses, and the commissioner is authorized to make such regulations.

Any act authorized to be done by the commissioner may be performed by any assistant or agent designated by him for that purpose. Records required to be filed with the commissioner shall be filed with an assistant commissioner or other person designated by the commissioner to receive such records.

Mr. HASKELL (interrupting the reading). Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is to be read by sections or by paragraphs?

The CHAIRMAN. By sections.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that, in reply to a question I asked of the regular occupant of the chair, he answered that it would be read by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. All bills except appropriation bills are customarily read by sections.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We are reading the bill by sections.

Mr. LONGWORTH. My recollection is that Chairman GOOD ruled specifically in reply to a question I asked that it was to be read by paragraphs.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No; I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I shall look it up.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the section.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. IGOE: Page 7, strike out all of lines 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The word 'liquor' or the phrase 'intoxicating liquor' shall be construed to include any spirituous, vinous, malt, or fermented liquor, liquids, and compounds, whether medicated, proprietary, patented or not, and by whatever name called, which are intoxicating and which are potable or capable of being used for beverage purposes."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members present, a quorum.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think this is perhaps the most important point in the bill. In this section is presented for the first time, as far as the enforcement of national prohibition is concerned, the question of the power of Congress under the constitutional amendment. There are other sections of the bill which follow where this same question will be presented. There is a very marked difference of opinion between those who advocate this bill and those who oppose it as to the power of Congress under the eighteenth amendment. The eighteenth amendment to the Constitution provides:

SECTION 1. After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes, is hereby prohibited.

My contention is that the Congress is limited to the provisions of that first section of the eighteenth amendment.

It is contended by the majority in the report on this bill that under the power given under the second section to enforce this article by appropriate legislation that Congress may go to the extent of prohibiting, if it deems it wise, the manufacture and sale of beverages that are in fact not intoxicating. Now, the amendment is not only limited to the manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicating beverages, but it is limited to the business in intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. If the Congress can go as far as these gentlemen say it can go and deal with nonintoxicants, then there is no reason why we should be limited to prohibiting merely the manufacture, sale, or transportation, nor is there any reason why we should be limited to the prohibition of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes. The amendment which I have offered provides, in the language of the Constitution, that intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes shall be prohibited. Now, the majority in the report filed on this bill claims that because several States under their various constitutions and State laws have passed acts in which intoxicating liquors are defined to include nonintoxicants, that the Congress may go to the same extent, and I wish to impress here again that in the first section of this article is contained the whole power of Congress, and that section of the article is a complete prohibition in itself. If the words selected there were not intended to give Congress authority, then it was useless to select the words "manufacture, sale, transportation, and exportation." Now, under State laws it is true that the State legislatures have included many beverages which are not intoxicating, but an examination of those cases and an examination of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, where those cases have come up to the court for decision, will show that the constitutions of the States either permitted them to do what the legislatures did or that under the broad police powers of the State that legislation was sustained. Attention has been called particularly to some of those cases where beverages admittedly nonintoxicating were prohibited, but the Federal Government has no general police power. I think that is conceded by all who have discussed this bill or who have considered the question of the power of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. IGOE. May I have five minutes additional?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend the request of the gentleman from Missouri, that instead of having 5 minutes he shall have 10 minutes, because he intends to present a legal argument.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Sixty-eight gentlemen are present; not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

Anthony	Frear	Linthicum	Robinson, N. C.
Ashbrook	Freeman	Luce	Rodenberg
Babka	French	Luhring	Rouse
Bacharach	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Rucker
Bankhead	Fuller, Mass.	McArthur	Sabath
Barbour	Gandy, S. Dak.	McClintic	Sanford
Bland, Ind.	Garner	McCulloch	Saunders, Va.
Booher	Goodall	McDuffie	Schall
Brinson	Gould	McFadden	Scott
Britten	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Scully
Brooks, Ill.	Green, Iowa	McKeown	Sells
Brooks, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Shreve
Browne	Griest	McPherson	Sims
Brumbaugh	Griffin	Madden	Sinclair
Buchanan	Hamill	Maher	Sisson
Burdick	Hamilton	Major	Slemp
Butler	Hardy, Colo.	Mann	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Tex.	Mansfield	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Harrison	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hayden	Mason	Snell
Carter	Heflin	Merritt	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hickey	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Cleary	Hicks	Mondell	Stephens, Miss.
Coady	Houghton	Montague	Stevenson
Copley	Howard	Moon	Stiness
Costello	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Strong, Kans.
Crago	Hudspeth	Moores, Ind.	Sullivan
Crisp	Hulings	Morin	Sweet
Davey	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Tenn.	Neely	Thompson, Ohio
Dempsey	Humphreys	Nelson, Mo.	Tilson
Dent	Ireland	Nichols, Mich.	Towner
Dickinson, Mo.	Jefferis	Nolan	Treadway
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor	Vare
Dooling	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield	Vestal
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Oliver	Vinson
Dunbar	Jones, Tex.	Park	Walsh
Dunn	Kahn	Parker	Walters
Dyer	Kearns	Platt	Ward
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Wason
Echols	Kelly, Pa.	Pou	Watson, Va.
Elliott	Kendall	Purnell	Webb
Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, H. T.	White, Kans.
Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Calif.	Williams
Emerson	Kettner	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Esch	King	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Evans, Mont.	Kitchin	Reavis	Wise
Fairfield	Langley	Reed, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.
Fields	Larsen	Reed, W. Va.	Woodyard
Flood	Lee, Ga.	Rhodes	Young, Tex.
Fordney	Lever	Riordan	Zihlman

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called, that 224 Members, a quorum, had answered to their names, and that he presented therewith the names of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its session.

The committee resumed its session for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6810, with Mr. ANDERSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that interruption came, because I could have finished what I had to say a long time ago. I do not know whether it would have enlightened the House very much, but I have been deeply interested in this particular question, because I think it is one of the most important in the bill. The gentlemen in charge of the bill or the majority of the committee, I think, will concede that Congress has no power to legis-

late upon this question within the States except under this amendment. Of course, it has been suggested that under the power of taxation we might enact certain legislation, and how far we might go in that respect I am not prepared now to discuss.

As to interstate matters, of course, our power is unlimited, and under the war power we may go a long ways. The amendment, however, gives Congress whatever power it has. The contention of the majority that the power is full and complete is one that I deny, because it is not the same as that which was given under the power to regulate interstate commerce or establish post offices and post roads.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. IGOE and Mr. GARD demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 71.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARD. There is an amendment pending, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to the amendment.

This is not a new question. It is a question that we decided a few days ago, and it seems to me we ought not to waste any more time on it unnecessarily. The Attorney General but yesterday called attention to the fact that it was absolutely necessary to have a definition in this war prohibition act to make it effective. It is equally necessary to put a definition of intoxicating liquor into this title, which is the one to enforce constitutional prohibition. There can be no doubt about that. Not only has it been illustrated in the enforcement of war-time prohibition, but it has been illustrated in every State where they have tried it, and, so far as I am advised, not a single State has attempted to enforce anything like a prohibition law or liquor laws of any kind without placing in their statutes a definition. There must be a definition; otherwise the law will be absolutely ineffective.

Let me say this now, and make it plain, that everyone who is in favor of this proposition is opposed to effective enforcement of prohibition. Knowing that the country will not stand for open opposition, they aim to make the law ineffective by providing for a jury trial and by striking out the definition of intoxicating liquor. Let us be honest. You who are for an effective law should stand up for the bill, and those who are opposed to it should come out flat-footed and say, "We are trying to defeat it."

