

4053. Also, petition of the American Medical Association, favoring appropriation of \$150,000 to publish a medical history of the part played by the United States in the World War; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4054. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of New Lots Citizens' League (Inc.), of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging legislation for increased wages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4055. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Teachers' Union of the City of New York, favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4056. By Mr. VARE: Petition of Republican Club of Philadelphia, Pa., urging immediate action on postal clerks' increased salary proposals as to be recommended by the Postal Salaries Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4057. By Mr. WEBSTER: Petition of numerous residents of the fifth district of Washington, indorsing Senate bill 3259 and House bill 10925, offering the aid of the National Government to the several States in maternal and infant-welfare work; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 2, 1920.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. E. O. Watson, secretary of the Council of the Churches of Christ in America, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, humbly, reverently, with grateful hearts, we bow before Thee; humbly as we think of our unworthiness, reverently as we think of Thy goodness and of Thy glory, gratefully as we think upon Thy loving kindness and tender mercies that have been ever held toward us. We acknowledge Thy hand, our Father, in our individual lives and the destiny of our Nation and of all nations. We pray that Thou wilt guide and bless each one of us as on this new day we come before Thee thanking Thee for life, for liberty, and for service; that Thou wilt guide us, that we may have wisdom to know and grace to respond to the calls of duty, and strength faithfully to discharge every obligation and meet every responsibility in this great day. Bless, we pray Thee, this great body, the Senate of our Nation, its President, and every Senator. Bless our great Nation, and guide us in all things that we may work out our high place to the glory of God and for the blessing of mankind. All this we ask, we humbly ask, in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Reading Clerk 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.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have just been honored with a copy of what purports to be my legislative record during my service in this body since 1914, bearing the signatures of Samuel Gompers, Frank Morrison, and James O'Connell, executive committee. I shall ask at the end of my comments to place this document in the Record. It is too important not to have a place in our proceedings, so that my conduct here may serve as a warning both to my successor, whether Democratic or Republican, and to those of my colleagues whose terms extend over the next Congress. This document is to be read at every meeting of the organizations of the Federation of Labor until election day. I shall therefore receive some publicity between now and the 2d day of November, which is gratifying even though it may prove disagreeable.

This record begins with the 27th day of February, 1915. I presume that date fixes the limitation upon my official misconduct. Consequently offenses preceding that date are lost and forgotten in the oblivion of time.

I am recorded as voting unfavorably on a number of occasions upon the motion to strike out what is called a "vicious" provision prohibiting the stop-watch and bonus system from the military bill. In some instances I am recorded as not voting. I can not understand it. I do not think that Mr. Gompers has treated me fairly. I am entitled to a correct and complete record of all my misdeeds here, and if I at any time failed to vote to strike out what is called the stop-watch and bonus system it should be explained that I was absent from the Chamber at the time or because no record vote was taken. I voted to strike out these provisions upon every opportunity that offered itself, and surely I am entitled to some credit for having myself interposed a motion to strike out on a number of occasions. It

is said that everything is fair in love and war, and I am sure Mr. Gompers intends to play the game according to that rule, so that all my misdeeds may receive the publicity to which they are entitled.

Let me proceed. I voted unfavorably once on the Borland amendment increasing the hours of Government employees and I failed to vote once upon it. Here again is a strangely unaccountable hiatus in my unfortunate record. I tried here to get rid of the system which permits some employees to work less than eight hours while others are required to work eight hours and more. I acted upon the assumption that a full day's wage entitled the Government to a full day's service, and I voted accordingly. I shall repeat the vote if given the opportunity. Again, if I failed to vote on the 21st of March, 1918, it is a lapse for which I owe the Senate an explanation. I am accused on the 27th day of August, 1918, of voting unfavorably on the "work-or-fight amendment" to the draft bill. I did vote against striking out the provision, but it is unfair to me not to record the fact that I was the author of that provision. It was I who offered it in the Committee on Military Affairs and it is I who am responsible for it, and I protest, Mr. President, that that fact should appear in this record of condemnation. I entertained the idea that a man relieved from duty at the front because of his need in the manufactures at home ought to work just as hard in the vocation to which he had been assigned as though he were in the trenches. Consequently my amendment was designed to take men who, having been thus detailed, refused or declined to work and put them in the trenches. It was known as the work-or-fight amendment. Mr. Gompers opposed it, to use his expression, viciously. We had quite a spirited correspondence about it. I got the best of the argument, but unfortunately he had the votes. My argument, albeit conclusive, was ineffectual, and Mr. Gompers's argument, however inconclusive, was very triumphant. Hence men relieved from military service and detailed to work in munitions production were permitted to work or shirk as they pleased, while their pay continued in any event.

I could read, if I were so disposed, the Record giving the names of the Senators who voted to strike out that provision. Unfortunately some of them have since incurred the displeasure of King Samuel, and are therefore upon his blacklist along with me.

I am sorry for them; I am very, very sorry for them; but "I can not cry for laughing."

Unconsciously, perhaps, these gentlemen have since given offense to Mr. Gompers. Unconsciously they have done things which put them out of favor at court. Unconsciously, perhaps, they have been unmindful of those requirements, the observance of which is absolutely essential to reelection.

So, while the fate now confronting me looms large and disagreeable, I shall have the melancholy pleasure of enjoying the company of a number of my associates here, who then passed under Mr. Gompers's rod, and who next November will have to pass under it again.

I am recorded as casting an unfavorable vote upon the motion to strike out the antistrike clause of the Cummins bill. Upon that I seem to have voted unfavorably three times, but upon the 23d of February, 1920, when the Cummins-Esch railroad bill conference report, containing the obnoxious antilabor and other objectionable provisions was accepted, I am recorded as not voting. I did not; that is a fact. I was not here. Unfortunately I was in New York, engaged in making an antistrike speech. I could not be here and cast my vote in favor of that obnoxious provision and at the same time be addressing an audience in New York in favor of antistrike legislation. Had it been possible for a man of my dimensions to have been at two places on the same date, I should have made my record good upon the last vote that was taken upon that bill, although I did not approve of the conference report. We had not the sand to stand by our convictions and retain the antistrike clauses of the bill, and consequently I was not at all enamored of the conference committee report.

Upon the 3d of April, 1920, that being my last recorded offense, I am charged with voting unfavorably upon the Myers amendment prohibiting the affiliation of Federal employees with organized labor. I did. I voted once since upon the same subject. My recollection is that the only votes favoring the Myers amendment were his and my own. On a subsequent occasion, however, 3 votes for were cast. So we gained 50 per cent; and when it comes up again, as it certainly will, I hope that we will record 4 votes for it, which will be 100 per cent gain. Then, after the election, when it again recurs, as I trust it will, with no election to be held for two years, I hope we will secure a dozen votes for it. That is perhaps a very extravagant anticipation, but I am sometimes overextravagant, generally, however, in a

pessimistic way. However, nothing in the world so stiffens the official vertebræ as the fact that an election has just been passed and one will not be confronted with another for two years.

So, if Mr. Gompers, in justice to me, will please amend this record with the explanation which I have made, so that if hung at all I may be hung for an old sheep and not for a lamb, he will for the first time in our pleasant association together place me under lasting obligation.

I ask unanimous consent, although perhaps modesty should suggest that some one else should do so, to print my record in the RECORD. I may add, as suggested by the Senator from Utah (Mr. Smoot), that it may save others from the disagreeable necessity of making similar requests.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
NATIONAL NONPARTISAN POLITICAL
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
May 13, 1920.

To the secretaries of all local unions and central bodies in Colorado:

DEAR SIRS AND BROTHERS: We are inclosing a copy of the legislative record of Senator CHARLES SPALDING THOMAS, of Colorado, on measures of interest to labor that have come before the United States Senate for a record vote during his membership therein.

Conforming to a suggestion by the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor's national nonpartisan political campaign committee, the unions which have received these labor records of their public officials have adopted the method of reading them at every meeting of their organizations, the object being to keep their members advised continually until election day of the position taken on labor matters by their legislators. We have been advised that this has been a very effective and instructive method of publicity.

Yours, fraternally,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,
FRANK MORRISON,
JAMES O'CONNELL,
Executive Committee.

SENATOR CHARLES SPALDING THOMAS—ATTITUDE TOWARD LABOR.
[Sixty-third Congress.]

February 27, 1915: Motion to reconsider passage of seamen's bill. Favorable.

[Sixty-fourth Congress.]

June 30, 1916: Motion to strike out Tavenner amendment prohibiting vicious stop-watch and bonus systems from fortification bill. Not voting.

July 25, 1916: Motion to strike out Tavenner amendment prohibiting vicious stop-watch and bonus systems from military bill. Unfavorable.

July 26, 1916: Gallinger's amendment to nullify Tavenner amendment prohibiting vicious stop-watch and bonus systems. Unfavorable.

August 8, 1916: Federal child-labor bill. Not voting.

December 14, 1916: Passage immigration restriction bill. Favorable.

January 8, 1917: Conference report immigration restriction bill. Favorable.

February 5, 1917: Immigration restriction bill over President's veto. Favorable.

[Sixty-fifth Congress.]

September 25, 1917: Appropriation for Employment Bureau, Department of Labor. Not voting.

October 4, 1917: War-risk insurance—soldiers and sailors. Not voting.

February 6, 1918: Civil rights bill—soldiers and sailors. Favorable.

March 15, 1918: Borland amendment increasing hours of Government employees. Unfavorable.

March 21, 1918: Borland amendment increasing hours of Government employees, motion to strike out. Not voting.

May 22, 1918: Motion to strike out Tavenner amendment prohibiting vicious stop-watch and bonus systems from naval appropriation bill. Unfavorable.

August 27, 1918: Motion to strike out "work or fight" amendment from draft bill. Unfavorable.

December 5, 1918: Retirement bill—objectionable substitute by POMERENE. Not voting.

December 18, 1918: Child labor—revenue bill to tax products in interstate commerce. Unfavorable.

[Sixty-sixth Congress.]

June 4, 1919: Woman suffrage. Favorable.

October 21, 1919: Amendment to strike out antitrust clause favoring labor in first deficiency bill. Unfavorable.

November 5, 1919: Motion to strike out labor charter from League of Nations. Unfavorable.

December 18, 1919: Motion to strike clause making strikes unlawful from Cummins railroad bill. Unfavorable.

December 19, 1919: Motion to strike clause making strikes unlawful from Cummins railroad bill. Unfavorable.

December 20, 1919: Final passage of Cummins railroad bill making strikes unlawful. Unfavorable.

January 26, 1920: Americanization bill—education of illiterates. Not voting.

February 23, 1920: Cummins-Esch railroad bill—acceptance of conference report containing the obnoxious antilabor and other objectionable provisions. Not voting.

April 1, 1920: Motion by Senator PHELAN to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Conciliation, Department of Labor. Not voting.

April 3, 1920: Retirement bill—Myers amendment prohibiting affiliation of Federal employees with organized labor. Unfavorable.

Favorable	12
Unfavorable	17
Not voting	11

Total 40

SCHEDULES OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of claims amounting to \$863,568.91, allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, etc. (S. Doc. No. 286), which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$500,000 required by the War Department for expenses incident to the settlement of war claims arising out of Ordnance Department contracts (S. Doc. No. 289), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$15,000, required by the Bureau of Education for "Register of Teachers, Bureau of Education," for the remainder of the current fiscal year and to remain available until December 31, 1920 (S. Doc. No. 294), which, with accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the Public Health Service to be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921 (S. Doc. No. 290), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$5,000 required by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1921 for necessary expenses to repair damage by typhoon at the Agricultural Experiment Station on the island of Guam (S. Doc. No. 288), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the president of the Civil Service Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$7,500, required by the commission for printing and binding, fiscal year 1920 (S. Doc. No. 291), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$292,000, required by the Treasury Department for expenses incident to the transfer of duties and function of the several subtreasuries when discontinued as provided for by law (S. Doc. No. 292), which, with the accom-

panying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$104,050 for general expenses, public buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$35,000, required by the Department of State in connection with foreign intercourse, for the relief and protection of American seamen, fiscal year 1920 (S. Doc. No. 287), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$19,000, required for alterations incidental to discontinuance of the electric generating plant in the State, War, and Navy Building, and to provide for the purchase of electric current for operation of that building during the fiscal year 1921 (S. Doc. No. 293), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6222) to remove a certain tract or lots of lands 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).

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Caribou National Forest.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 406) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Calif., to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.," approved June 30, 1906, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

S. 2890. An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes;

S. 4411. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.;

S. 4431. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, in Lee County, State of Illinois, at or near the city of Dixon, in said county; and

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for the enforcement of the prohibition law in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of the United States, praying for the ratification of the treaty of peace and the participation by the United States in the League of Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SPENCER. I present a statement issued by Daniel T. O'Connell, director of the Friends of Irish Freedom, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Daniel T. O'Connell, director, Friends of Irish Freedom, National Bureau of Information, to-day issued the following statement in relation to interruptions of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

"The acts of the small group of women who to-day interrupted the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives are disavowed by those intrusted with the responsi-

bility of guiding the activities of the Americans of Irish blood striving to aid Ireland in establishing her independence. The interruptions were wholly without authority and without the knowledge of any responsible officer or representative of the National Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom or associated organizations.

"Fair-minded people of America will, I am sure, realize that these women acted as individuals and not in any representative capacity. In view of these circumstances it would seem but proper that the Friends of Irish Freedom as an organized body, representing 20,000,000 of Americans of Irish blood should not be misjudged by the acts referred to and that in the spirit of fairness pending legislation, namely, the Mason resolution, should in no way be affected thereby."

Mr. SPENCER. I also present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., which I ask to have printed in the Record.