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this section be now closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist on that, because I have an amendment I know he will accept.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. On this amendment, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that debate on this amendment be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASKELL: Amend subdivision (1) of section (1) of title 2 as follows: In lines 12 and 13, page 7, strike out the words "one-half of 1 per cent or more of." In line 13, page 7, after the word "volume," insert "in excess of the maximum per cent fixed for nonintoxicating beverages by proclamation of the President of the United States to be made as hereinafter set forth: That the President of the United States shall appoint a commission of five members to serve without pay, with power to meet at such places as said commission deems advisable, and compel the attendance of witnesses, send for persons and papers, and administer oaths to witnesses. It shall be the duty of this commission to investigate and report to the President of the United States, and to this Congress, at the earliest practicable moment, what maximum per cent of alcohol in the beverages and preparations described in the first paragraph hereof which are potable or capable of being used as a beverage, in its opinion, constitute nonintoxicating liquors. The President of the United States shall, by proclamation, fix the maximum per cent of alcohol for nonintoxicating beverages as reported by said commission."

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated on the floor of this House——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I presume that that is not germane to the purpose of this bill. The purpose of the bill is not to have prohibition by presidential proclamation. The purpose of the bill is to provide adequate legislation in support of the constitutional provision, as provided by the Constitution. The Constitution does not say that the President shall proclaim laws that would carry into effect the constitutional provision. The Constitution says that the Congress may prescribe rules and regulations that will put this law into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the proposition.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, will not the Chair hear me on the proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, this section refers to the percentage of alcohol by volume to be permitted in these beverages, and I submit that resolution after resolution has been introduced here in one form or another upon this subject.

That being true, my amendment prescribes a definite and precise way of fixing the alcoholic-volume content. It certainly is proper to have some investigation of the percentage of alcohol which makes these drinks intoxicating, and, on the other hand, the percentage which renders them nonintoxicating. We have had no adequate investigation of that proposition. In fact, no investigation at all. The Committee on the Judiciary, reporting this bill, will not say upon the floor of this House that they have investigated what percentage of alcoholic volume in these drinks constitutes them intoxicating, and, on the other hand, constitutes them nonintoxicating. My amendment proposes a sane way of finding out, in order to comply with the provisions of the eighteenth amendment, which only prohibits intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

That is the proposition under consideration. My amendment covers that situation. I would like to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it has been held many times by the House that where a provision fixes a standard it is not germane to offer an amendment providing for a commission or any other method of fixing a standard; and the gentleman's amendment providing for a commission is not germane to the provision fixing the percentage of alcohol in the beverage. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, it is too late. The decision was announced.

Mr. HASKELL. I could not appeal until it was announced.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee? Those in favor of sustaining the ruling of the Chair will say "aye"; those opposed will say "no."

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASKELL. I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 73, noes 14.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members present, a quorum.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee do now rise.

The question being taken (on a division demanded by Mr. HASKELL) there were—ayes 7, noes 86.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chariman, I offer an amendment. On page 7, at the end of line 17, I move to strike

out the period after the word "corporation" and insert a comma and then add the following words:

Also the principal officer of every corporation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Page 7, line 17, after the word "corporation," strike out the period and insert a comma and add the words "also the principal officer of every corporation."

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What would "the principal officer of every corporation" be under this definition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Under the definition of "persons," an individual can be both fined and imprisoned; but a corporation can not be imprisoned and can only be fined.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A common carrier corporation may violate the law and nobody can be imprisoned. The corporation may pay a fine and get off. A hotel corporation could violate the law and get off with a fine and nobody would be imprisoned. But if the language that I have just offered is added to the definition, the principal officer of the corporation can be both fined and imprisoned.

Mr. WALSH. But the gentleman will notice that this is only a definition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Now, what would "the principal officer of a corporation" be if that amendment were adopted?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That would depend on the articles of incorporation and by-laws of the corporation.

Mr. WALSH. He would be a natural person?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; but he himself would not violate the law if a railroad took an illegal shipment.

Mr. WALSH. This definition would not make him a violator of the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The definition I have added would bring him in all right.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If I am mistaken, it is a mistake in the right direction; and this language had better be put in.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Any individual acting as an officer would be liable anyway without this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; if the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, for instance, or the American Railways Express Co., should be indicted for an illegal transportation of whisky, the president of the company could not be imprisoned under this bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. You would not want to imprison him unless he had some knowledge and had participated in the offense, and if he had he would be liable as a natural person.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the principal officer of the corporation were liable to imprisonment, he would see that the law was carried out by his corporation. Any two or three persons in a community who are bootleggers may resolve themselves into a corporation. Every hotel, every soft-drink establishment, could go to the proper place in the State and become incorporated, and then they could not be imprisoned.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman object to striking out the word "principal" and inserting the word "managing"? The president might not have anything to do with the violation of the law. It might be an underling who was the manager of the corporation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If this becomes the law, we will have a live man as the principal officer.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. VENABLE. As I understand, anyone who participates in the commission of a misdemeanor is liable. Now, how could a corporation commit a misdemeanor through an agent without the agent being equally guilty with the corporation? And if that be true, why is it necessary to make the agents of the corporation liable by name?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Oh, I think it is quite clear that there is no way to impose imprisonment upon anybody connected with a corporation unless he be included in this definition.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the purpose of the gentleman from Kentucky is not carried out by the amendment he proposes. As has been suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Massachusetts, subdivision 2 provides a definition of the word "person," and it is supposed that they shall include natural persons, corporations, associations, and copartnerships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say that the corporation would be fined, but nobody could be imprisoned.

Mr. GARD. The same rule would apply to associations or copartnerships or any officer thereof. The gentleman seeks to have somebody designated who might be made criminally responsible on behalf of the corporation, but he does not accomplish that, because it simply provides a definition of the word "partnership." No matter what amendment is put in after the word "corporation," it still means that "corporation" is a person under this definition of the law. That is all there is to it. The amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is not only not necessary but defeats its own end.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, if the purpose be to so arrange that if the corporation is engaged in the sale of liquor some individual who would act for the corporation can be punished, I do not think the amendment is necessary. A corporation can only act through certain individuals named, and everyone who participates in the commission of a misdemeanor is guilty of the misdemeanor. There are no accessories to misdemeanors. Everyone who aids and abets and helps in the perpetration of a misdemeanor is guilty as principal, and so if you had the agent of a corporation, when the corporation was engaged in the sale of liquor, that individual would be punished on the basis of his own personal guilt.

Now, however, if the purpose of the amendment be to choose some agent of the corporation to punish as a vicarious sacrifice, whether he had anything to do with the actual sale or not, it ought to be defeated, because it is unjust to punish a man for an act that he knew nothing about and had no part in the performance.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, on page 7, line 6, before the word "that" the words "section 1," and strike out the figures 2 and 3 and insert the Roman numerals II and III in place thereof.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 6, before the word "that" insert the words "section 1." In the same line add an "s" to the first word "title," strike out the figure 2, and strike out the word "title" and the figure 3, and insert in place of figure 2 the Roman numeral II and in place of title 3 insert the Roman numeral III.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in line 7, after the figure 1 in parentheses, the word "the" may be spelled with a capital "T."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that in line 7 the word "the" shall commence with a capital. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if he would have any objection, in lines 20 and 23, page 7, and in line 1, on page 8, to striking out the word "means" and insert the words "shall mean," making it conform to the provisions in subparagraphs 2 and 3?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is all right, except in line 5, on page 8. You will have to strike out the word "include" there.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; and insert the words "shall mean."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no objection to that.