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

"Whereas the official records and reports from unimpeachable sources reveal the fact that in 1905 Japan forced the protectorate treaty upon Korea against the wish of the Korean ruler and her people, Korea having been an independent kingdom for 40 centuries, and five years later annexed her as a Province of the Japanese Empire in violation of her treaty stipulations with Korea; and

"Whereas since the annexation Japan has pursued a most oppressive policy in Korea with a view to denationalize the Korean people as a race, Japan has taken the agricultural lands of the Koreans by force and fraudulent methods, Japan has prevented the Koreans from obtaining a higher education, and by arbitrary rules and regulations the Koreans have been hindered from pursuing commercial or industrial activities, thus bringing their condition politically, economically, and educationally to a most pitiful state; and

"Whereas Japan has persistently attempted to check the spread of Christianity in Korea, because Christianity demands a spirit of individual liberty, education, and moral and material improvement among the Korean people; the native Christian leaders have been constantly persecuted on false and foolish charges, and often without any charge, and even the American missionaries have been insulted, maltreated, and imprisoned without just cause; and

"Whereas on March 1, 1919, the united Korean people peacefully declared their independence from Japan, but did not commit any act of violence, but the Japanese soldiers and gendarmes used the most inhuman and barbarous methods in suppressing them; in this brutal treatment of these defenseless people who aspire to be free the Japanese singled out the Christian element of the Korean population, killed them by thousands, tortured them, and incarcerated them in the foulest dungeons for indefinite periods without trial, even women and girls being subjected to the most barbarous treatment; and

"Whereas the Japanese Government endeavored to suppress the news of these outrages for several months by sending out false and misleading official statements, but failed in their attempt; and now the same officials are trying to assuage the just indignation of the civilized world by making various promises of reforms which so far have not been fulfilled, nor have the ruthless methods of repression ceased; and

"Whereas the only remedy for this intolerable condition lies in the withdrawal of Japanese domination from Korea; by removing this fundamental wrong of the strong nation oppressing and exploiting the weak for selfish greed peace will be permanently restored in the world; Therefore be it

Resolved by the mass meeting of the people of Philadelphia, held on the 23d day of May, 1920, at the Academy of Music, city of Philadelphia, That we strongly protest against Japan's imperialistic policy in Korea, and we urge the Japanese people to persuade their Government to adopt a just and humane course toward their Korean neighbors; be it further

Resolved, That we sympathize with the Korean people in their hour of struggle for the principle of political and religious freedom, and we admire their firm and uncompromising attitude for their ideals and their abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness over brute force; be it further

Resolved, That we request our Government to use its good offices to bring about an amicable adjustment between Japan and Korea in fulfillment of our pledge to Korea in the treaty of 1882 between the United States and Korea; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President and Senate of the United States.

Proposed by Joseph M. Steele.

Meeting was presided by Floyd W. Tomkin."

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Building Trades Council of Contra Costa County, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in the necessities of life and speculating in stocks and bonds, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have received a large number of telegrams relating to the coal situation in New England, upon which I submitted some remarks a few days ago. I ask that the telegrams may be inserted in the RECORD.

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

LYNN, MASS., June 1, 1920.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our industrial interests urge upon you the need for immediate action on bituminous-coal situation. Export through Virginia ports, which we depend upon for our major supply by water, are far above normal, resulting in New England movement so small that hand-to-mouth existence is now necessary. If wheels of industry are to be kept moving next winter, now is the time we must accumulate reserve supply, which must come by water, as railroads never have, and in our judgment can not, move enough bituminous coal to supply New England needs. We believe temporary embargo on foreign shipments only solution of problem.

LYNN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

BOSTON, MASS., May 29, 1920.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing information which you already have with respect to the present deplorable and ruinous coal prices. Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway Co., operating over 800 miles of street railway, under direction of five public trustees in the interest of preserving transportation facilities at reasonable rates throughout the greater part of eastern Massachusetts, is now compelled to pay \$15.25 per ton for tidewater bituminous coal, with assurance that price will advance to \$16 next week. Under all known facts as to the fair and profitable cost, including Shipping Board water and rail rates, price should not exceed \$8.75 per ton. We are unable to obtain any reasonably firm price contracts and are compelled to buy coal at arbitrary and at prohibitive prices to keep our 10 power plants running. This company uses thousands of tons per annum. Coal bunkers are practically empty. Fifteen to sixteen dollar coal will add \$1,000,000 per year to operating expenses, which are now so inflated that many miles of track on this system, serving thousands of citizens, must be shut down if these prices continue. We can not too strongly support all the statements you have made as to this shameful coal situation, and are ready to urge our complaint with evidence when and where the same will be of value.

R. B. STEARNS,

Vice President and General Manager Eastern Massachusetts
Street Railway Co., by direction of Public Trustees.

SALEM, MASS., May 29, 1920.

Senator D. I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our board commends and thanks you for coal embargo resolution.
R. A. GODDARD,
Secretary Salem Chamber of Commerce.

LEE, MASS., May 29, 1920.

DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge immediate passage of bill prohibiting exportation of coal. New England industries, including ourselves, are closing down, due to inability to get coal. Prices here trebled, and coal is impossible to secure.

LEE LIME CO.
CONNECTICUT LIME CO.
WHITE MARBLE & TERRAZZA CO.
WEST STOCKBRIDGE MARBLE WORKS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have received a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by the South Carolina executive committee of the American Legion, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

THE AMERICAN LEGION OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, S. C., May 29, 1920.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith is a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by the South Carolina executive committee of the American Legion.

Yours, very truly,

JULIUS H. WALKER,
State Commander.

"Whereas it appears from statements made by Dr. W. C. Rucker, chief medical adviser of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and other Government officers, that 641,900 men were discharged from the Army and Navy with disabilities, of whom 276,327 were seriously disabled, and that less than 5 per cent of the disabled have been cared for by the Federal Board of Vocational Education; and

"Whereas it is estimated by qualified experts that the proper and adequate care of those who have been disabled may cost the Government annually from \$325,000,000 to \$500,000,000: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the executive committee of the American Legion of South Carolina, That we strongly condemn any legislation designed to give a cash bonus to the able-bodied ex-service men at this time, when it appears that no adequate provision has been made for the disabled, who are really entitled to assistance; and

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Representative in the United States Senate and Congress and published in the State newspapers."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Irvine F. Belser, of Columbia, S. C., relative to the soldiers' bonus bill now before Congress. I ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

MELTON & BELSER,
Columbia, S. C., May 29, 1920.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to a matter which vitally affects the soldier bonus bill now before Congress.

Dr. W. C. Rucker, chief medical adviser of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, in a recent statement says that 641,900 men were discharged from the service for disability, of whom 276,327 were seriously disabled, and that less than 5 per cent of these men have been cared for by the Federal Board. Also it is estimated by Dr. Rucker and others qualified that the proper care of these wounded and disabled will cost the Government annually from \$325,000,000 to \$500,000,000.

Regardless of how much it should cost, the disabled are certainly entitled to preferential treatment over the able-bodied; and there must be some limit to taxation. For this and other reasons I urge you to vote and use your influence against the proposed blanket bonus bill now before Congress.

I am writing this letter simply as a citizen and taxpayer of the United States and as an ex-service man who spent 20 of the most valuable months of his life in the Army. I trust that we can count on the South Carolina Representatives to take a statesmanlike view of the matter.

Yours, very truly,

IRVINE F. BELSER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRANCE, from the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, to which was referred the bill (S. 3259), for the public protection of maternity and infancy and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 650) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4357) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 651) thereon.

Mr. FRANCE. For the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13627) to amend paragraph (e) of section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1919, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6407) for the relief of Michael MacGarvey, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 649) thereon.

JAMES L. VAI.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2673) entitled "A bill for the relief of James L. Vai," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4479) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of Thomas A. Henry, F., and Joseph F. Eagan, and the parcel-post and collection-wagon contract of the estate of Thomas Eagan; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 4480) granting a pension to Sadie Judith Tharp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4482) to provide for the addition of certain public lands to the Lewis and Clark National Forest in Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4483) for the relief of the Lambert Transportation Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4484) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 4485) to enlarge the area of lands authorized to be taken for the reclamation of the Anacostia River Flats; to the Committee on the Library.

BUREAU OF SUPPLY.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I introduce the bill which I send to the desk, in order that it may be printed and the subject discussed and studied during the recess.

It provides for the creation of a central purchasing bureau for the purchase of Government supplies, and is intended to systematize the purchase of supplies, and to avoid the present extensive duplication that exists, and to bring about a more orderly and economical system of purchasing supplies.

The bill (S. 4481) to establish in the District of Columbia a Government bureau of supply, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$19,084.59 for continuing the extension of the quay wall at the navy yard, Portsmouth, N. H., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$9,819 to pay Katherine Macdonald, of Butte, Mont., for work and services performed on or supplies furnished for the construction of the Corbett Tunnel, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NORRIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$117,735.31 for the payment of the judgment of the Court of Claims affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Omaha Tribe of Indians against the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 2265, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WALTER B. HENRETTY.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 381), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter B. Henretty the sum of \$1,208.33 for clerical services rendered the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs appointed to investigate the question of awards in the Navy under authority of Senate resolution of June 6, 1919.

FOREST RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CAPPER. Yesterday there was received a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture relative to timber depletion, lumber prices, lumber exports, and concentration of timber ownership, which was in response to a resolution submitted by me on February 21, 1920. The Chair ordered the communication and accompanying papers to lie on the table. I move that the communication and accompanying papers be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The motion was agreed to.

LAND IN CALIFORNIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to amendment No. 7 of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 406) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California, and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Calif., to the city of Los Angeles,

Calif.," approved June 30, 1906, which was, in Senate amendment No. 7, line 1, after "page," to strike out "5" and insert "6."

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

The motion was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PAGE. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13108) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. SMOOT. I am positive that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] notified the chairman of the committee that he would desire to speak upon the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS. That being the case, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gerry	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Hale	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Henderson	Nugent	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Keyes	Page	Underwood
Curtis	King	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dial	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Dillingham	McCormick	Sheppard	Wolcott
Elkins	McCumber	Simmons	
Fernald	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GAY, Mr. KNOX, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WATSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. NEW, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. EDGE, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. HARDING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SPENCER. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] are engaged on the business of the Senate in connection with an investigating committee.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are necessarily detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I realize that at this late time it is practically impossible to remedy a defect in the pending naval appropriation bill which involves the abandonment of a policy followed heretofore for many years. When the naval appropriation bill came over from the House I found that no appropriation had been made for carrying on the work of the torpedo station at Newport, R. I. I suggested to the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate an amendment appropriating \$200,000 for that station, which would have afforded an adequate amount to carry on their work for the next fiscal year. The committee agreed to my amendment, as did also the Senate, but when the bill went to conference the House conferees objected, I understand, on the ground that the necessary amount could be obtained from the general appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores. They insisted on disagreeing to the amendment, and the Senate conferees, to insure the passage of the naval appropriation bill at this session, finally yielded.

I have no fault to find with the Senate conferees, for I know they did all they could to maintain my amendment in the bill. Mr. President, the Senate was right in inserting this amendment, and for this reason: The work of the naval torpedo station at Newport is of the most important character. With the development of the submarine, with the increased number of destroyers we have lately built, and with the lessons we have learned in the war, there can be no question that the torpedo is becoming a more and more important weapon of naval attack; and I am proud to say that the American torpedo is probably the best in the world.

That such is the case is due to the efficiency and the ability of not only our naval experts but of the men in the torpedo station. The Newport torpedo station has been in existence for something like 50 years; there has been built up a skilled, able, and loyal personnel. Its record before the war was excellent and during the war it was magnificent. The employees take a pride in their work, and the results prove their great efficiency.

I do not believe, therefore, Mr. President, that it is a wise policy in any way to curtail or cut down such an important appropriation as the one to which I refer. The argument that it is covered, as I have said, by the general appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores, I do not think is sound. Admiral Earle, when he came before the committee, asked for \$20,000,000. The House Naval Affairs Committee considered that sum too great, and they cut the appropriation down to \$17,500,000. Admiral Earle's first estimate was conservative, and it was a mistake, in my judgment, to cut down the appropriation \$2,500,000, for it may mean the curtailing to a considerable extent of naval endeavors which should be carried on.

I am an advocate of economy, but I do not believe that it is possible always wisely to economize by cutting down appropriations. Sometimes that is false economy. A good example of this was the failure of this Congress to provide increased pay for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey last fall, and delaying action until late this spring, because of a cry of economy, with the result that the Navy lost between 70,000 and 80,000 of its most efficient men.

I trust and believe that the department will see that no injury is done to the station at Newport. I know that the Secretary of the Navy is interested in it and will do what he can to see that it is carried on in its present efficiency, but I do not believe that Congress should allow any department to decide how little is to be spent in such a vital naval matter. It was for that reason that I offered the amendment in the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, which was adopted by the Senate, and it is for that reason that I am protesting now against the action of the conferees in not sustaining the Senate contention.

As I said before, however, I realize that at a time like this, at the end of the session, it is practically impossible to rectify an injury of this sort, and all that I can do is to voice my protest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TEMPORARY RED CROSS BUILDINGS.

Mr. FERNALD. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 200) to grant authority to continue the use of the temporary buildings of the American Red Cross headquarters in the city of Washington, D. C., and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let the joint resolution be read first.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas by joint resolution of Congress approved the 22d day of May, 1917, authority was granted to the American National Red Cross to erect temporary structures upon square No. 172 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, for use in connection with its work in cooperation with the United States Government, provided said buildings erected under said authority should be removed and the site or sites thereof placed in good condition within three years from the date of said resolution; and

Whereas the buildings erected pursuant to said resolution are still needed for use in connection with its work in cooperation with the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That authority be and is hereby given to the central committee of the American National Red Cross to continue the use of such temporary buildings as are now erected upon square 172 in the city of Washington, for the use of the American Red Cross in connection with its work in cooperation with the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any building or buildings, the use of which is extended under this authority, shall be removed and the site or sites thereof placed in good condition within three years from the date of the approval of this resolution, unless otherwise especially provided by Congress: *Provided further*, That the United States shall be put to no expense of any kind by reason of the exercise of the authority hereby conferred.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like the Senator from Maine to explain in detail, if he will, the reasons for the passage of the legislation.