Mr. WALSH. Very well. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer that as an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 7, line 20, strike out the word "means" and insert the words "shall mean." Page 7, line 23, strike out the word "means" and insert the words "shall mean." Page 8, line 1, strike out the word "means" and insert the words "shall mean." Page 8, line 5, strike out the word "include" and insert the word "mean."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which has been authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary, but which so far has not been reported by the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 7, line 14, strike out the words "as a" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for." Strike out the period and after the word "beverage" insert the word "purposes."

Mr. GARD. As I say, that was authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no objection to that.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 8, line 2, by striking out the word "issued" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "executed." Mortgaged bonds are issued, but appearance bonds are executed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Page 8, line 2, strike out the word "issued" and insert in lieu thereof the word "executed."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I accept that.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Also on the same page at the end of line 10, after the word "regulations," strike out the period and insert the words "as are not inconsistent with law." Subsection (8) there gives a blanket commission to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue when approved by the Secretary of the Treasury to issue all sorts of regulations. I think it should be limited to make the regulations consistent with law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Page 8, line 10, after the word "regulations," strike out the period and insert the words "as are not inconsistent with law."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to add the word "cider" after the word "wine," in line 9, page 7, striking out the word "and" which precedes the word "wines."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman should put his amendment in writing in accordance with the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will submit his amendment in writing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very well. Here it is. I send it to the desk and ask that the Clerk report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FITZGERALD: Page 7, line 9, after the word "porter," strike out the word "and," and after the word "wine" insert the words "and cider."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 16, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether in line 21, page 7, the words "showing that the commissioner may grant the request," should not be stricken out of the definition of the term "application"? It seems to me a clumsy addition to the definition already there.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think not. I think it is as it ought to be set forth.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If it is supported by the committee, that seems to be sufficient.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his assistants, agents, and inspectors shall investigate and report violations of this act to the United States attorney for the district in which committed, who shall be charged with the duty of prosecuting the offenders, subject to the direction of the Attorney General, as in the case of other offenses against the laws of the United States; and such Commissioner of Internal Revenue, his assistants, agents, and inspectors may swear out warrants before United States commissioners or other officers or courts authorized to issue the same for the apprehension of such offenders, and may, subject to the control of the said United States attorney, conduct the committing trial for the purpose of having the offenders held for the action of a grand jury. Section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby made applicable in the enforcement of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 8, line 20, I move to strike out the words "shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the words "is hereby."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 20, strike out the words "shall be" and insert in lieu thereof the words "is hereby."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 9, in line 5, after the word "conduct" I move to insert the words "the prosecution at."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 5, after the word "conduct" insert the words "the prosecution at."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the comma as it appears in line 3, page 9, and insert a period, and strike out the balance of the language down to and including the word "jury" in line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are two commas in line 3; after which word?

Mr. GARD. After the word "offenders." I said to strike out the comma after the word "offenders" and insert a period, and strike out the balance of the language of that line and lines 4, 5, and 6 down to and including the word "jury."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 3, after the word "offenders" strike out the comma, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 3, all of lines 4, 5, and 6 down to and including the word "jury" in line 6.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That no person shall on or after the date when the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States goes into effect, manufacture, sell, barter, give away, transport, import, export, deliver, furnish, receive, or possess any intoxicating liquor except as authorized in this act, and all the provisions of this act shall be liberally construed to the end that intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prohibited. Liquor for nonbeverage purposes and wine for sacramental purposes may be purchased, sold, transported, and used as herein provided.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, lines 17 and 18, after the word "be," strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert the words "manufactured, sold, bartered, given away, transported, imported, exported, delivered, furnished, and used, but only as herein provided and permits may be issued therefor."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The words "received, possessed," should come after the word "furnished," and I desire to modify the amendment to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Before that is done I desire to offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to state again in what respect he desires to modify his amendment?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. After the word "furnished" insert the words "received, possessed."

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman will be permitted to modify his amendment, and the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, lines 17 and 18, after the word "be," strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert "manufactured, sold, bartered, given away, transported, imported, exported, delivered, furnished, received, possessed, and used, but only as herein provided and permits may be issued therefor."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by including the word "purchased."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I desire to offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. GARD. After the word "manufactured," in what came from the chairman of the committee—I ask for the attention of the chairman of the committee—is it not the purpose of the gentleman also to include the word "purchased"? The gentleman struck out the language after "may be" and inserted the word "manufactured" and other words. Did not the gentleman also intend to include the word "purchased"?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no prohibition expressly against purchase in the first part of the section, and it is not necessary.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "manufactured" insert the word "purchased."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I have no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, and Mr. WHITE of Maine rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 9, line 14, after the word "be," strike out the balance of the line and all of line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Construed according to the plain import of the language used, without regard to the distinction made between construction of penal laws and laws upon other subjects; and no person shall be punished for an offense which is not made penal by the plain import of the words of this act."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in the section which we now have under consideration is written the following language, on lines 14 and 15:

All the provisions of this act shall be liberally construed to the end that intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prohibited.

I think I am as strong an advocate of a firm and effective enforcement measure as any man in this House, but, gentlemen, this is a highly penal statute, and it occurs to me that the language which I have just read is very unusual. What is meant by the language "shall be liberally construed to the end that intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prohibited"? What is the meaning of the words "liberal construction"? Does it mean that enlarged construction which would extend words beyond their natural and obvious meaning? If it does, I am sure that Congress would not want to adopt language of that sort in a statute that is as highly penal as this one. We all understand that the common-law construction was that laws are strictly construed when they are highly penal in favor of the person accused. That is to say, if the language used was ambiguous and not clear, the party accused under it was given benefit of doubts.

Now, I take it that it was the purpose of the committee who framed this bill to get away from the common-law rule of construction, and, therefore, they have used these words, "shall be liberally construed."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment.

An interpretation of that language would seem to mean that when you bring a defendant into court and charge by indictment that he has violated the provision of this law, if the judge in construing that language shall be doubtful as to whether he is guilty or not, he shall give it a "liberal construction," and instruct the jury, in effect, to find him guilty. If that is not the meaning of the words "shall be liberally construed," then I would like to inquire, What do they mean?

I have not the slightest desire to help write a lame and ineffective prohibition law. On the contrary, I wish to aid in passing one which will carry out the mandate of the eighteenth constitutional amendment. I think my record on the prohibition question will bear any test my constituents care to give it. But my advocacy of prohibition does not prevent me from advocating such an amendment as the one which I have proposed, and which, if adopted, I think will improve the bill and make it more harmonious with our code of laws and system of criminal jurisprudence.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know any two ways to construe a statute, except to construe it liberally or strictly, and the courts have so recognized it from time immemorial in their decisions, and your amendment injects confusion into the law.

Mr. BLACK. It does not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. To a lawyer it does. It may not to a layman.

Mr. BLACK. I wish to say that the language contained in my amendment is not chosen hurriedly and without consideration. I have adopted the language which has been embodied in our penal code in Texas for years, and it was put in there, not to give any so-called liberal construction to penal statutes nor to permit any narrow construction, but to say that language used shall be construed according to the plain import of the words.

Now, let me read you the amendment I have offered—and I have followed exactly the language that has been used in the construction of the penal statutes in my own State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. May I be permitted to speak for five minutes more?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

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

Mr. BLACK. Here is the language I have moved to substitute for the language of this section relating to construction, and if my amendment is adopted it would therefore read as follows:

And all the provisions of this act shall be construed according to the plain import of the language used without regard to the distinction made between construction of penal laws and laws upon other subjects; and no person shall be punished for an offense which is not made penal by the plain import of the words of this act.

Now, that provision was put in as article 9 of our penal code in Texas because of the fact that prior to it the courts had said that in the construction of a penal statute they would have to follow the common law; and in many cases the common-law construction was highly technical.