Mr. FERNALD. The explanation is simply this:

Three years ago authority was given to the American Red Cross Association to erect some buildings in the rear of the Red Cross building, and those buildings were built largely by charity. They cost in the neighborhood of \$300,000. The time has expired within which they should be removed, but the buildings are still in use, and they ask that the time may be extended for another three years. They ask for no appropri-

tion, but simply for an extension of the time that the buildings may remain on this lot. I understand that there is no objection from any source.

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

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine whether or not there is any provision now upon the statute books in regard to the time when these buildings are to be removed and at whose expense?

Mr. FERNALD. It is so stated in the joint resolution.

Mr. KING. No; the joint resolution states, as I understand, that they may be removed. There is nothing in the joint resolution to require their removal.

Mr. FERNALD. The purpose of the joint resolution is simply to extend the time under the same law, and to say that they may remain there for another three years.

Mr. KING. But is it the purpose of the Senator to keep these buildings in their present situation for three years?

Mr. FERNALD. Not unless it is necessary. That, I assume, would be left to the Red Cross Association.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to my colleague that the joint resolution is mandatory, for it provides that these buildings shall be removed, and the site or sites thereof shall be placed in good condition, within three years. So it is left entirely to the judgment of the Red Cross officials as to whether they shall be removed within a year or two years, but not to exceed three years. At the end of three years the joint resolution says they shall be removed.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Maine whether or not the Government, prior to the expiration of the three-year period of limitation, might remove the buildings if the Government required the land?

Mr. FERNALD. I should think they might.

Mr. KING. Will any expense be devolved upon the Government in the maintenance of these buildings?

Mr. FERNALD. Not at all.

Mr. KING. Nothing for insurance?

Mr. FERNALD. Not at all, as I understand.

Mr. KING. Are there no Government officials in charge of the buildings?

Mr. FERNALD. I think not.

Mr. KING. But the entire cost of the maintenance of the buildings will be met by the Red Cross organization?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; I assume so.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not there are any employees of the Government who are engaged in service in these buildings?

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know about that. I think they are used entirely by the Red Cross Association.

Mr. KING. The reason why I am making the inquiry is that I have been told that in some quasi public organizations now, organizations which ought to be conducted entirely by private individuals or by corporations, Government employees give their services at the cost of the Government.

Mr. FERNALD. My understanding is that the Government has no employees in this Red Cross work.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution.

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

THE MERCHANT MARINE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, out of order I present a conference report on the merchant-marine bill, and ask that it may lie on the table until action is taken by the House.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I desire to ask the Senator from Washington a question in regard to the conference report. As I understand it, the Senator simply wishes to have the conference report printed, and intends to ask to have it taken up, and it will be taken up, by unanimous consent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand it, under the rule I can not ask that it be taken up until it is acted upon by the House. When the House has informed the Senate that it has acted upon the report I shall ask that it be taken up.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. When the conference report is taken up, will it be taken up under unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to inform the Senator from New Jersey what action the Senate will take respecting the conference report. The Senator from Washing-

ton merely asks that it lie on the table for the present, and it is in the province of the Senate to determine when it will proceed to the consideration of the conference report. There is no request whatever pending for the consideration of the report. So the Chair can not tell the Senator from New Jersey what action the Senate may hereafter take in regard to the report.

Mr. NELSON. I suppose the conference report can be taken up at the proper time either by unanimous consent or on motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly. Any Senator can make a request for unanimous consent to consider the report, and if that is not secured he may at the proper time move to consider the report. The Senator from New Jersey must appreciate the fact that the Chair can not anticipate what the Senate may do in the matter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submit the report, and ask that it lie on the table for the present.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 35, 44, 47, 49, 122, 125, and 149.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 140, 143, and 148, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "in this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and shall have authority to adjust, settle, and liquidate all agreements, express or implied, on a fair and equitable basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) That section 3 of the 'Shipping act, 1916,' is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That a board is hereby created to be known as the United States Shipping Board and hereinafter referred to as the board. The board shall be composed of seven commissioners, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and the President shall designate the member to act as chairman of the board, and the board may elect one of its members as vice chairman. Such commissioners shall be appointed as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act and shall continue in office two for a term of one year, and the remaining five for terms of two, three, four, five and six years, respectively, from the date of their appointment, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the commissioner whom he succeeds.

"The commissioners shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient discharge of the duties imposed on them by this act, and two shall be appointed from the States touching the Pacific Ocean, two from the States touching the Atlantic Ocean, one from the States touching the Gulf of Mexico, one from the States touching the Great Lakes, and one from the interior, but not more than one shall be appointed from the same State. Not more than four of the commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party. A vacancy in the board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments. No commissioner shall take any part in the consideration or decision of any claim or particular controversy in which he has a pecuniary interest.

"Each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office, and shall not be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any common carrier or other person subject to this act, nor while holding such office acquire any stock or bonds thereof or become pecuniarily interested in any such carrier.

"The duties of the board may be so divided that under its supervision the directorship of various activities may be assigned to one or more commissioners. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the board shall not impair the right of the remaining members of the board to exercise all its powers. The board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

"The board may adopt rules and regulations in regard to its procedure and the conduct of its business. The board may employ within the limits of appropriations made therefor by Congress such attorneys as it finds necessary for proper legal service to the board in the conduct of its work, or for proper representation of the public interest in investigations made by it or proceedings pending before it whether at the board's own instance or upon complaint, or to appear for or represent the board in any case in court or other tribunal. The board shall have such other rights and perform such other duties not inconsistent with the merchant marine act, 1920, as are conferred by existing law upon the board in existence at the time this section as amended takes effect.

"The commissioners in office at the time this section as amended takes effect shall hold office until all the commissioners provided for in this section as amended are appointed and qualify."

"(b) The first sentence of section 4 of the 'Shipping act, 1916,' is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That each member of the board shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Provided, That all vessels assigned to river and harbor work or inland waterways, and vessels now in the course of construction or under contract by the War Department or the Navy Department, shall be exempt from the provisions of this act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale after appraisal and due advertisement, to"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "existing freight rates and prospects of their maintenance,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and any other facts or conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "not inconsistent with the provisions of section 5 (except that completion of the payment of the purchase price and interest shall not be deferred more than 10 years after the making of the contract of sale)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "but no such sale shall be made unless the board, after diligent effort, has been unable to sell, in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 5, such vessels to persons citizens of the United States, and has, upon an affirmative vote of not less than five of its members, spread upon the minutes of the board, determined to make such sale; and it shall make as a part of its records a full statement of its reasons for making such sale. De-

ferred payments of purchase price of vessels under this section shall bear interest at the rate of not less than 5½ per cent per annum, payable semiannually"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 6 and 7 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the following words: "Where adequate terminal connections with rail carriers can and will be made or already exist"; in line 17 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board"; in line 30 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "authorized," insert the following: "Notwithstanding the act entitled 'An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,' approved March 3, 1891"; at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a colon and add the following: "And provided further, That whenever the board shall determine, as provided in this act, that trade conditions warrant the establishment of a service or additional service under Government administration where a service is already being given by persons, citizens of the United States, the rates and charges for such Government service shall not be less than the cost thereof, including a proper interest and depreciation charge on the value of Government vessels and equipment employed therein"; in line 8 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment after the word "world," insert the words "and domestic"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "board," insert a comma and the following: "in cooperation with the Secretary of War"; in line 6 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, after the word "rail," insert a comma and the word "water"; omit the proviso at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That if after such investigation the board shall be of the opinion that rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations or practices of common carriers by railroad subject to the interstate commerce act are detrimental to the object declared in this section, or that new rates, fares, charges, classifications, regulations or practices, new or additional port terminal facilities, or action on the part of such common carriers by railroad are or any of them is necessary or desirable to promote such declared object, the board may file its application or complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission praying for such relief and order as the commission may deem proper under the law then existing. In connection with such application or complaint the board may submit to the commission its findings together with the record or records on which they are based and the commission is hereby empowered to issue such order or orders relative thereto as it may deem proper without further investigation, but the commission may augment or supplement the record or records submitted to it by the board by such further investigation as the commission deems appropriate"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu "\$25,000,000"; in line 21 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out everything after the word "built," down to and including the word "semiannually," at the end of the matter proposed by such Senate amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "may be reconditioned and kept in suitable repair and until"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "pursuant to the policy and purposes declared in sections 1 and 5 of this act; and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation shall continue in existence and have authority to operate vessels, unless otherwise directed by law, until all vessels are sold in

accordance with the provisions of this act, the provision"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 17. That the board is authorized and directed to take over on January 1, 1921, the possession and control of, and to maintain and develop, all docks, piers, warehouses, wharves and terminal equipment and facilities, including all leasehold easements, rights of way, riparian rights and other rights, estates and interests therein or appurtenant thereto, acquired by the President by or under the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes,' approved March 28, 1918.

"The possession and control of such other docks, piers, warehouses, wharves and terminal equipment and facilities or parts thereof, including all leasehold easements, rights of way, riparian rights and other rights, estates or interests therein or appurtenant thereto which were acquired by the War Department or the Navy Department for military or naval purposes during the war emergency may be transferred by the President to the board whenever the President deems such transfer to be for the best interests of the United States.

"The President may at any time he deems it necessary, by order setting out the need therefor and fixing the period of such need, permit or transfer the possession and control of any part of the property taken over by or transferred to the board under this section to the War Department or the Navy Department for their needs, and when in the opinion of the President such need therefor ceases the possession and control of such property shall revert to the board. None of such property shall be sold except as may be hereafter provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment after the word "chartered" at the end of the line preceding and the beginning of said line 12 insert the words "by the board"; in lieu of the last two paragraphs of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"It shall be unlawful to sell, transfer or mortgage, or, except under regulations prescribed by the board, to charter, any vessel purchased from the board or documented under the laws of the United States to any person not a citizen of the United States, or to put the same under a foreign registry or flag, without first obtaining the board's approval.

"Any vessel chartered, sold, transferred or mortgaged to a person not a citizen of the United States or placed under a foreign registry or flag, or operated, in violation of any provision of this section shall be forfeited to the United States, and whoever violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than five years, or both."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 19. (1) The board is authorized and directed in aid of the accomplishment of the purposes of this act (a) to make all necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(b) To make rules and regulations affecting shipping in the foreign trade not in conflict with law in order to adjust or meet general or special conditions unfavorable to shipping in the foreign trade, whether in any particular trade or upon any particular route or in commerce generally and which arise out of or result from foreign laws, rules or regulations or from competitive methods or practices employed by owners, operators, agents, or masters of vessels of a foreign country; and

"(c) To request the head of any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government to suspend, modify, or annul rules or regulations which have been established by such department, board, bureau, or agency, or to make new rules or regulations affecting shipping in the foreign trade other than such rules or regulations relating to the Public Health Service, the Consular Service, and the Steamboat-Inspection Service.

"(2) No rule or regulation shall hereafter be established by any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government

which affect shipping in the foreign trade, except rules or regulations affecting the Public Health Service, the Consular Service, and the Steamboat-Inspection Service, until such rule or regulation has been submitted to the board for its approval and final action has been taken thereon by the board or the President.

"(3) Whenever the head of any department, board, bureau, or agency of the Government refuses to suspend, modify, or annul any rule or regulation, or make a new rule or regulation upon request of the board, as provided in subdivision (c) of paragraph (1) of this section, or objects to the decision of the board in respect to the approval of any rule or regulation, as provided in paragraph (2) of this section, either the board or the head of the department, board, bureau, or agency which has established or is attempting to establish the rule or regulation in question may submit the facts to the President, who is hereby authorized to establish or suspend, modify, or annul such rule or regulation.

"(4) No rule or regulation shall be established which in any manner gives vessels owned by the United States any preference or favor over those vessels documented under the laws of the United States and owned by persons who are citizens of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 20. (1) That section 14 of the shipping act, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. That no common carrier by water shall, directly or indirectly, in respect to the transportation by water of passengers or property between a port of a State, Territory, District, or possession of the United States and any other such port or a port of a foreign country,—

"First. Pay, or allow, or enter into any combination, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, to pay or allow, a deferred rebate to any shipper. The term "deferred rebate" in this act means a return of any portion of the freight money by a carrier to any shipper as a consideration for the giving of all or any portion of his shipments to the same or any other carrier, or for any other purpose, the payment of which is deferred beyond the completion of the service for which it is paid, and is made only if, during both the period for which computed and the period of deferment, the shipper has complied with the terms of the rebate agreement or arrangement.

"Second. Use a fighting ship either separately or in conjunction with any other carrier, through agreement or otherwise. The term "fighting ship" in this act means a vessel used in a particular trade by a carrier or group of carriers for the purpose of excluding, preventing or reducing competition by driving another carrier out of said trade.

"Third. Retaliate against any shipper by refusing, or threatening to refuse, space accommodations when such are available, or resort to other discriminating or unfair methods, because such shipper has patronized any other carrier or has filed a complaint charging unfair treatment, or for any other reason.

"Fourth. Make any unfair or unjustly discriminatory contract with any shipper based on the volume of freight offered, or unfairly treat or unjustly discriminate against any shipper in the matter of (a) cargo space accommodations or other facilities, due regard being had for the proper loading of the vessel and the available tonnage; (b) the loading and landing of freight in proper condition; or (c) the adjustment and settlement of claims.

"Any carrier who violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$25,000 for each offense."

"(2) The shipping act, 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 14 a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 14a. The board upon its own initiative may, or upon complaint shall, after due notice to all parties in interest and hearing, determine whether any person, not a citizen of the United States and engaged in transportation by water of passengers or property—

"(1) Has violated any provision of section 14, or

"(2) Is a party to any combination, agreement, or understanding, express or implied, that involves in respect to transportation of passengers or property between foreign ports, deferred rebates or any other unfair practice designated in section 14, and that excludes from admission upon equal terms with all other parties thereto, a common carrier by water which is a

citizen of the United States and which has applied for such admission.

"If the board determines that any such person has violated any such provision or is a party to any such combination, agreement, or understanding, the board shall thereupon certify such fact to the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary shall thereafter refuse such person the right of entry for any ship owned or operated by him or by any carrier directly or indirectly controlled by him, into any port of the United States, or any Territory, District, or possession thereof, until the board certifies that the violation has ceased or such combination, agreement, or understanding has been terminated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 1 and 2 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "one year from the enactment of this act" and insert in lieu "February 1, 1922"; in line 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "within a year" and insert the words "by February 1, 1922"; at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a colon and insert the following: "And provided further, That the foregoing provisions of this section shall not take effect with reference to the Philippine Islands until the President of the United States after a full investigation of the local needs and conditions shall, by proclamation, declare that an adequate shipping service has been established as herein provided and fix a date for the going into effect of the same"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 23" and insert in lieu "Sec. 21"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 10 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly"; in line 13 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly"; in line 15 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "wholly in American" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in such" and after the word "ownership" in said line 15 insert the following: "Subject to the rules and regulations of such trade: *Provided*, That the board is authorized to issue permits for the carrying of passengers in foreign ships if it deems it necessary so to do, operating between the Territory of Hawaii and the Pacific coast up to February 1, 1922"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 24" and insert in lieu "Sec. 22"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 23. That the revenue act of 1918 is amended by inserting after section 206, a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 207. (a) That the owner of a vessel registered, enrolled or licensed under the laws of the United States and operated only in foreign trade shall for each of the 10 taxable years while so operated, beginning with the taxable year 1920, be allowed as a deduction for the purpose of ascertaining his net income subject to the war-profits and excess-profits taxes imposed by Title III an amount equivalent to the net earnings of such vessel during such taxable year, determined in accordance with rules and regulations to be made by the United States Shipping Board. Such owner shall not be entitled to such deduction unless during such taxable year he invested, or set aside under rules and regulations to be made by such board in a fund (to be known as a "replacement fund") for investment, in the building in shipyards in the United States of new vessels of a type and kind approved by such board, an amount to be determined by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, and certified by him to such board, equivalent to the war-profits and excess-profits taxes that would have been payable by such owner on account of the net earnings of such vessels but for the deduction allowed under the provisions of this section; but at least two-thirds of the cost of any new vessel so constructed shall be paid for out of the ordinary funds or capital of the person having such vessel constructed.

"The "invested capital" of the taxpayer attributable to any vessel, the net income from which is exempt from the taxes imposed by Title III shall be regarded as an "inadmissible asset" in computing the taxes due under such title upon the remainder of the taxpayer's net income for the taxable year.

"(b) After January 1, 1920, upon the sale of a vessel registered, enrolled or licensed under the laws of the United States

and built prior to January 1, 1914, the vendor may upon application, under oath made in such form as the commissioner shall by regulation prescribe, establish a fund to be known as a "replacement fund." The vendor shall cover into such fund the entire amount received from the sale of such vessel in excess of its value on March 1, 1913, or its cost if acquired on or after that date. Such fund shall be used exclusively for the building by the vendor in shipyards in the United States of a new vessel of a type approved by the United States Shipping Board.

"Upon the completion of the new vessel it shall not be valued in the accounts of the taxpayer at an amount in excess of that at which the vessel sold was carried in such account at the time of the sale, except and to the extent that the productive capacity of such new vessel is greater than that of such old vessel.

"(c) Accounting for gain or loss upon the entire amount placed in the fund under the provision of paragraphs (a) or (b) may be deferred for a reasonable period of time to be determined in each case by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. If the new vessel is built within the time so determined, the moneys in the fund provided for (1) under paragraph (a) shall not be subject to the taxes imposed by Title III, and (2) under paragraph (b) shall not be subject to the taxes imposed in Titles II and III.

"(d) The taxpayer shall be required to furnish a bond with such security or surety as the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, shall require for an amount not less than the estimated income, war-profits, and excess-profits taxes not paid upon the income so covered into the replacement fund. In lieu of such bond the taxpayer may at his option deposit as security for such estimated amount of taxes, obligations of the United States to be held in trust as such security in a bank or trust company designated by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary.

"(e) In case a new vessel is not built within the time determined under this section, the taxes imposed (1) by Title III for the taxable year upon the amount set aside in such year under the provisions of paragraph (a), and (2) by Titles II and III for the taxable year in which the vessel built prior to January 1, 1914, was sold, shall be immediately due and payable, but no penalty or interest shall be added with respect to the time which has elapsed between the time that such taxes would have been due, but for the provisions of this section and the due date.

"(f) The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, or a majority thereof, are hereby authorized and directed to determine from time to time what shall be allowed for annual depreciation of vessels documented under the laws of the United States engaged in foreign trade and owned by persons citizens of the United States, in order that the owners of such vessels shall be put as nearly as may be on a parity for taxation purposes with the owners of vessels under the flag of our foreign competitors in the world's carrying trade, and such allowances shall be embraced in the deductions allowed by law in determining the net income subject to income taxes and war-profits and excess-profits taxes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Nothing herein shall be affected by the act entitled 'An act to provide for ocean-mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce,' approved March 3, 1891"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 26" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 24"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Beginning in line 6 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, strike out everything after the word "shipping" down to and including "citizens," in line 9 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment; in lines 10 and 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "or such approved organization"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen"; between the first and second paragraphs of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert a separate paragraph as follows:

"The privilege bestowed by this section on vessels of the United States shall be extended in so far as the foreign trade is concerned to the cargo vessels of any nation which allows the like privilege to cargo vessels of the United States in trades not restricted to vessels under its own flag."

In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 28" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 26."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "wholly," and in line 11 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the figures "24" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "22"; at the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to merchandise transported between points within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, over through routes heretofore or hereafter recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission for which routes rate tariffs have been or shall hereafter be filed with said commission when such routes are in part over Canadian rail lines and their own or other connecting water facilities: *Provided further*, That this section shall not become effective upon the Yukon River until the Alaska Railroad shall be completed and the Shipping Board shall find that proper facilities will be furnished for transportation by persons citizens of the United States for properly handling the traffic"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 29" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 27"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 17 and 18 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "and owned by persons who are citizens of the United States"; in line 22 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "and owned"; in line 30 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may"; in line 1 of the proposed amendment strike out the numerals "30" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "28"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 29. (a) That whenever used in this section—

"(1) The term 'association' means any association, exchange, pool, combination, or other arrangement for concerted action; and

"(2) The term 'marine insurance companies' means any persons, companies, or associations authorized to write marine insurance or reinsurance under the laws of the United States or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof.

"(b) Nothing contained in the 'antitrust laws' as designated in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, shall be construed as declaring illegal an association entered into by marine insurance companies for the following purposes: To transact a marine insurance and reinsurance business in the United States and in foreign countries and to reinsure or otherwise apportion among its membership the risks undertaken by such association or any of the component members."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 30. SUBSEC. A. That this section may be cited as the 'Ship mortgage act, 1920.'"

"DEFINITIONS.

"SUBSEC. B. When used in this section—

"(1) The term 'document' includes registry and enrollment and license;

"(2) The term 'documented' means registered or enrolled or licensed under the laws of the United States, whether permanently or temporarily;

"(3) The term 'port of documentation' means the port at which the vessel is documented in accordance with law;

"(4) The term 'vessel of the United States' means any vessel documented under the laws of the United States and such vessel shall be held to continue to be so documented until its documents are surrendered with the approval of the board; and

"(5) The term 'mortgagee,' in the case of a mortgage involving a trust deed and a bond issue thereunder, means the trustee designated in such deed.

"RECORDING OF SALES, CONVEYANCES, AND MORTGAGES OF VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"SUBSEC. C. (a) No sale, conveyance, or mortgage which, at the time such sale, conveyance, or mortgage is made, includes a vessel of the United States, or any portion thereof, as the whole or any part of the property sold, conveyed, or mortgaged shall be valid, in respect to such vessel, against any person other than the grantor or mortgagor, his heir or devisee, and a person having actual notice thereof, until such bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage is recorded in the office of the collector of customs of the port of documentation of such vessel, as provided in subdivision (b) of this subsection.

"(b) Such collector of customs shall record bills of sale, conveyances, and mortgages, delivered to him, in the order of their reception, in books to be kept for that purpose and indexed to show—

"(1) The name of the vessel;

"(2) The names of the parties to the sale, conveyance, or mortgage;

"(3) The time and date of reception of the instrument;

"(4) The interest in the vessel so sold, conveyed, or mortgaged; and

"(5) The amount and date of maturity of the mortgage.

"SUBSEC. D. (a) A valid mortgage which, at the time it is made includes the whole of any vessel of the United States of 200 gross tons and upward, shall in addition have, in respect to such vessel and as of the date of the compliance with all the provisions of this subdivision, the preferred status given by the provisions of subsection M, if—

"(1) The mortgage is indorsed upon the vessel's documents in accordance with the provisions of this section;

"(2) The mortgage is recorded as provided in subsection C, together with the time and date when the mortgage is so indorsed;

"(3) An affidavit is filed with the record of such mortgage to the effect that the mortgage is made in good faith and without any design to hinder, delay, or defraud any existing or future creditor of the mortgagor or any lienor of the mortgaged vessel;

"(4) The mortgage does not stipulate that the mortgagee waives the preferred status thereof; and

"(5) The mortgagee is a citizen of the United States.

"(b) Any mortgage which complies in respect to any vessel with the conditions enumerated in this subsection is hereafter in this section called a 'preferred mortgage' as to such vessel.

"(c) There shall be indorsed upon the documents of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage—

"(1) The names of the mortgagor and mortgagee;

"(2) The time and date the indorsement is made;

"(3) The amount and date of maturity of the mortgage; and

"(4) Any amount required to be indorsed by the provisions of subdivisions (e) or (f) of this subsection.

"(d) Such indorsement shall be made (1) by the collector of customs of the port of documentation of the mortgaged vessel, or (2) by the collector of customs of any port in which the vessel is found, if such collector is directed to make the indorsement by the collector of customs of the port of documentation; and no clearance shall be issued to the vessel until such indorsement is made. The collector of customs of the port of documentation shall give such direction by wire or letter at the request of the mortgagee and upon the tender of the cost of communication of such direction. Whenever any new document is issued for the vessel, such indorsement shall be transferred to and indorsed upon the new document by the collector of customs.

"(e) A mortgage which includes property other than a vessel shall not be held a preferred mortgage unless the mortgage provides for the separate discharge of such property by the payment of a specified portion of the mortgage indebtedness. If a preferred mortgage so provides for the separate discharge, the amount of the portion of such payment shall be indorsed upon the documents of the vessel.

"(f) If a preferred mortgage includes more than one vessel and provides for the separate discharge of each vessel by the payment of a portion of the mortgage indebtedness, the amount of such portion of such payment shall be indorsed upon the documents of the vessel. In case such mortgage does not provide for the separate discharge of a vessel and the vessel is to be sold upon the order of a district court of the United States in a suit in rem in admiralty, the court shall determine the portion of the mortgage indebtedness increased by 20 per cent

(1) which, in the opinion of the court, the approximate value of the vessel bears to the approximate value of all the vessels covered by the mortgage, and (2) upon the payment of which the vessel shall be discharged from the mortgage.

"SUBSEC. E. The collector of customs upon the recording of a preferred mortgage shall deliver two certified copies thereof to the mortgagor who shall place, and use due diligence to retain, one copy on board the mortgaged vessel and cause such copy and the documents of the vessel to be exhibited by the master to any person having business with the vessel, which may give rise to a maritime lien upon the vessel or to the sale, conveyance, or mortgage thereof. The master of the vessel shall, upon the request of any such person, exhibit to him the documents of the vessel and the copy of any preferred mortgage of the vessel placed on board thereof.

"SUBSEC. F. The mortgagor (1) shall, upon request of the mortgagee, disclose in writing to him prior to the execution of any preferred mortgage, the existence of any maritime lien, prior mortgage, or other obligation or liability upon the vessel to be mortgaged, that is known to the mortgagor, and (2), without the consent of the mortgagee, shall not incur, after the execution of such mortgage and before the mortgagee has had a reasonable time in which to record the mortgage and have indorsements in respect thereto made upon the documents of the vessel, any contractual obligation creating a lien upon the vessel other than a lien for wages of stevedores when employed directly by the owner, operator, master, ship's husband, or agent of the vessel, for wages of the crew of the vessel, for general average, or for salvage, including contract salvage, in respect to the vessel.

"SUBSEC. G. (a) The collector of customs of the port of documentation shall, upon the request of any person, record notice of his claim of a lien upon a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage, together with the nature, date of creation, and amount of the lien, and the name and address of the person. Any person who has caused notice of his claim of lien to be so recorded shall, upon a discharge in whole or in part of the indebtedness, forthwith file with the collector of customs a certificate of such discharge. The collector of customs shall thereupon record the certificate.

"(b) The mortgagor, upon a discharge in whole or in part of the mortgage indebtedness, shall forthwith file with the collector of customs for the port of documentation of the vessel, a certificate of such discharge. Such collector of customs shall thereupon record the certificate. In case of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage, the collector of customs at the port of documentation shall (1) indorse upon the documents of the vessel, or direct the collector of customs at any port in which the vessel is found, to so indorse, the fact of such discharge, and (2) shall deny clearance to the vessel until such indorsement is made.

"SUBSEC. H. (a) No bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage shall be recorded unless it states the interest of the grantor or mortgagor in the vessel, and the interest so sold, conveyed, or mortgaged.

"(b) No bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, notice of claim of lien, or certificate of discharge thereof, shall be recorded unless previously acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized by a law of the United States, or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, to take acknowledgment of deeds.