And, therefore, in order to obviate those technicalities we put in our penal code the provision which I have just read.

Now, I am not advocating any narrow and technical method of construction. But if I have got to choose between a strict construction and a liberal construction in a penal law, I would choose the strict construction, because, if I understand it aright, it has always been the doctrine of the Democratic Party and the theory of this Government and one of its most cherished principles that the protection of the individual in his rights is the highest aim and purpose of government. In fact, the very essence of our Federal Constitution is found in that provision, in it which guarantees to every citizen that he shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Of course, if all men who are accused of crime were guilty, possibly we would not need to guard their rights so carefully, but in framing a law, no legislator has a right to assume that all men accused under it will be guilty and none innocent. Therefore it is our duty and our responsibility to see to it that in all penal laws proper safeguards are provided for the protection of the innocent.

The amendment which I have offered simply provides that the provisions of this act shall be construed according to the plain import of its language and that no man shall be convicted of a crime, unless it comes clearly within the plain import of the language used. If that is not the way any penal statute should be construed, then I would like to inquire, Why not? The intent of Congress is the thing to be sought, and what better evidence is there of that intent than the plain import of the words used in the act? With this explanation of my amendment I submit it to the consideration of the House.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to take up a great deal of time on this. This is not an unusual proposition at all. It is found in many statutes of this class. The purpose of it is to indicate to the court what the object of the legislation is, and to say to the court that it shall receive a construction that will carry out that purpose. We say the object of it is to prohibit intoxicating liquor as a beverage. That may be important in connection with the next section, and I think it ought to remain in there, and remain in substantially the form in which it is. I can see no harm.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this amendment be now closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Minnesota is going to try in that way to prevent us from being heard on this bill we will see if he can gain time by it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is out of order. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty Members are present—a quorum. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate upon this amendment be now closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 24.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers. Those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One person has risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum on the vote last taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is dilatory.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLACK. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 84.

Mr. BLACK. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded. As many as favor the taking of the vote by tellers will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty gentlemen have risen, a sufficient number.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. VOLSTEAD and Mr. BLACK as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 51, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Maine: Page 9, line 15, after the word "that," insert "the manufacture, sale, transportation, exportation, and importation of," and strike out the words "as a beverage" and insert in lieu thereof "for use for beverage purposes."

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this changes in any particular the real intent of the section; but we get our power to act from the constitutional amendment, and when we undertake in the act itself to express its real purpose and intent it seems to me we may well make it conform to the constitutional language. That is what my amendment does, and nothing more. If my amendment is adopted, the language will read in this fashion in line 15:

To the end that the manufacture, sale, transportation, exportation, and importation of intoxicating liquors for use for beverage purposes may be prohibited.

And that is just what the constitutional amendment authorizes us to do, and that is the limit of our power. It seems to me the amendment is proper.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do no believe this amendment ought to be agreed to. Our various State courts in construing State constitutional amendments that are practically in the same language, and in construing statutes on this subject containing language substantially the same as this, have all held, so far as I am aware—I know a great many of them have held—that the object of those statutes is to prohibit the use of liquor, and it is perfectly evident to anyone who reads this constitutional amendment that the use of liquor as a beverage is what is prohibited. The manufacture is prohibited. The importation is prohibited. Without manufacture and without importation there can be no intoxicating liquor as a beverage in this country, and it seems to me we might as well express that purpose clearly in the act itself. That is the reason why I did not insert the language that has been offered now by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE] as an amendment. It seems to me we ought to stand for the interpretation of the language of the amendment that has contantly been announced by the courts as the purpose of this class of legislation, and it seems to me we might as well write it into the statute and tell the courts that this is what we understand it to mean.

Mr. WALSH. Why was it not written into the statute?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think that is what the language in the bill means.

Mr. WALSH. It does not mean that. It does not say so. It is very cumbersome language, if the gentleman will note—

To the end that intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prohibited.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think that clearly expresses the idea.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. The gentleman thinks that means then just exactly what my language says?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think you will have to spell it out from your language, while my language says so in so many words.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I should like to ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee a question. In line 12 is the word "possess." What does that word mean, and what significance does it carry?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Possession is very important in connection with the prosecution of a great many of these offenses.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have this specific case in mind. Suppose a citizen has a case of wine that he purchased at a time when it was lawful to make the purchase, and the same is now in his possession. Does this act undertake to make that possession unlawful?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We make express provision for that in section 35, on page 30. There we expressly make it legal to have it in one's possession, and this does not interfere with that. When we reach that section probably some amendment will be offered.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I merely desired to ascertain the meaning that this word "possess" is intended to carry.

I wish to say a word in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. It seems to me that this is a very desirable amendment, and one that ought to be adopted by the committee. I do not think that the argument of the chairman of the committee [Mr. VOLSTEAD] in reply to the argument of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was by any means convincing. Whatever may be the declarations in State statutes with respect to the construction of State enactments, the analogy is by no means striking enough to justify the language of the present bill. We are enacting a statute in enforcement of a constitutional amendment, and our statute by construction can not give to the amendment a meaning in excess of that which it plainly carries.

The constitutional amendment says that exportation, importation, transportation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes are prohibited. Our statute of enforcement can only deal with the acts prohibited by the amendment. We can not go further in our legislation, than the limits of the amendment which does not, for instance, prohibit the consumption of intoxicating spirits provided they are in your possession.

Even when constitutional prohibition becomes effective, spirits lawfully in the possession of the citizen may be used in his home. Use is not inhibited by the amendment. When the gentleman from Maine proposes by his amendment that we shall construe a law in enforcement of the constitutional amendment to the end that the inhibitions of that amendment shall be effected, he is proposing something that is plainly right. The committee should be anxious to make effective the plain meaning of the Constitution. Thus far should we go, and no further.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am as strong a prohibitionist as there is in this House or in the United States, yet I am in favor heartily of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine. I think it should be adopted, for it is clearly the law, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], that we can not go beyond the power given to us by the eighteenth constitutional amendment.

I was not in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. BLACK, although in nine cases out of ten I would be willing to follow this distinguished gentleman from Texas, because his judgment is right nine times out of ten. But I remember the effect of the very statute which he had incorporated from the Texas code into his amendment. I remember that under that very statute a negro indicted for a cold-blooded murder was four different times by a jury found guilty of murder in the first degree and given the death penalty.

Four different times the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas under that very statute was forced to reverse the case on a technicality, and the fifth time the negro was tried the jury for the fifth time gave him the death penalty. But in their verdict they said, "We, the jury, find the defendant guilty of murder as charged in the indictment, and assess the punishment at death." And yet because the jury failed to say that they found him guilty of murder "in the first degree," under that statute which the gentleman from Texas quoted, which required a strict construction of the law, for the fifth time in Texas that verdict was reversed, notwithstanding the fact that the indictment charged murder in the first degree, and the jury found him guilty of murder as charged in the indictment. Some people say a negro can not get a fair trial in the South; yet for the fifth time the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals reversed the judgment and sent it back for another trial, and this negro's lawyer was appointed by the court and served throughout all trials without a single dollar of compensation.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I will now confine myself to the question, but I was prevented from speaking against the Black amendment at the time it was offered.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman know that the court of appeals pointed out substantial errors in all those trials?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Texas knows that the fifth time the court of appeals sent it back they found only

one error, and that a technical one, to wit, that the jury had failed to say that it was murder "in the first degree," although they assessed the death penalty as a punishment and said that he was guilty of murder as charged in the indictment, which charged murder in the first degree.

Mr. BEE. Was not that fundamental?