"(c) In case of a change in the port of documentation of a vessel of the United States, no bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage shall be recorded at the new port of documentation unless there is furnished to the collector of customs of such port, together with the copy of the bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage to be recorded, a certified copy of the record of the vessel at the former port of documentation furnished by the collector of such port. The collector of customs at the new port of documentation is authorized and directed to record such certified copy.

"(d) A preferred mortgage may bear such rate of interest as is agreed by the parties thereto.

"SUBSEC. I. Each collector of customs shall permit records made under the provisions of this section to be inspected during office hours, under such reasonable regulations as the collector may establish. Upon the request of any person the collector of customs shall furnish him from the records of the collector's office (1) a certificate setting forth the names of the owners of any vessel, the interest held by each owner, and the material facts as to any bill of sale or conveyance of, any mortgage covering, or any lien or other incumbrance upon, a specified vessel, (2) a certified copy of any bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, notice of claim of lien, or certificate of discharge in

respect to such vessel, or (3) a certified copy as required by subdivision (c) of subsection H. The collector of customs shall collect a fee for any bill of sale, conveyance, or mortgage recorded, or any certificate or certified copy furnished, by him, in the amount of 20 cents a folio with a minimum charge of \$1. All such fees shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"PENALTIES.

"SUBSEC. J. (a) If the master of the vessel willfully fails to exhibit the documents of the vessel or the copy of any preferred mortgage thereof, as required by subsection E, the board of local inspectors of vessels having jurisdiction of the license of the master, may suspend or cancel such license, subject to the provisions of 'An act to provide for appeals from decision of boards of local inspectors of vessels and for other purposes,' approved June 10, 1918.

"(b) A mortgagor who, with intent to defraud, violates any provision of subsection F, and if the mortgagor is a corporation or association, the president or other principal executive officer of the corporation or association, shall upon conviction thereof be held guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than 1,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both. The mortgaged indebtedness shall thereupon become immediately due and payable at the election of the mortgagee.

"(c) If any person enters into any contract secured by, or upon the credit of, a vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage, and suffers pecuniary loss by reason of the failure of the collector of customs, or any officer, employee, or agent thereof, properly to perform any duty required of the collector under the provisions of this section, the collector of customs shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of such loss. If any such person is caused any such loss by reason of the failure of the mortgagor, or master of the mortgaged vessel, or any officer, employee, or agent thereof, to comply with any provision of subsection E or F or to file an affidavit as required by subdivision (a) of subsection D, correct in each particular thereof, the mortgagor shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of such loss. The district courts of the United States are given jurisdiction (but not to the exclusion of the courts of the several States, Territories, Districts, or possessions) of suits for the recovery of such damages, irrespective of the amount involved in the suit or the citizenship of the parties thereto. Such suit shall be begun by personal service upon the defendant within the limits of the district. Upon judgment for the plaintiff in any such suit, the court shall include in the judgment an additional amount for costs of the action and a reasonable counsel's fee, to be fixed by the court.

"FORECLOSURE OF PREFERRED MORTGAGES.

"SUBSEC. K. A preferred mortgage shall constitute a lien upon the mortgaged vessel in the amount of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness secured by such vessel. Upon the default of any term or condition of the mortgage, such lien may be enforced by the mortgagee by suit in rem in admiralty. Original jurisdiction of all such suits is granted to the district courts of the United States exclusively. In addition to any notice by publication, actual notice of the commencement of any such suit shall be given by the libellant, in such manner as the court shall direct, to (1) the master, other ranking officer, or caretaker of the vessel, and (2) any person who has recorded a notice of claim of an undischarged lien upon the vessel, as provided in subsection G, unless after search by the libellant satisfactory to the court, such mortgagor, master, other ranking officer, caretaker, or claimant is not found within the United States. Failure to give notice to any such person, as required by this subsection, shall not constitute a jurisdictional defect; but the libellant shall be liable to such person for damages in the amount of his interest in the vessel terminated by the suit. Suit in personam for the recovery of such damages may be brought in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (c) of subsection J.

"SUBSEC. L. In any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of the preferred mortgage lien, the court may appoint a receiver and, in its discretion, authorize the receiver to operate the mortgaged vessel. The marshal may be authorized and directed by the court to take possession of the mortgaged vessel notwithstanding the fact that the vessel is in the possession or under the control of any person claiming a possessory common-law lien.

"SUBSEC. M. (a) When used hereinafter in this section, the term 'preferred maritime lien' means (1) a lien arising prior in time to the recording and indorsement of a preferred

mortgage in accordance with the provisions of this section; or (2) a lien for damages arising out of tort, for wages of a stevedore when employed directly by the owner, operator, master, ship's husband, or agent of the vessel, for wages of the crew of the vessel, for general average, and for salvage, including contract salvage.

"(b) Upon the sale of any mortgaged vessel by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of a preferred mortgage lien thereon, all preexisting claims in the vessel, including any possessory common-law lien of which a lienor is deprived under the provisions of subsection L, shall be held terminated and shall thereafter attach, in like amount and in accordance with their respective priorities, to the proceeds of the sale; except that the preferred mortgage lien shall have priority over all claims against the vessel, except (1) preferred maritime liens, and (2) expenses and fees allowed and costs taxed, by the court.

"SUBSEC. N. (a) Upon the default of any term or condition of a preferred mortgage upon a vessel, the mortgagee may, in addition to all other remedies granted by this section, bring suit in personam in admiralty in a district court of the United States, against the mortgagor for the amount of the outstanding mortgage indebtedness secured by such vessel or any deficiency in the full payment thereof.

"(b) This section shall not be construed, in the case of a mortgage covering, in addition to vessels, realty or personality other than vessels, or both, to authorize the enforcement by suit in rem in admiralty of the rights of the mortgagee in respect to such realty or personality other than vessels.

"TRANSFERS OF MORTGAGED VESSELS AND ASSIGNMENT OF VESSEL MORTGAGES.

"SUBSEC. O. (a) The documents of a vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage may not be surrendered (except in the case of the forfeiture of the vessel or its sale by the order of any court of the United States or any foreign country) without the approval of the board. The board shall refuse such approval unless the mortgagee consents to such surrender.

"(b) The interest of the mortgagee in a vessel of the United States covered by a mortgage shall not be terminated by the forfeiture of the vessel for a violation of any law of the United States, unless the mortgagee authorized, consented, or conspired to effect the illegal act, failure, or omission which constituted such violation.

"(c) Upon the sale of any vessel of the United States covered by a preferred mortgage, by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty for the enforcement of a maritime lien other than a preferred maritime lien, the vessel shall be sold free from all preexisting claims thereon; but the court shall, upon the request of the mortgagee, the libellant, or any intervenor, require the purchaser at such sale to give and the mortgagor to accept a new mortgage of the vessel for the balance of the term of the original mortgage. The conditions of such new mortgage shall be the same, so far as practicable, as those of the original mortgage and shall be subject to the approval of the court. If such new mortgage is given, the mortgagee shall not be paid from the proceeds of the sale and the amount payable as the purchase price shall be held diminished in the amount of the new mortgage indebtedness.

"(d) No rights under a mortgage of a vessel of the United States shall be assigned to any person not a citizen of the United States without the approval of the board. Any assignment in violation of any provision of this section shall be void.

"(e) No vessel of the United States shall be sold by order of a district court of the United States in any suit in rem in admiralty to any person not a citizen of the United States.

"MARITIME LIENS FOR NECESSARIES.

"SUBSEC. P. Any person furnishing repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessities, to any vessel, whether foreign or domestic, upon the order of the owner of such vessel, or of a person authorized by the owner, shall have a maritime lien on the vessel, which may be enforced by suit in rem, and it shall not be necessary to allege or prove that credit was given to the vessel.

"SUBSEC. Q. The following persons shall be presumed to have authority from the owner to procure repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, and other necessities for the vessel: The managing owner, ship's husband, master, or any person to whom the management of the vessel at the port of supply is intrusted. No person tortiously or unlawfully in possession or charge of a vessel shall have authority to bind the vessel.

"SUBSEC. R. The officers and agents of a vessel specified in subsection Q shall be taken to include such officers and agents when appointed by a charterer, by an owner pro hac vice, or by an agreed purchaser in possession of the vessel; but nothing in this section shall be construed to confer a lien when the furnisher knew, or by exercise of reasonable diligence could have ascertained, that because of the terms of a charter party, agreement for sale of the vessel, or for any other reason, the person ordering the repairs, supplies, or other necessities was without authority to bind the vessel therefor.

"SUBSEC. S. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the furnisher of repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessities, or the mortgagee, from waiving his right to a lien, or in the case of a preferred mortgage lien, to the preferred status of such lien, at any time, by agreement or otherwise; and this section shall not be construed to affect the rules of law now existing in regard to (1) the right to proceed against the vessel for advances, (2) laches in the enforcement of liens upon vessels, (3) the right to proceed in personam, (4) the rank of preferred maritime liens among themselves, or (5) priorities between maritime liens and mortgages, other than preferred mortgages, upon vessels of the United States.

"SUBSEC. T. This section shall supersede the provisions of all State statutes conferring liens on vessels, in so far as such statutes purport to create rights of action to be enforced by suits in rem in admiralty against vessels for repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, and other necessities.

" MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

"SUBSEC. U. This section shall not apply (1) to any existing mortgage, or (2) to any mortgage hereafter placed on any vessel now under an existing mortgage, so long as such existing mortgage remains undischarged.

"SUBSEC. V. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to furnish collectors of customs with all necessary books and records, and with certificates of registry and of enrollment and license in such form as provides for the making of all indorsements thereon required by this section.

"SUBSEC. W. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make such regulations, in respect to the recording and indorsing of mortgages covering vessels of the United States, as he deems necessary to the efficient execution of the provisions of this section.

"SUBSEC. X. Sections 4192 to 4196, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, and the act entitled 'An act relating to liens on vessels for repairs, supplies, or other necessities,' approved June 23, 1910, are repealed. This section, however, so far as not inconsistent with any of the provisions of law so repealed, shall be held a reenactment of such repealed law, and any right or obligation based upon any provision of such law and accruing prior to such repeal, may be prosecuted in the same manner and to the same effect as if this act had not been passed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 33" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 31." In lines 8 and 9 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the words "or take in fuel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the figure "11" and insert in lieu the figure "10" and change the section number from "34" to "32"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 33. That the requirements provided in section 14 of the act entitled 'An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea,' approved March 4, 1915, to be observed on the Great Lakes in the intervals from May 15 to September 15, inclusive, and from September 15 to May 15, inclusive, shall be required to be observed instead in the intervals from May 1 to October 15, inclusive, and from October 15 to May 1, inclusive, respectively."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Jurisdiction in such actions shall be under the court of the district in which the defendant employer resides or in which his principal office is located"; in line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment, strike out the section number "36" and insert in lieu thereof the number "34"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "36"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "specifically"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment strike out the section number "39" and insert in lieu thereof the number "37"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "the term 'board' means the United States Shipping Board; and the term 'alien' means any person not a citizen of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 39. That section 2 of the shipping act, 1916, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless the controlling interest therein is owned by citizens of the United States, and, in the case of a corporation, unless its president and managing directors are citizens of the United States and the corporation itself is organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof; but in the case of a corporation, association, or partnership operating any vessel in the coastwise trade the amount of interest required to be owned by citizens of the United States shall be 75 per cent.

"(b) The controlling interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to a majority of the stock thereof is not vested in such citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if the majority of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that the majority of the voting power may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever control of the corporation is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States.

"(c) Seventy-five per cent of the interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to 75 per cent of its stock is not vested in such citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if 75 per cent of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if, through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that more than 25 per cent of the voting power in such corporation may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever control of any interest in the corporation in excess of 25 per cent is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States.

"(d) The provisions of this act shall apply to receivers and trustees of all persons to whom the act applies, and to the successors or assignees of such persons."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with

an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following "40"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,
WILLIAM M. CALDER,
CHAS. L. McNARY,
JOS. E. HANDELL,
F. M. SIMMONS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

WILLIAM S. GREENE,
G. W. EDMONDS,
FREDERICK W. ROWE,
L. LAZARO,

I sign this report because as a whole I favor the bill, but there are parts of the bill to which I strongly object.

RUFUS HARDY,

Managers on the part of the House.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the sundry civil appropriation conference report is on the table, and I ask unanimous consent to take it up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The Reading Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 11, 14, 27, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 47, 50, 52, 54, 56, 62, 63, 71, 79, 80, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 118, 119, and 124.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 39, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 55, 58, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 83, 86, 87, 88, 89, 100, 101, 102, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 125, and 126, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Lighthouse Service shall cooperate with the Coast Guard in marking anchorage grounds in the harbors of New York and Hampton Roads by furnishing and maintaining buoys necessary for such purposes. Appropriations for the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year 1921 are made available therefor."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "in" and insert in lieu thereof the word "to"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

"To carry out the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920,

including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery, printing, purchase of books, office equipment and other supplies, \$50,000, of which sum \$4,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum except one at \$2,000 and four at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except that there may be employed during the fiscal year 1921, in addition to this limitation, employees at annual rates of compensation as follows: One at not to exceed \$6,500, 1 at not to exceed \$5,000, 2 at not to exceed \$4,000 each, 10 at not to exceed \$3,500 each, 10 at not to exceed \$3,250 each, and 10 at not to exceed \$3,000 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "not to exceed \$7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$183,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Medical and surgical history of the war with Germany: Toward the preparation for publication under the direction of the Secretary of War of a medical and surgical history of the war with Germany, including printing and binding at the Government Printing Office and the necessary engravings and illustrations, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the total cost of such history shall not exceed \$150,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$4,436,297.60" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

"To enable the Bureau of Pensions to perform the duties imposed upon it by the act entitled 'An act for retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, including personal services, purchase of books, office equipment, stationery and other supplies, printing, traveling expenses, and expenses of medical and other examinations, \$50,000, of which sum \$4,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum except one at \$2,000 and four at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,302,642"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof: *Provided further*, That the fore-

going proviso shall not be construed as an expression of opinion by the Congress upon the litigation pending between the Government and the settlers on such project or in any manner prejudice such litigation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,463,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$278,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$525,326" and insert in lieu thereof "\$510,797"; on page 135 of the bill, in line 12, strike out "\$121,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$104,000"; on page 135 of the bill, in line 15, strike out "\$280,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$255,570"; on page 136 of the bill, in line 13, strike out "\$147,100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$134,560"; on page 136 of the bill, in line 16, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,550"; on page 137 of the bill, in line 8, strike out "\$579,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$524,280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$308,270"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Standards is authorized and directed to make an investigation as to the standard, quality, and cost of production and distribution of gas furnished the Government and private consumers in the District of Columbia and report the result of such investigation to Congress on or before the first Monday in December, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$9,281,851, to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "discontinued" in line 8 down to and including the word "advertisements" in line 16; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment the following paragraph:

"The loans for equipment authorized by section 210, transportation act, 1920, may be made to or through such organization, car trust or other agency as may be determined upon or approved or organized for the purpose by the commission as most appropriate in the public interest for the construction, and sale or lease of equipment to carriers, upon such general terms as to security and payment or lease as provided in this

section or in subsections 11 and 13 of section 422 of the transportation act, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WILLIAM S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to the amendment which I offered in the Senate, and which was adopted, striking out the proviso with reference to the appropriation which is, I think, amendment numbered 60 of the Senate. As the matter appeared in the bill in the first instance, after the appropriation, it said:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof.

This was stricken out in the Senate. I should like a statement on the part of the chairman of the committee as to why this amendment was receded from.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Senator does not expect me to allege a particular reason why that particular amendment was stricken out as apart from all the other amendments. That was not the case. I was entirely agreeable to its going in, and sought to protect it in conference; but we met very sturdy opposition from the other side, and in the final settlement of the bill we were compelled to recede from that amendment, with some others, in this case with an amendment, as we did in many other cases, believing that we had at least approached as near the Senator's wish as we could and get the consent of the House. It was because of no neglect on the part of the conferees of the Senate, and it was with no joy, of course, that we were compelled to recede from any of the amendments; but that, with others, we were unable to retain in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know just what the rules of conferences are with reference to stating the specific objections which the House conferees had to the amendment. I do not know whether that is proper or not; but I am at a loss to know what argument could be advanced for retaining this proviso.

As I stated when the matter was before the Senate, the subject matter covered by the proviso is now in litigation. It is a matter of contention between the water users and the Government, and it has been taken into the courts. This proviso is in effect passing judgment upon that question in controversy, and the judgment is being rendered without any hearing upon the part of the water users. In other words, it deprives them of an opportunity of presenting their view of the matter before the Congress—in effect says that "you must do what the Government has asked you to do."

The matter arises out of a controversy over the items of expense with reference to a certain irrigation project which have been charged up to the water users, they contending that a number of the items of expense, constituting a large portion of the expenditure, ought not to be charged, under the reclamation law, to the water users.

As I said, the matter has gone into the courts. The question of the organization of the district depends alone upon the settlement of it within the courts, and yet the Congress has declared that the appropriation for drainage purposes shall not be used until the district is organized, which is in effect declaring that judgment is rendered against the contention of the water users.

As I said, I do not know why that should be insisted upon by the House, and I should like to know if I am permitted to know?

Mr. WARREN. There is no secrecy about it. May I ask if the addition which the conferees believed would take care of the situation, as nearly as it could be taken care of—that is, that there should be no prejudice on account of this appropriation, and that the finding of the court should, of course, prevail—relieve the situation more than it would have been relieved by striking this out and not including anything?

Mr. BORAH. I do not see, Mr. President, that the second proviso really changes the effect of the first proviso. It reads:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be construed as an expression of opinion by the Congress upon the litigation pending between the Government and the settlers of such project or in any manner prejudice such litigation.

But, Mr. President, the effect of saying that the money shall not be used until the irrigation district is formed is to declare that the water users must surrender and organize the district before they can get the benefit of the bill. So, notwithstanding the proviso that it shall not be considered to prejudice, it really does prejudice it. It is like striking a man in the face and then saying that you did not intend any insult or any injury to him; although I have no doubt that this proviso was added in the utmost good faith upon the part of the representatives of the Senate. But the fact is that as a legal proposition it does not save the effect of the first proviso. I dislike very much, Mr. President, to see that kind of a judgment rendered. It seems to me its injustice must be apparent to all.

I think the House conferees understood, probably, that unless this first proviso was in the bill there would be no method by which to get back the money which was appropriated for drainage purposes; but that is not true. The water users are responsible for the amount which would be charged to their separate lands, respectively, for all the money which would be used for drainage purposes. The contention is over the question of organizing the district and making them responsible collectively as a district organization, and in order to organize the district they must agree upon the contract between them and the Government, and they can not agree upon the contract until the items which go into the contract have been settled by the court.

So the result of it is, Mr. President, that Congress is really passing judgment upon this contention, and doing so under such conditions that they will practically, in my judgment, have to abandon the contention, or else get no benefit from this appropriation at all. I urge the injustice of such a proceeding. These people should be heard before the committee. Only one side has been heard.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I trust the conference report on the sundry civil bill will not be agreed to, for the reasons advanced by my colleague.

When that bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations it contained, on page 106, an item appropriating certain sums of money for the Boise reclamation project, and there was incorporated in it the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof.

When the bill was considered by the Senate my colleague moved as an amendment to strike out the proviso just read, and that amendment was accepted by the chairman of the committee. In conference, however, the proviso was again incorporated in the item. I believe it is absolutely unfair; I think it is not right or proper that it should remain there, and I am opposed to the acceptance by the Senate of the conference report for that reason.

The Boise project, Mr. President, is one of the largest in the United States. It is one of the garden spots of the United States. It contains approximately 265,000 acres of land. About 124,000 are under canals owned by the Government, and the remainder is in irrigation districts or is being supplied with water from canals the owners of which acquired water rights in the Boise River long prior to the time the Reclamation Service commenced operations in that section.

In 1906 the Reclamation Service commenced the irrigation of irrigated land in the Boise project. In 1915 the Arrow Lake dam was completed, at a cost to the Government of approximately four and a third million dollars. It is 349 feet in height, the second highest dam in the United States.

Last year, of the entire project, 216,348 acres were harvested and the crops produced on that acreage were of the value of \$14,458,453.62. The land lying under the Government canals was supplied with water by the Government, as was also about 38 per cent of the other land in the project, and the total value of the crops produced last year on land irrigated with water supplied by the Government was \$9,372,252.62.

There are more than 3,900 farms within the project, with a population of more than 15,000. There are also 10 towns, with a population of 40,000, or a total population of 55,000.

There are 24 public schoolhouses; 54 churches; 15 banks, with a capital stock of more than \$2,000,000, with deposits aggregating \$13,500,000, and 28,000 depositors.

Those people, Mr. President, are entitled to an absolute fair, square deal at the hands of the Congress, and I have not

the least doubt in the world that the Congress will accord it to them in the event the Members are familiar with all the facts and circumstances connected with this matter.

So far as I am concerned, I have no personal knowledge of the facts relative to the controversy in which the settlers on the project, or, rather, certain of them, are now involved with the Reclamation Service, but I am in receipt of a copy of certain preambles and resolutions which were adopted by the water users at a meeting held recently, from which I quote the following:

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior * * * did, on July 2, 1917, issue and promulgate a "public notice" violative of the terms of said contract and violative of the laws of the United States; and

Whereas said public notice was based upon and prepared from false and fraudulent data supplied and furnished to said Secretary of the Interior by said D. W. Cole, project manager of the Boise project and other officers of the Reclamation Service under his direction, and said Arthur Powell Davis; and

Whereas said Arthur Powell Davis and the project managers of the Boise project and the local counsel for said project have for a great many years, to wit, more than 10 years, used their official position unlawfully, arbitrarily, and oppressively to influence, induce, and to force the stockholders of the Payette-Boise Water Users' Association to abandon said association and to refuse to pay the assessments levied against their stock and to form and establish an irrigation district instead, and to abandon and surrender their established rights under said contract of February 13, 1906; and

Whereas the settlers under said Boise project have, through their proper officers, requested of said reclamation officials a copy of the proposed contract which would be acceptable in case an irrigation district should be formed, and said officials have persistently refused to furnish such copy or to guarantee the preservation of the rights as provided in the existing contract.

It appears from these resolutions that prior to the time of the organization of the Water Users' Association under the laws of the State of Idaho the then Secretary of the Interior requested that such organization be formed, and it was organized in accordance with his request. It also appears that the constitution and by-laws of the association were submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and that a contract was actually entered into, executed in 1906, under which the settlers have from that day to the present time been operating.

It further appears from the resolutions that every effort has been made during the past several years to induce the settlers to abandon the contracts under which they have established rights and to organize an irrigation district under the laws of Idaho; and it is stated that the Director of the Reclamation Service has persistently and insistently demanded that the settlers take such action; and that they have, as they say, requested that a copy of the contract they will be called upon to enter into with the Government, in the event they organize an irrigation district, be submitted to them, and that it has never been submitted for their consideration.

As was said by my colleague, the matters in dispute between the water users and the Reclamation Service are in litigation, and have been for a number of years. The settlers, who are members of the Water Users' Association, are litigating their rights in a court of justice. The suit, if my recollection serves me right, has been pending for more than a year—possibly two years—and the questions in controversy are now before the Federal court for the district of Idaho for determination. I earnestly insist that they should be settled by the courts, and not by this Congress. So far as the Congress as a whole is concerned, it has no knowledge concerning the facts connected with this matter, and it follows, as a matter of course, that it has no knowledge of the law applicable to those facts. Therefore, how can it decide the questions that are at issue?

Mr. President, I deny that the Congress has any right to in any way, shape, or form determine the question of the validity or invalidity of the contracts now in litigation, and I challenge the right of the Congress to condemn, either directly or indirectly, 10,000 of the people of my State without affording them an opportunity to be heard, and upon the absolutely uncorroborated statement of one man, namely, the Director of the Reclamation Service.

I reside at Boise and have resided there for many years. I know this project, and I know the people who reside on it, and I am proud to say that they will compare most favorably with an equal number of citizens in any other section of the country. They are good Americans. They are honest, industrious, hard-working people, and in the event the court determines the suit now pending adversely to them they will pay every dollar that may be assessed against them.

Again I say that they are entitled as of right to a square deal, they are entitled to fair treatment at the hands of the Congress, and in order to accord them that square deal and such fair treatment the conference report should be rejected and other conferees should be appointed on behalf of the Senate, and they should be instructed to insist on the Senate amendment striking out the proviso which I have read.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does the Senator think that the proviso added by the conferees would save the legal situation?

Mr. NUGENT. Not at all. While I do not believe for a single solitary moment that the proviso would have the slightest effect on the mind of Judge Dietrich, the judge of the court in which these controverted matters are pending, at the same time it may have the effect of placing the 10,000 water users in an awkward position in the minds of other people. In other words, other people may assume, because of the proviso, that the Congress of the United States has held that the settlers are wrong in their contentions, and that they are seeking to defraud the Government of the United States of money which they owe to it, which is not true.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have listened with no little sympathy to the statement of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] on this item in the conference report under consideration. We have trouble with the Reclamation Service in our State. I have followed them with a sincere desire to accept their views with respect to this, but I must confess I am at an entire loss to understand the point which they make in connection with the matter.

As I understand the matter, the water users' association was organized and was necessary by reason of the fact that much of the land under the reclamation project was without any private ownership, and an agreement was entered into with that association under which the association agreed to reimburse the Government for whatever expense it incurred in the construction of the irrigation plant, the ordinary contract entered into with water users' associations. Now, a controversy arises as to how much should be paid to the Government of the United States—that is to say, how much the thing actually did cost—it being contended, as I suppose, that items had been incorporated in the total charge not properly chargeable against these particular water users; and that controversy as to how much should be paid apparently is pending before the Federal courts in the State of Idaho.

Now comes on an application for a further appropriation for the project, to be used for the purpose of drainage, and now the Reclamation Service does not care to bring that appropriation under the contract by which the cost was to be reimbursed through the water users' association, and insists that that shall be taken care of under an irrigation district organization. In other words, the Reclamation Service, for some reason or other, is dissatisfied with further negotiations and further transactions with reference to the matter with the water users' association, and insists that hereafter it will deal only, so far as it can help itself, with the district organization, and insists that before this appropriation has its approval the district organization should be effected.

Now, I am utterly at a loss to understand the contention that this provision predetermines anything whatever in the lawsuit. The lawsuit will go on just the same as before, and the amount which the water users' association is required to pay will, of course, be determined. It is simply a question, as it seems to me, as to the reasonableness of the contention now made by the Reclamation Service that hereafter it will not, unless Congress requires it, deal with the water users' association, but will insist upon an irrigation district organization. If I am in error about this, I should be very glad to be corrected by the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. The proviso is inserted at the earnest insistence of the department. It seems to believe—and I think correctly—that it would help to effectuate their purpose. It desires, in other words, to withhold any appropriation from these people until they shall have formed this irrigation district. One of the things that these people contend that they do not desire to do and will not do is to form an irrigation district until the terms of the agreement which the district is asked to sign shall have been agreed upon and the amount of it shall have been disposed of between the representatives of the water users' association and the Government. If the conference report is agreed to, with the proviso that no amount of the appropriation shall be used for drainage until they shall have formed the district and shall have executed this contract, of course it is a powerful club in the hands of the department to compel them to come to their terms. It is an attempt to withhold what they are entitled to have, to wit, drainage, until they agree to something which the users claim to be unjust. All this takes place in an appropriation bill. I know how anxious you all are to pass these supply bills and how difficult it is to delay them, but certainly

we ought not to do a wrong to these people, even under such urgent conditions.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am unable to follow the Senator at all. We will say the district organization is effected and it agrees to pay the actual cost—

Mr. BORAH. But the department will not let them do that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If after the irrigation district is formed the Reclamation Service declines to enter into a fair and reasonable agreement with them, then they would, of course, appeal to Congress and the appropriation would be made accordingly.