Mr. BLANTON. Under the said "strict-construction" statute, yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not confining himself to the question.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. What became of the negro?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that that negro got justice in Texas. [Laughter.] I think the amendment of the gentleman from Maine should be adopted and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it. If he does not, I hope the House will adopt it, because clearly we can not go beyond the scope given us in the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution. We must not adopt provisions in this bill unwisely, that would force the Supreme Court to hold that it was unconstitutional. I want a severe, drastic measure, with sharp teeth in it, that will forever put intoxicating liquor out of business in our Nation, but, above all, I want a constitutional bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto now close.

Mr. GARD. I have another amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will not use the word "section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. IGOE) there were 78 yeas and 46 noes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. VOLSTEAD and Mr. GARD.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 77 yeas and 51 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 9, line 13, I move to insert after the word "act" the words "and also except such as may be legally stored in a United States bonded warehouse."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do not think that ought to go in here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 13, after the word "act," insert the words "and also except such as may be legally stored in a United States bonded warehouse."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Page 9, line 18, add the following:

"*Provided, however*, That wine and cider may be made and possessed at his home by any person for use thereat for himself and his family."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I desire to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed by action of the committee. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 50, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, in line with the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Maine, I move to strike out, on page 9, line 11, the words "give away."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 11, strike out the words "give away."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were—ayes 32, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. On page 9, line 12, I move to strike out the word "furnish."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 12, strike out the word "furnish."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, in the same line I move to strike out the word "receive."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 12, strike out the word "receive."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, on page 9, line 12, I move to amend by inserting the words "for sale" after the word "possess."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 12, after the word "possess," insert the words "for sale."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the purchase, sale, transportation, importation, exportation, and use of the articles enumerated in this section shall not, after having been manufactured and prepared for the market, be subject to the provisions of this act if they correspond with the following descriptions and limitations, namely:

(a) Denatured alcohol or denatured rum produced and used as provided by laws and regulations now or hereafter in force.

(b) Medical preparations manufactured in accordance with formulas prescribed by the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary of the American Institute of Homeopathy that are nonpotable and unfit for use for beverage purposes.

(c) Patented, patent, and proprietary medicines that are nonpotable and unfit for use for beverage purposes.

(d) Toilet, medical, and antiseptic preparations and solutions that are nonpotable and unfit for use for beverage purposes, contained in bottles or packages, upon which are printed conspicuously and legibly in English the quantity by volume of alcohol in such preparation.

(e) Flavoring extracts that are nonpotable and incapable of being used for intoxicating beverage purposes.

(f) Vinegar.

A person who manufactures any of the articles mentioned in this section may purchase and possess liquor for that purpose, but he shall secure permits to manufacture such articles and to purchase such liquor, give the bonds, keep the records, and make the reports specified in this act and as directed by the commissioner. No such manufacturer shall sell, use, or dispose of any liquor otherwise than as an ingredient of the articles authorized to be manufactured therefrom.

Any person who shall knowingly sell any of the articles mentioned in this section for beverage purposes, or who shall sell same under circumstances from which the seller might reasonably deduce the intention of the purchaser to use them for beverage purposes, shall be subject to the penalties provided in section 30 of this act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language to be found in line 21, on page 9, "after having been manufactured," and so forth. Does not the chairman think it would be better if he moved to strike out the word "having" in line 21 and inserted the words "they have," so that it will read "after they have been manufactured"?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I accept that amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Then I offer that as an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 21, strike out the word "having" and insert the words "they have."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 10, line 16, after the word "extracts," insert the words "and sirups."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. For the purpose of asking a question. Does the gentleman from Minnesota understand that the amendment he offered is all he is going to offer to subdivision E?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, lines 16 and 17, after the word "are," in line 16, strike out the words "nonpotable and incapable of being used" and insert the word "unfit."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, at the end of line 2, add "no more alcohol shall be used in the manufacture of any extract, sirup, or other article capable of being used for beverage purposes than the quantity necessary for extraction or solution of the elements contained therein and for the preservation of the article.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 7, after the word "purposes" insert "or shall sell any beverage containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume in which any extract, sirup, or other article is used as an ingredient."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be present when this amendment was considered in the committee.

Mr. GARD. It never was considered in the committee.

Mr. WALSH. And I will ask the Chairman if he will just explain what those words are intended to cover.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no question but these sirups and extracts can be used for intoxicating beverage purposes by being mixed with a little water and sugar. When we had this matter under consideration and the attorneys and others appeared for the extract and sirup people they insisted it could not be done, but I thereupon drew an amendment which would have prohibited any of these sirups or extracts that would be fit for beverage purposes after being diluted. When that proposition was submitted to them they very promptly threw up their hands and confessed they could be used for intoxicating beverage purposes. Then this proposition that I have just submitted to the House was submitted to them.

Mr. GARD. Was this proposition ever submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. My understanding was that it was.

Mr. GARD. I have no such understanding.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I had it there and tried to submit all of these propositions. It has been submitted to the extract and sirup people, and they agreed to have it inserted in substantially the language that I offer these amendments.

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

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. This is the first time I have heard of it, and I just want to get the effect of the gentleman's amendment. Does it provide that any beverage that contains one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, which also contains any flavoring extract, shall be——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is made illegal to sell as a beverage any liquid made out of these extracts or sirups that contain one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume.

Mr. IGOE. Any beverage that contains one-half of 1 per cent by volume and which contains a flavoring extract——

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes. The claim is that the extracts and sirups are never used as a beverage, but they can be used to make a beverage, and to guard against that we insert this provision. I have another proposition that likewise was agreed to by the people——

Mr. IGOE. By whom?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That takes care of it.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question? By whom does the gentleman say it was agreed to?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It was agreed to by the men that represented the extract and sirup people.

Mr. GARD. Not agreed to by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do not know that all of these amendments were submitted to the committee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would like to ask the chairman of this committee if these amendments which are now being proposed meet the situation presented to us by the wholesale druggists and manufacturers of extracts, those people engaged in legitimate industries in which they use alcohol, and who are sending telegrams and letters to the Members of the House?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They have been consulted, and they have made no serious objection to this proposition.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The question I ask the chairman of the committee is, if this series of amendments which are being proposed reach objections to this bill that have been raised by these people?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is the purpose of them, and they are practically agreed to now by the various people.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It was the understanding of the chairman of this committee that this series of amendments do meet the objections that have been raised by those engaged in that business?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes. Some of them will not agree, but there is a practical agreement between myself and those men in reference to these particular amendments. I am offering them with that understanding. There may be a slight change in the phraseology, because we did not distinctly agree on all of the phraseology, but this was the result of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee to explain the necessity for this amendment, particularly in view of the fact that in the definition under subparagraph 1 of section 1 of Title II, that says liquids containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume are included within the term "liquor" or "intoxicating liquor." Now, what is the advantage or necessity for this particular amendment?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. In paragraph (e) we do not use the expression "liquor." We use the word "beverage." Consequently flavoring extracts and sirups are not limited to the definition in the paragraph the gentleman refers to.

Mr. WALSH. They are liquids.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. But the language is not used in the first paragraph. And we liberalize it by limiting sirups and extracts to liquids that are unfit for intoxicating-beverage purposes.

Mr. WALSH. That is, they might contain more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol and still not be considered as intoxicating?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They might contain 95 per cent of alcohol.