Mr. BORAH. I know, but the Senator does not take into consideration—and he knows, of course, quite as well as the Senator from Idaho—that it is a considerable task to organize an irrigation district for the purpose of effectuating a contract or concluding a contract, and then if it turns out that the contract is not acceptable to the district they have a large amount of expenses on their hands for nothing.

If the Senator will pardon me, they have asked the department, as I am informed, time and time again to submit to them the contract which they will be asked to sign in case the district is formed. I am also informed that the department has declined to do this. Although the contract is withheld, so I am informed, nevertheless the department asks that all drainage and all protection to these people by the Government be withheld until they form the district and sign this contract, the terms of which they do not know.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, it occurs to me that the position taken by the local users is a very reasonable one and that they should know beforehand what kind of a contract they are expected to enter into after they effect their organization. If it should appear here that that is the situation of affairs and that they have asked the Reclamation Service to designate the kind of contract that they will be expected to enter into when they do organize, and the Reclamation Service declines even to intimate to them what kind of contract they will have to sign, I should say this is an unreasonable provision.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. NUGENT. I quoted at some length from the resolutions recently adopted by the water users' association, in which it was stated, the Senator will remember, among other things, that they had frequently requested that they be advised as to the character of contract they would be called upon to enter into with the Government in the event they complied with the wishes of the Director of the Reclamation Service and organized an irrigation district, and that as a matter of fact a copy of such contract has not at any time been presented to them. I will read a telegram which is dated at Caldwell, Idaho, May 21, and is as follows:

CALDWELL, IDAHO, May 21, 1920.

Hon. J. F. NUGENT,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas a bill having been passed by the lower House of Congress appropriating a sum of money for drainage in the Boise Valley, the said bill now being before the Senate for consideration; and

Whereas a provision of the bill being to the effect that the appropriation shall not be available to the Boise project until an irrigation district shall have been formed; and

Whereas a mass meeting having been called to consider the advisability of so organizing: Be it

Resolved, That we, the settlers under the Boise project, in mass meeting assembled, hereby reaffirm our desire to promote harmonious cooperation between the Reclamation Service and ourselves and concerning the formation of an irrigation district we invite the Reclamation Service to submit a copy of the contract which we would be required to execute under such an organization.

L. J. MAGEE, Secretary.

It appears not only from this telegram but from the resolutions which I have read that requests have been made in the past and are now made by the water users for a copy of the contract, which they will be urged to execute in the event they organize an irrigation district, and that it has never been presented to them.

I believe that the Senator from Montana desires to be entirely fair in this matter, and I again call his attention to the fact that the rights of the people on the Boise project became established in 1906, when, at the request of the then Secretary of the Interior, they organized a water-users' association and entered into a contract with the Government, which was executed by all parties concerned. Now, it is sought, indirectly, if you please, to deprive them by this proviso of certain of those rights and without affording them an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is why I rose, because I am utterly unable to see that it has that effect, nor how it is going to operate to affect that legislation in the slightest degree.

Mr. NUGENT. I am not familiar with the provisions of the contract, but I assume that the difficulty that has arisen between the Reclamation Service and the settlers' association relates to the construction to be placed on certain sections of the contract. The dispute has been submitted to a court for settlement. It does seem to me that, notwithstanding the pending litigation, the settlers should not be deprived of an appropriation for the purpose of drainage or for any other purpose connected with the reclamation work on the ipse dixit of one man.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, everybody will agree to that, but that is not the proposition. Here is the amendment:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation—

That is, the \$774,000—

shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof.

That is to say, for reimbursement to the United States of this \$774,000, or so much thereof as shall be expended in connection with irrigation. That is the condition. The costs of the reclamation project are in controversy in the lawsuit, and that lawsuit will go on just exactly the same. The proviso does not affect that contract in any way whatever, but simply provides that this appropriation of \$774,000 shall not be available for irrigation unless an irrigation district shall be formed, which irrigation district shall enter into the contract with the United States, not to pay the whole cost of the irrigation project—that is already taken care of by the water users' contract—but to repay the \$774,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is in error.

Mr. NUGENT. Then the Senator's contention is that it matters not what the legal rights of those settlers may be under their contract, the Congress can deprive them of those rights by refusing to appropriate money for reclamation purposes?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Not at all. It simply provides that the money we now appropriate, \$774,000, can not be made available unless an irrigation district is formed, which irrigation district will agree to pay not the costs already incurred but to pay back the \$774,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana could separate expenditures heretofore incurred in the building of the project from the appropriation of \$774,000 and have in mind the proposition of organizing a district merely to take care of the \$774,000, of course, he would be entirely correct; but, entering into the question of the organization of the district, as to whether the people will vote to organize a district, whether or not they can act intelligently at all, they must have before them the contract which the district is to sign, and that contract must cover not only the items of expense under the appropriation of \$774,000, but the contract must also cover the items of expense which are involved in all previous relationships between the settlers on the project and the Reclamation Service.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that that is not what the law says.

Mr. BORAH. I beg the Senator's pardon; that is what it says in its practical workings. It is that—

No part of this appropriation shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws.

In other words, they can not get any part of this drainage money until they organize a district, and they can not organize a district in the State until they know the terms of the contract, and that contract must include all previous expenses as well as the \$774,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is where the Senator from Idaho and I differ as to the language of the bill. It provides not that the irrigation district shall be required to pay the cost of the entire reclamation project, but the "costs thereof"; that is to say, to reimburse the \$774,000.

Mr. BORAH. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will go to the telephone and call up Mr. Davis, who is doubtless the author of the language, I will venture to say that he will not contend for a moment that he is asking for the organization of the district to make sure the repayment of the \$774,000, but he is asking for the organization of a district which will enter into an agreement for the repayment of all costs which have been assessed against that entire project from its original inception to the present day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Idaho will understand, of course, that I am desirous of voting with him on this matter; I am desirous of accommodating my views to those of the Senators from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that exactly, and the Senator and I do not disagree upon the law at all. We simply disagree

upon the facts, which facts construe the law in this instance, and necessarily so.

Now, let us bear in mind that under no possible conditions can the Government lose one dollar by this transaction that it ought to have. Even if the \$774,000, or any of it, is utilized for drainage prior to the organization of an irrigation district, nevertheless every dollar of it is just as secure as if it were a first mortgage upon all that land, because the water users' association, already formed, and the respective farmers, with their individual responsibility, are liable for every dollar that is expended for drainage or anything else. Therefore, the Government can not lose a dollar.

I have no doubt the House conferees honestly thought that without the formation of the irrigation district there would be no security for the \$774,000. That assumption probably arose from the fact that they were not entirely familiar with the operations of an irrigation district; but, as a matter of fact, every dollar of it is perfectly well secured, because the liability is there in another form. The department, however, requires that before the amount be expended the liability be placed in a different form, to wit, by the organization of an irrigation district instead of a water users' association.

The organization of the irrigation district involves, if there is to be intelligent action upon the part of the people, knowledge of what their contract is to be. The knowledge of that contract, they say, is withheld from them, so that they can not even proceed intelligently to cast their votes in favor of an irrigation district, because they do not know what it will be. Nevertheless, they are asked to proceed to organize an irrigation district without knowledge, and when it is organized, then the contract will be presented to them in such form and including such amounts as the department sees fit to suggest; in other words, the people are asked to vote for a district the obligations of which they do not know before they vote.

What is the object of the proviso? The object of the proviso is to withhold the drainage that is necessary and essential and which they will need until they comply with the demands of the Reclamation Service and organize a district, and do so without knowledge of the terms of the contract. That is the object of the proviso. It is not necessarily to affect the litigation but to drive them into the organization of an irrigation district before they can get relief from the extra flow of water upon their lands, which relief is very necessary for their purposes. In other words, they have got to do without drainage until they organize a district, and they have got to organize a district regardless of whether the contract suits them or not, and they have got to organize it regardless of whether they know the contents of the contract. That is the manner in which judgment is being passed upon these people.

I say again that I must believe that the House did not understand that every dollar of this money is perfectly secure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the measure which we are considering is the sundry civil appropriation bill, which provides very largely for running the Government during the next fiscal year. We are now under the shadow of a proposed adjournment. The bill covers some 200 pages, and there were 126 differences for the conferees to adjust.

When the bill originally came to the Appropriations Committee from the House it received at the hands of the Senate committee very urgent and continued attention. We took up everything that was offered, heard everyone who wished to be heard, and came on to the floor of the Senate with the bill. Of course, those not especially interested received their first knowledge from the terms of the bill as it was being read; I can understand that; and there is nothing more natural in the world than that the Senator from Idaho should offer the amendment, with his view of the case, which is doubtless correct; and there is nothing more reasonable, I think, than that the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill should accept the amendment, as it related to an Idaho matter, and was presented by an Idaho Senator. This incident, however, proves, I think better than almost anything else, the danger of legislating on the floor and placing amendments in a bill which the chairman or the committee has had no opportunity to investigate because of the lack of time. The amendment went in the bill with no one knowing of the circumstances of the case except as they appeared here.

The original provision coming as it did from the House, where the two Idaho Representatives are very active, it was natural to assume that the provision was satisfactory to them or else they had overlooked its significance. However, the Senate struck out the House provision and the bill went to conference, where the Senate conferees met with very decided resistance. In the meantime, the only information we have

been able to obtain has been from the Reclamation Service, which seemed to think the House provision was all right, and from statements of Members of the other House. Now in the very last moment of the session we are met with this difference, which I regret exceedingly, because I know that Senators in States where irrigation projects are located are the best authority we can have in such matters; but here is a condition confronting us.

When I say it is impossible, it is impossible in all reason to say that we can amend it now. Of course we can destroy the bill; we can vote against the conference report and send it back, and on account of the time that it would take for a further struggle with opposing elements and enrollment and the signatures of the presiding officers and all of that we probably would lose the bill. On the other hand, I may say without any secrecy about it that we met with the most determined resistance to this amendment on the part of the House conferees, and we did not receive any help from any Members of the House to maintain our amendment as it was offered and accepted in the Senate. It was one of the very last matters to be settled in conference, and I regretted very much, as I know my colleagues did, that we were compelled to recede in part, and, as we thought, to better it somewhat by the additional language.

I wish to assure the Senators from Idaho that if the matter were not in this extremity I should certainly offer to cooperate with them in obtaining in some substantial way a reconsideration; but I regret to say that it is now simply a matter of taking it as it is or losing the bill, this particular appropriation and all the others in it.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, there are three days of the session remaining; and I fail to appreciate the reason why, in the event this conference report is rejected, another conference can not be had and the matter amicably adjusted in the three days. I suggest to the chairman of the committee that that course be taken.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, my sympathies were with the Senator, but I say to him that it can not be done at this hour. There is too much to be done. In fact, the men who are conferees on this bill have other bills following this one, so that their time is occupied; but, even if they met, the fact that we send the bill back does not take from the other side any of their steadfastness in regard to this amendment. They get no contradiction other than from us here on this side of the Capitol concerning this amendment.

I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I realize, as the chairman of the committee [Mr. WARREN] has said, that the shadow of adjournment is hanging over the Congress. It is rather a fog of adjournment. Everything that is being done now is being done blindly, apparently. I should like to vote for this conference report, because I entertain the hope that there is something in it that is founded upon reason and not upon haste. I have not found it yet, but I am sure it is there somewhere.

A case like that cited by the Senator from Idaho appeals very strongly to western men who know something about irrigation. I can very readily conceive that it is a matter of no importance whatever to the great majority of the Congress. I conceive, however, that it is of importance to the whole country. It is one of the chief sources to which we must look in the future for the production of food.

The methods used in the legislation to which the Senator from Idaho refers constitute the same character of coercion that was used to force the water-power companies to submit to a voluntary and revocable permit under the Forestry Service. They would drive a little wedge of a forest reserve across a line of ditch or power, and then they would say, "You have got to cease work unless you accept a revocable permit under such terms as we want." This legislation is intended to accomplish the same thing; that is all. They say, "You do not have to take this money for drainage unless you want to." They know they have to take it. Then they attach terms to it which these people do not want; that is all. It is a method of coercion. I am referring, of course, to the matter affecting Idaho.

Now, I want to turn to another matter. I refer to amendments numbered 62 and 63, on page 109 of the bill, under the title "Reclamation Service." The Government has expended over \$10,000,000 on the Newlands project in Nevada. They have taken that money and they have dumped \$10,000,000 worth of water on a flat country, and then they have not spent a cent to drain it off. They have not spent anything to drain it off, because Congress will not give them the money. Congress is in the shadow of adjournment. Congress is in the shadow of a

convention which is apparently of more importance than any legislation for the West. That is the truth about the thing.

I do not blame Congress for knowing nothing about irrigation. I would not blame the conference committee for not knowing anything about the Newlands project, except that it was argued on this floor before it went to conference. We tried with all of the information we had to convince the members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate that drainage is as essential to irrigation as placing water on the ground. I am satisfied that the members of this committee from the West ought to have understood that. The Reclamation Service made an estimate of \$300,000 to drain the Newlands project. They stated that the land was being swamped with water; that a project that had cost the Government over \$10,000,000 was being destroyed for the lack of drainage; that the Government was losing money upon its investment by reason of the failure to appropriate this insignificant sum by comparison with the great investment that had been made; yet, in spite of that estimate, and in spite of that assurance by the Reclamation Service, in spite of the pleas by the 10,000 people who live on that project, this conference committee treat this matter as cavalierly as they would treat some foreign question.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have no desire to object to any pleasure that the Senator may get from alluding to the conferees in that manner; but I assure him that when men go into conference they go in to compose the differences between the two bodies, and I have never yet seen the time when the conferees of the Senate could obtain for every single Senator everything that he desired, not even the Senator from Nevada. The conferees did their duty, and did it, I think, as well as conferees usually do, and stuck to every one of their additions here in the way of amendments as long as it seemed as if there was a chance of winning.