Mr. WALSH. And that is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is the purpose of this amendment, because we are turning over to these people a large amount of alcohol and we are saying to them, "Make these articles; the public wants them." Now we try to put some limitation on them so that they shall not be used for beverage purposes. That is all.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly we would agree to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How can the druggist or proprietor tell for what purpose anybody is buying this stuff?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This is intended to reach the wholesaler and retailer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but I am asking how the retailer is going to tell for what purpose a man is buying it?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is true enough; but this is the only way I can see that we can reach the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that extract of lemon is a very popular tipple in certain neighborhoods. Now, suppose some man's wife wants him to get a lot of this stuff in order to make cakes and pies or use for other culinary purposes, how does the druggist know that he is not going to drink it?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. If he does not know and sells in good faith, he is not liable.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of information, may we have the last amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pending amendment will be again read.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The debate has not been exhausted on this question, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands seven minutes have been exhausted and three minutes remain.

Mr. BENSON. Nobody has spoken on this side, Mr. Chairman. No time was fixed, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that two Members have already spoken on this amendment. The Chair recollects that the time was yielded by one man.

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

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

Mr. BENSON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that that amendment that is put in there now is simply giving to the extract people with one hand the privilege to manufacture and conduct their business, and with the other hand you are taking it away from them. [Laughter.]

It is impossible to manufacture extracts with less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol in them, and the last provision that is put in there prevents the use or manufacture of extracts if they have one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol. It is well known to everybody that you can not produce extract of lemon or of vanilla or any of these other essences without using alcohol to do it. That is conceded. It is also known that you could not have flavoring for food, you can not have flavoring for bread or cake or candy or soda water if you do not have extracts to take the place of it. You are going ahead and in this act providing it so that people who are accustomed to using sherry and brandy for baking purposes will not even have the opportunity of using lemon and vanilla for those things.

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

Mr. BENSON. No; I can not yield. I will yield to the gentleman if I have time. As a matter of fact, we all know that when you cut out the use of alcohol it increases the use of sweets, and the people of this country and the soldiers found it out, that they needed candy and sweets. You will practically be putting these people on a flavorless diet if you cut out all flavoring extracts, and this last part of the amendment does exactly that thing and nothing else, because in the first case there it says that anyone who shall knowingly sell any of the articles mentioned for beverage purposes shall be guilty, and it ends up by saying that anybody who sells extracts with one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol shall be guilty. The first part of the amendment is nullified by the latter part.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. I want to say that in providing these extracts you do not contend that it is necessary to have a preparation of alcohol to sell them and keep them?

Mr. BENSON. Of course you have to.

Mr. TINCHER. Does not the gentleman understand that in dry States now they are forced to sell the extracts, and do sell them?

Mr. BENSON. No. I understand that in the State of Montana they did have such a law, and the people there forced them to repeal it.

Mr. TINCHER. That is an argument on the part of the manufacturers the other way.

Mr. BENSON. I have a letter in my pocket from a manufacturer who manufactures, or tries to manufacture, five extracts, and he says that is all he can do, and he has no confidence in them himself. [Laughter.] The great society of flavoring extract people, which met at Atlantic City last week, went on record on that subject.

Mr. TINCHER. I have here a vanilla flavor prepared without alcohol.

Mr. BENSON. Yes, and it is a fake. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. No; it is not a fake. I can prove to you by the best cook in Washington that it is the best flavor going. [Laughter.]

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

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

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

Mr. ELSTON. I have heard the amendment read, and I do not know whether I understand it perfectly or not. I would like to know if this is the interpretation of the amendment that the gentleman proposes: Do you mean that any extract manufactured in accordance with the terms of this act and strictly within the limitations in regard to the alcohol content in volume can not be injected into any beverage containing other liquid save water unless that extract itself, which might be in volume a drop only, contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No. Here is the proposition: The flavoring extract itself may contain 50 per cent or 95 per cent, as some of it may. That does not cut any figure. But if you do that for the purpose of making a beverage out of it, then you must reduce it below one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. ELSTON. This is the proposition: If you take a container and fill that container with a nonalcoholic liquid, and then inject only sufficient of this 50 per cent of extract into it so that the whole shall contain less than one-half of 1 per cent in volume of alcohol, then it is permissible to drink it, is it?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is permissible; yes. There is no difficulty about it when you stop to think.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BENSON), there were—ayes 74, noes 47.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I offer another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 11, at the end of line 8, add: "If the commissioner shall find, after notice and hearing, as provided for in section 5 of this title, that any person has sold any flavoring extract, sirup, or beverage in violation of this paragraph, he shall notify such person, and the person for whom the sale was made, if any, to desist from selling such article, and it shall thereupon be lawful for a period of one year thereafter for any person so notified to sell any such extract, sirup, or beverage without making an application for, giving a bond, and obtaining a permit so to do, which permit may be issued upon such conditions as the commissioner may deem necessary to prevent such illegal sales, and shall require a record and report of sales. If the commissioner shall find that any article can be successfully and economically manufactured so as to contain less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume he shall by regulation forbid the manufacture and sale of any such article containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume. Such regulation shall take effect six months after the date it is promulgated, and thereafter it shall be unlawful to manufacture and sell any article so forbidden. Any finding under this paragraph shall be subject to court review as in said section 5 provided.

Mr. GARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. In the course of this amendment as read by the Clerk, it seems that the commissioner orders somebody to desist, and after that time it is "lawful" for a year for him to do this thing.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Unlawful.

Mr. GARD. The Clerk read "lawful."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARD. It is a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to have it reread, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment provides that it shall be "unlawful."

Mr. GARD. The Clerk read "lawful."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment specifies that it shall be unlawful. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This is agreed to by the extract people—those engaged in the industry.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman think he ought to write a bill here because it is agreed to by the extract people or other people?

Mr. WALSH. That is the way this bill was written.

Mr. GARD. Does the chairman of the Judiciary Committee think that is the way it ought to be written?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Republicans have been accustomed to allow interested parties to write their bills for them, and they have never gotten away from that habit.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GARD. I have no further inquiry. I simply desired to know whether the chairman of the Judiciary Committee thought that was proper.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will just make an explanation in reference to this. Because of the change made in paragraph (e) of this section, it is necessary to harmonize the language.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman intend to continue longer in session this evening?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. We would like it very much if we could finish this section.

Mr. GARD. I think the members of the committee are tired. We have been here since noon, nine hours and a half now.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I want to call attention to this amendment. I think it is important that something of this kind should go into the bill.

When this matter first came up no one appeared, as far as the extract people were concerned. I think the committee—I know I was—was misled as to just what the situation is in regard to flavoring extracts. After the bill had been reported, a number of parties interested in extracts and sirups appeared in my office, and I received a large number of letters calling my attention to the language in paragraph (e). It was insisted that under that paragraph the makers of extracts and sirups could not continue business. So the question came up as to what sort of an amend-

ment would have to be made. It was claimed that no extract could be made without alcohol. At first it was insisted that these sirups and extracts containing alcohol could not be used for beverage purposes at all. They finally abandoned that theory and made frank confession that a good deal could be made into drink for beverage purposes.

Then the question was presented of how to make it safe to permit their manufacture and sale. I examined the statutes of different States to determine what the States had done in reference to this matter. After considerable negotiation I submitted to the committee the proposition that is outlined in these amendments. There are extracts made without alcohol. The States of Kansas, Texas, and Georgia permit very few, if any, of these extracts to be sold.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman: Are not the extracts made without the alcohol synthetic or artificial flavor?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I am not able to answer that question. There have been sent to my office different kinds of extracts made without alcohol. I have received a large number of letters from various institutions insisting that all of this sort of extracts can be made without alcohol. Consequently we put the provision contained in this amendment that if they can be made successfully and economically without alcohol then, in the interest of prohibition, we ought to require it.

It is insisted that extracts made without alcohol are just as good. In fact, some contend that they are better and more economic than those made with alcohol. It seems to me that if they are going to sell large quantities after prohibition goes into effect that can be used for intoxicating beverages, we ought to find some way to reach the situation. Consequently I thought we might leave it to the commissioner to determine whether these articles need go on the market at all.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Does the gentleman or the manufacturers say that the extract of vanilla can be made from the vanilla bean without alcohol?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I have a large number of packages of vanila extracts in my office.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Is it artificial or synthetic flavor?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is insisted that they are just as good as the alcohalic extracts.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Just as good to the taste, does the gentleman mean?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; they are called extracts and are, no doubt, extracts of the vanilla bean. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words to get some information from the chairman of the committee. This is a very important provision in this bill and deals with a matter concerning which everybody in the country is interested. These amendments, which practically rewrite this section of the bill, we have never had an opportunity to examine. I will ask the chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour, if he would not be willing to offer the amendments to-night for the purpose of the RECORD and afford the Members of the House an opportunity to examine them and vote on them later.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. If the House is willing to do that, I will offer them and then move that the committee rise.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask that for the time being that the amendments be submitted now and voted on when we resume our sitting on this bill, but in the meantime I would like to suggest other amendments to perfect the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers certain amendments for the information of the House, and they will be read.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman seems to be asking to have them printed in the RECORD, so that Members may see what they are. If they are going to be put into the RECORD, what is the sense of reading them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that they be read for the information of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 4, after the word "in," insert the words "paragraphs a, b, c, and d of."

Page 11, line 7, strike out "beverage" and insert "such."

Page 11, line 4, after the word "purposes," insert "or any extract or sirup for intoxicating-beverage purposes."

Page 11, lines 10 and 11, after the figure "4," strike out "is capable of being used as a beverage" and insert "does not correspond with the descriptions and limitations therein provided."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, we have not yet read section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. These are merely being read for the information of the House.

Mr. GARD. They are not offered for purposes of adoption?

The CHAIRMAN. Not now. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 8, strike out the word "act" and insert the word "title."

Page 11, lines 13 and 14, after the word "article," in line 13, strike out "is capable of being used for beverage purposes" and insert "does not so correspond."

Page 11, lines 23 and 24, after the word "article," in line 23, strike out "is not capable of being used for beverage purposes" and insert "corresponds to the descriptions and limitations provided in section 4 of this title."

Page 9, lines 19 and 20, after the word "the," in line 19, strike out the words "purchase, sale, transportation, importation, exportation, and use of."

Mr. GARD. Should not the word "act" be stricken out in line 22, page 9, and the word "title" inserted?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That has been done. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6810, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Nolan-Kenyon bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Nolan-Kenyon bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein a letter from Judge Pollock, a noted authority on prohibition.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BAER. Then I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. If it is to contain any letter written by anyone else, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 18, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation required by the Bureau of Standards for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for salaries, office of the Secretary of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 152); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DENISON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6222) to remove a certain tract or lots of land in Cristobal, Canal Zone, from the operation and effect of the Executive order of the President of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stats., ch. 390, p. 565), reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 123), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4718) granting a pension to Winfield H. Handley, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 7470) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Celina, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of McKinney, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7472) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Honey Grove, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7473) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Ladonia, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7474) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Greenville, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7475) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Commerce, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 7476) to extend the provisions of section 211 of the Penal Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7477) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pineville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 7478) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 7479) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Stephenville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANFORD (by request): A bill (H. R. 7480) to amend the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation to construct a bridge across the Hudson River in the State of New York"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7481) to fix the annual salary of the collector of customs for the district of North Carolina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 7482) to establish the standard of weights and measures for flours, meals, corn products for human food, and commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7483) for the enlargement, extension, and improvement of the United States post-office building at Hattiesburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7484) to amend section 465 and section 466 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, in respect to the tariff on corn or maize and corn meal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 7485) granting 30 days' leave of absence in each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave, to civilian employees of the United States Coast Guard and Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 7486) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 7487) to regulate the pay, allowances, promotion, and privileges of warrant officers in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7488) to provide for the monthly payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7489) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Braxton, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7490) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Webster, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7491) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Calhoun, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7492) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Harrison, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lewis, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7494) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Nicholas, State of West Virginia, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7495) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Ritchie, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7496) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Upshur, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7497) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Gilmer, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7498) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Doddridge, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7499) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Clay, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 7500) to protect the coastwise trade of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 7501) to amend section 15 of an act approved July 17, 1916, and known as the Federal farm-loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 149) creating a congressional committee to confer with the leaders of the Mexican people for the purpose of bringing about harmony among the factions in Mexico and establishing law and order in that country; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1919; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PARRISH: Resolution (H. Res. 180) authorizing the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee from the House to investigate the causes of the high cost of living, the reasons therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Porto Rico, urging an appropriation to build a breakwater in the Port of Ponce, Island of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, urging Congress to confer upon the Territory of Hawaii the right of statehood; to the Committee on the Territories

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, urging Congress to enact legislation requiring residence of not less than one year in the Territory of Hawaii in order to be eligible for Federal appointments within the Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, authorizing the governor of Hawaii to appoint a commission for the purpose of assisting the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 7502) granting a pension to James O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7503) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 7504) for the relief of Einar Barfod; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7505) granting a pension to Mary A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 7506) granting an increase of pension to Antionette Flint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7507) to reimburse S. G. Ward for losses and damages sustained by him by the negligent dipping of his cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7508) to reimburse H. A. Swink for losses and damages sustained by him by the negligent dipping of his

cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 7509) granting a pension to Emma S. Hanlon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7510) granting a pension to Albert S. Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 7511) granting a pension to William Fussnecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7512) granting a pension to Edward E. Henton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7513) granting a pension to Charles W. Lanham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7514) granting a pension to Charles Dolderer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7515) granting a pension to Starling N. Caron; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7516) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7517) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Caplinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7518) granting an increase of pension to John J. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 7519) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elseser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7520) to correct the military record of William H. Dotson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 7521) to reimburse Louis Schultz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 7522) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7523) granting a pension to Philip Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7524) granting a pension to Carl C. Dunham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7525) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Kravets; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 7526) granting a pension to Ira Froment; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 7527) granting a pension to Lula L. Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7528) for the relief of L. H. Howell and R. L. McKenzie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 7529) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 7530) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 7531) granting an increase of pension to William E. Armstrong; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 7532) granting a pension to Isaac Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 7533) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia F. Huckins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 7534) granting an increase of pension to John J. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 7535) for the relief of Ellen M. Willey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Ogoyago Tribe No. 91, Improved Order of Red Men, urging legislation to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of sundry citizens of San Antonio, Tex., for the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Resolutions of Lithuanian R. C. Alliance of America, Lodge No. 119, signed by L. J. Jakaitis, chairman, and J. A. Zukauskas, secretary, located in the city of Manchester, N. H., requesting the United States Government to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Lithuanians of the city of Manchester, N. H., by R. Kondrotas, chairman, and J. A. Zukauskas, secretary, requesting recognition by the United States Government of the complete independence of the Lithuanian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Parish of All Saints of the city of Manchester, N. H., by L. J. Jakaitis, chairman, and Felix Chekutis, secretary, requesting the United States Government to compel Poland to withdraw her army from the Lithuanian territories and that all assistance be denied to Poland as long as she continues to occupy the invaded territories, and also that the United States Government recognize the present Lithuanian Government and render it moral and material assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Harmony Grange of Sanbornton, N. H., by J. S. Currier, J. M. Bodwell, and M. A. Hill, committee on resolutions, urging the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Annie E. Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of 225 citizens of Iowa, asking the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of the National Grange, the National Board of Farm Organizations, and E. M. D. Bracker, county farm adviser of Knox County, Ill., favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Confectioners' Association of the United States favoring the repeal of the excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. W. Wessels Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, of Portville, N. Y., favoring a pension of $50 per month for all surviving soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rockford, Ill., favoring the repeal of the tax on soda water, ice cream, and similar articles of food and drink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Petitions of Dr. E. J. Mathis, of Deaumont, Miss., and 20 other citizens, and the Kiln Drug Co., Kiln, Miss., all protesting against that part of the revenue law pertaining to soda water, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Jacob Moschets Sons, Joseph Hahlen estate, and Jacob Dold Packing Co., protesting against the Kenyon and Kendrick Senate bills to regulate meat packers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Industrial Traffic Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., suggesting changes in the Esch bill, H. R. 4378; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edward Smith Packing Co., of East Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against passage of Kenyon and Kendrick Senate bills to regulate meat packers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the C. K. Linck Packing Co., Buffalo, N. Y., urging defeat of the Kendrick bill, S. 2199, and the Kenyon bill, S. 2202; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of numerous citizens of Geneva, Ohiowa, Tobias, Chester, Alexandria, Bruning, Fairmont, Exeter, Carleton, Davenport, Martland, Chickley, Milligan, Friend, Sutton, and Grafton, Nebr., urging the immediate repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of the mayor and aldermen of Jersey City, urging the adoption of a resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Protest of Alfred Berryessa, secretary Federal Employees' Union No. 1, San Francisco, Calif., against Good amendment to Nolan minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, protest of Forbes H. Brown, Vallejo, Calif., against Good amendment to Nolan minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Cam Whitthorene, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the Good amendment to Nolan minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of the Lithuanian R. C. Alliance of America, Branch 22, Kenosha, Wis., by Melis Tubeles, chairman, and Paul Jusis, secretary, requesting the United States Government to recognize the complete independence of the Lithuanian republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Thomas A. Sullivan, Capt. Edward Dayton, and 44 citizens of Kenosha, Wis., requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of John Biskis and Peter Buscavage, of Tamaqua, Pa., and of Joseph Abravzinsky and John A. Rutkowsky, of Shenandoah, Pa., asking that the United States demand the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory and give to Lithuania a moral support in her war against Bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the employees of the Boston Navy Yard, urging 44-hour week for employees of United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Bottlers and Drivers' Union, No. 122, in favor of the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Nikolaus Kuhn, 3309, Thirty-eighth Place, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the United States joining the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Tenk Hardware Co., of Quincy, Ill., protesting against reduction of postal rates on advertising pages of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Farm Implement News, Masonic Temple, Chicago, Ill., urging repeal of zone postal rate advance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schneider & Metzger, Peoria, Ill., urging repeal of luxury tax, and also urging that Congress put an end to inefficient administration of our railroad and express systems which are unendurable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Keith Swartz, Anti-Saloon League, Dixon, Ill.; Joseph J. Edwards, Forrest, Ill.; and Edward F. Rittenhouse, Pontiac, Ill., all urging enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *July 18, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee and open our hearts for the reception of Thy truth. Thou hast promised that Thou wilt write Thy laws in our hearts, and in our minds Thou wilt establish them. So we pray as we journey on to the duties of this day that we may have the guidance of the inward monitor—the law that is written deep in our own hearts, that is in conformity to the will of God. May we feel that our highest obligation is to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight. So do Thou bless us this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

CABLEGRAM FROM THE ARGENTINE SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a cablegram from the President of the Senate of the Argentine Nation, expressing its intense satisfaction for the signing of the treaty of peace, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT RANK OF SUPERIOR OFFICERS (H. DOC. NO. 153).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I take the liberty of calling your attention to a matter which I am sure is at the heart of the whole country, and which I have had very much in mind throughout all these months when we were trying to arrange a peace that would be worthy of the spirit and achievements of the men who won the victory in the field and on the sea. After mature reflection, I earnestly recommend that you give the permanent rank of general to John J. Pershing and Peyton C. March, expressing the law in such a way as to give precedence to Gen. Pershing; and that you give the permanent rank of admiral to William S. Benson and William S. Sims. I take it for granted that I am only anticipating your own thoughts in proposing these honors for the men upon whom the principal responsibilities devolved for achieving the great results which our incomparable Navy and Army accomplished.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *18 July, 1919.*

PROPAGANDA FOR LEGISLATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, during the last two or three days my mail has been largely burdened with letters, some of which are written, some in printed form, but practically identical in language, of which this is a sample:

The writer wishes to protest against the passage of Senate bill 2202, the Kenyon bill, on account of it being unjust, un-American, and socialistic.

The bill referred to is that introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to regulate the packing industry. My purpose in reading this communication into the RECORD is to emphasize the fact that a very obvious and a very common system of propaganda has been inaugurated against the bill.

I am not familiar with the merits of the bill; it may be subject to all the epithets which are made against it in this correspondence; but it would seem to me that those who are initiating it either have a very low opinion of the intelligence of the average Senator or else they go upon the theory that by demonstrating considerable political strength they can influence Senators in their ultimate determination of this bill. As a Member of this body I want to protest against the constant tendency to either oppose or commend to our attention bills and business before it by that method of appeal. It is becoming a nuisance and particularly to those of us who have other correspondence that is of substantial value to attend to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7343) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7343, an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and, on motion of Mr. WARREN, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MILITARY AIR SERVICE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, while I have the floor I want to refer to another subject briefly, and I will preface what I have to say by reading a very brief clipping from this morning's Washington Post. It is entitled "Air Service drops plans":

SQUADRONS ABANDONED, AS OFFICERS WILL BE ONLY 222 ON SEPTEMBER 30.

Plans for the establishment of four observation air squadrons in the Philippines as part of the basic defense of the islands will have to be abandoned, Army officials said yesterday, unless some remedy is found for the present situation of the Air Service. Each of these squadrons requires 41 flying officers, and the entire commissioned personnel of the service will number only 222 by September 30.

Other important projects to be abandoned include 3 squadrons for Hawaii, 3 squadrons for Panama and 2 for the border patrol, and 40 balloon companies for the United States.

This announcement is doubtless due to the fact that the committee of conference on the Army supply bill were unable to agree upon a greater amount than $25,000,000 for the Army Air Service, a sum which would be as well expended if it were taken out into midocean and sunk to the bottom of the sea, so far as any permanent benefit that it will confer upon our air service is concerned. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with practical unanimity, recommended and reported, and the Senate adopted, an appropriation of twice that amount, which was the lowest limit under the hearings that was commensurate with the adequacy and the needs of this service.

Now, I believe in economy as earnestly as any man, but I protest against that false economy which consigns this great arm of the service, both for offense and defense, into what is virtual abandonment.

Mr. President, the Air Service is the coming arm for defensive and for offensive purposes. It is so fully appreciated and recognized by our late allies in the war that they, notwithstanding their depleted finances and burden of taxation, are bending their energies and devoting large appropriations to the development of this service. We, with whom the airship originated—for it is an American invention—and who found ourselves so handicapped because of our neglect of it at the time we entered into the war, now propose to give little, if any, attention to it, in consequence of which, if trouble again arises, we shall be in the same situation in which we were when war was declared against Germany.

Mr. President, if the information which the public receive from the administration is reliable—and I hope it is—to the effect that the policy of "watchful waiting" with regard to Mexico is to be abandoned, and if we are to assume a firm attitude toward that country, we may happen to be precipitated into serious differences almost without warning. It will then