The Senator certainly must know that in a bill of this size, and with this number of amendments, some of them have to be yielded; and the Senator knows, as I told him the other day, that every single project mentioned here had estimates of twice or nearly twice as much as we gave them, because there is not enough money to give the full amount, and the law protects the money that there is by providing that it must be divided equally.

The Senator knows, although he skips it in his remarks, that that large statement or computation was made upon the expectation of this free oil money, or that we should borrow \$5,000,000, which we have not done, and the oil money is not yet free, so that that talk about the estimate being more than the appropriation cuts no figure whatever unless you should prefer that one project as against all the others, and take the money that belongs to others for that one.

Mr. PITTMAN. Why did the conference committee strike out the word "drainage"?

Mr. WARREN. For two reasons. In the first place, the House insisted that it should go out. In the next place, the Senator knows—or if he does not know he can find out by inquiring—that while in making up an estimate they may put in drainage at so much, and reservoirs at so much, as a matter of fact they can use that amount for drainage or they can use it for the other purpose, as they have done in the other States. There is no question about that.

Mr. PITTMAN. It did not do any harm in the provision, then, if that is the case, did it?

Mr. WARREN. It did not.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is a difference of opinion among lawyers, the Senator understands, as to whether the word "drainage" is necessary or not.

Mr. WARREN. There was no difference of opinion on the part of the conferees of the Senate that would cause them not to stand by it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada, since he has spoken of this matter as having been treated cavalierly, that I am not a western man and know very little about western matters and reclamation. I find, however, that the western Senators do not always agree. When they do agree, they will find me agreeing with them; but when they differ about these matters I have to exercise my best judgment, and I generally listen to the heads of the great departments of the Government who investigate these matters and are expected to know all about them.

The views of the head of a department whose business it is to watch over these things are what really govern me when the western men differ, and they do not always agree. If they agree, they will find me agreeing with them. Therefore the Senator must appreciate the fact that there has to be some way for me to make up my mind, and in such cases it seems to me

that the best thing for me to do is to go to the head of the department.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator say that, because I know now how he stood on the conference committee, because the head of the department stood for these amendments that I introduced, and in fact recommended them before they were adopted, and every western Senator stood for them. Therefore, there is no question about where the Senator from North Carolina stood; but I realize that the Senator from North Carolina would have no very powerful control over that conference committee, or any other conference committee, under the shadow that has been spoken of. There is a shadow on this Congress and has been for some time, that has obstructed all common-sense reasonable legislation.

I know well enough that things are being jammed through here because Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are seeking to go to a political convention. I do not blame them. It is a matter of great interest. It is a matter of importance to them; but there is no reason why legislation vital to the interests of this country should be sacrificed by reason of any of those desires or political ambitions. So far as I am concerned, there is not any three days left at all; there is an illimitable number of years left to stand here and legislate properly on this matter. I will not vote for a conference report so made up.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, do I understand that there is no significance to be attached to the action of the Senate conferees in receding from the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and adopted by the Senate, in regard to the drainage on the Newlands project?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator asks if there is any significance about it. First the objection came, and we were not able to overcome it. It stood separate and apart from the raising of the appropriation—that is, we treated it separately—and the House would not consent to it. On the other hand, the Senate conferees knew, as I know and as the Senator, I think, knows, that that money could be expended whether that was in it or not; so they felt more comfortable about that, naturally, than they would about cutting down the amount of money to be expended.

The conferees, like every Senate conferee that acts his part conscientiously, undertook to maintain exactly what the Senate instructed them to maintain; and although the chairman of a committee or Members may say on the floor that they object to the incorporation in the bill of an amendment, and may vote against it, when the Senate has voted to put in the amendment the conferees, so far as I know, never fail to sustain that amendment on its merits, exactly as they do the others.

The word "drainage," as I have stated, was objected to because it was a distinguishment that was not carried in the other cases, and, as they believed, because it was a dangerous precedent to make to affect the belief or in any way insinuate that it was possible that we had to take up the divisions of drainage and irrigation and specify in each case how much should go to drainage and how much should go to irrigation, because, since we are giving them the sum, it is to be presumed that the department and also the settlers will decide among themselves what amount of it should go first to drainage and what amount should go to the other purpose.

In my own case, whatever may be the observation about western Senators, I have been here some time and I am from the West, and I recall that I was chairman of the joint committee of 17 which brought in the original bill that was afterwards passed and that created this whole system of Government irrigation. I take no particular pride in it, because it was imperfect, but my first efforts in the United States Senate were along the lines of irrigation and reclamation, and I have spent 40 years, the best years of my life, in assisting in building up our system of reclamation and irrigation.

It ill becomes anybody to say that a thing of this kind is mistreated because there is not some particular western Senator on the conference. This conference was of three men, two of whom had had long experience in irrigation matters. One of the three was the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and I can say nothing to add to his glory, for we all know he is one of the fairest men who ever occupied a seat in this body.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, is it the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming—and I will ask him whether it was the opinion of the members of the conference—that the department could use any part of this \$664,000 they saw fit for drainage purposes in the Newlands district?

Mr. WARREN. We understand it is entirely in their hands to do as they please about it.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the mere fact that the word "drainage" now goes out of this section of the bill does not preclude the Reclamation Service from spending whatever amount they think necessary to put in a drainage system?

Mr. WARREN. It cuts no figure. The language here in the bill as to all these projects is the language as it was sent up by the department. They did not consider it necessary to put the word "drainage" in. As the Senator remembers, that was put in on the floor.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, all I want to be assured of is that the fact that the Senate conferees receded from their position in this matter could not be taken as precluding the Reclamation Service from expending whatever amount it saw fit of the \$664,000 for drainage on that project.

Mr. WARREN. It should in no way prejudice the matter, either here on this floor, or with the department, or anywhere.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada, but he declined to yield to me, and I will ask it of the chairman of the committee. As I understand it, on amendments numbered 62 and 63 the Senate conferees receded?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; those are the amendments which have just been under discussion.

Mr. NORRIS. So that that paragraph is just the same as it originally passed the House?

Mr. WARREN. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. I thought I understood it that way; but this question has been raised by this amendment: In all these other irrigation projects, where drainage systems have been put in—for instance, the one mentioned just above that, the North Platte project—they have systems of drainage. In the appropriation was drainage specifically provided for?

Mr. WARREN. I do not recall any instance of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I was under the impression, as the chairman of the committee is, that it was not necessary, in appropriating for these different projects, to stipulate in the law—although Congress would have the power to do it, I concede—that some of the money should be used for drainage. In other words, if they made the appropriation just as it came from the House, the reclamation officials could use any part of it they saw fit.

Mr. WARREN. They could.

Mr. NORRIS. If that be true, then it seems to me the Senators from Nevada can have no complaint, at least as to amendment numbered 62. Amendment 63, it is true, reduces the amount. I understand in that particular project a drainage system has never been put in, and that it is absolutely necessary or the entire amount of money spent there will be of no consequence.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will notice that the word "drainage" is not used.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not found it anywhere else.

Mr. WARREN. And yet there is drainage going on, as the Senator knows. The Shoshone project in Wyoming has a system of drainage and is expected, I think, to have drainage put in this year out of this money, but the word "drainage" is not used.

Mr. NORRIS. I happen to know that on some of these projects of which I have personal knowledge they are putting in drainage systems, some of them not until after the system itself had been put in and it was discovered that drainage was absolutely necessary when the water gradually rose to the top. As I understand it, it is not every system that requires a drainage addition to the system of irrigation.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is correct about that; and sometimes it is impossible to say whether there should be drainage.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that sometimes it is impossible to say until it is tried. In that case they naturally would not spend any money for drainage until they found out that water was coming up toward the surface and drainage was going to be necessary sooner or later. In other words, as far as amendment 62 is concerned, it looks as though the conferees have not really given up anything. It is just the same without the amendment as it would be with it; and if it is not customary to put it in in other cases, I do not see why the conferees should be criticized for receding on the amendment and letting the language be the same as to every one of these particular items.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the colloquy this morning demonstrates the unwisdom, to use a polite word, of having transferred the irrigation money and put its direction under the committees of Congress. If this were framed as such items used to be, with all its defects, the question of drainage would be handled by the department just as easily as the question of irrigation. One is as essential after so long a time as the other was essential in its inception, and Congress took care

of it, and refused as reasonable an amendment as the Senator from Idaho attempted to place on this bill. He knows something about the conditions, they are under his daily observation, and he has been met by people who never were in that country or saw an irrigation ditch in their lives, who evidently are in the great majority in both Houses of Congress. If this should be left to men who know something about it—not I, not he, but any man who knows—there would be much less difficulty in getting some sort of development of those arid lands.

I shall vote against the report as a protest against this system of congressional action. I know the conferees have done all they could, but I have no other way of recording the protest of one great irrigation district than to say that, as was done in our case, they are asking the constituents of the Senator from Idaho to go into a contract which they know nothing about; to form a district when they do not know what is going to be the condition of its formation; and they tell them to do all this in order to drain the land of water that is drowning out the crops on it.

Why should there be any objection to it? There would be none with men who knew the conditions. The House never would have insisted except as a result of the bulldozing plan, if you please to so term it, of the irrigation service forcing the citizens to take the contract before they have read it.

The first contract, I think, was entered into in my State, and it was estimated that it would cost \$35 an acre. Everybody signed it. My colleague can tell better than I to what extent that cost finally rose, and I would say that in round numbers they still owe at least \$85 or \$90 an acre, as against \$35 estimated when the contracts were first made. That has been done by the same department. The whip handle is in their hands, and they do not spare the lash, dancing to the music of those who want to put men in power over this business, and they keep them constantly employed in finding some fault with what the people are trying to do for the reclamation of the arid lands.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report for the reasons stated, but I want the conferees to know that, so far as my vote is concerned, it is no sort of criticism of their action in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WARREN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. COMER] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I notice that he is absent, and I am therefore not at liberty to vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GAY. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I have agreed to take care of him during that absence with a pair. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is unfortunately absent on account of sickness, to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. MCLEAN. Has the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MCLEAN. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. EDGE. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and vote "yea."

Mr. SPENCER. I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], but on this question I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BALL. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ball	France	Lodge	Smoot
Brandagee	Frellinghuysen	McCumber	Spencer
Calder	Gay	McNary	Sterling
Capper	Gerry	Nelson	Townsend
Chamberlain	Hale	New	Underwood
Curtis	Harding	Overman	Wadsworth
Dial	Harris	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Polindexter	Warren
Edge	King	Pomerene	Williams
Elkins	Lenroot	Simmons	

NAYS—14.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pittman	Thomas
Borah	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Harrison	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	
Henderson	Nugent	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—43.

Beckham	Johnson, Calif.	McLean	Sherman
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Shields
Comer	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Kellogg	Owen	Stanley
Fall	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Fernald	Keyes	Penrose	Swanson
Fletcher	Kirby	Phelan	Trammell
Glass	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Gore	La Follette	Reed	Wolcott
Gronna	McCormick	Robinson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I present the report of the conferees on the Army appropriation bill and ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 12, 22, 33, 48, 53, 54, 82, 83, 92, 93.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 79, 80, 81, 86, 87, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"Provided further, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell to any State or foreign government with which the United States is at peace at the time of the passage of this act, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any matériel, supplies, or equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment, except foodstuffs, as or may hereafter be found to be surplus, which are not needed for

military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "and the Signal Corps at Camp Alfred Vail, N. J."; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$33,000,000; *Provided*, That not less than \$5,250,000 thereof shall be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment: *Provided further*, That not less than \$6,000,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories: *Provided further*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: " : *And provided further*, That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and Naval Aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for construction and experimentation and for the training of personnel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$23,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$17,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "That, commencing January 1, 1920, warrant officers, Army Mine Planter Service, shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now authorized by law, an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum: *Provided*, That this increase shall remain effective until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, unless sooner amended or repealed"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: " ; for the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals in such numbers as are actually required for the service, including reasonable provision for replacing unserviceable animals; for the purchase, hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of such harness, wagons, carts, drays, other vehicles, and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles as are required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several depots; for the purchase and repair of ships, boats, and other vessels required for the transportation of troops and supplies and for official, military, and garrison purposes; for expenses of sailing public transports and other vessels on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That hereafter when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, accommodations are available,

transportation on Army transports may be provided for the members and employees of the Porto Rican Government and their families without expense to the United States: *Provided further*, That in the joint discretion of the Secretary of War and chairman of the Shipping Board, and when space is available, civilian passengers and shipments of commercial cargo may be transported on Army transports in the trans-Atlantic service, at such times as space is not available on commercial lines, at rates not less than those charged by commercial steamship companies, between the same ports, for the same class of accommodations, the receipts from which shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That authority is hereby granted the Secretary of War to sell or otherwise dispose of, in accordance with law and regulations, the United States Army transports *Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas, Logan, Buford, Kilpatrick, Crook, and Warren*; and the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts; and such vessels, if sold to citizens of the United States, may engage in the coastwise trade so long as they remain wholly the property of citizens of the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$8,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury, for the use of the Public Health Service, the military reservation of Whipple Barracks, Ariz., now occupied by said service for hospital purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That farm products and the increase in live stock (including fowls) which accrue as incidental to vocational training in agricultural and animal husbandry, may be sold under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and the proceeds of such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$200,000: *Provided*, That the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers to carry into effect the various appropriations for 'Engineer equipment of troops,' 'Engineer operations in the field,' and other military appropriations, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1921 shall not exceed \$150,000. The Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons who are employed, their duties, and amount paid to each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "*Provided further*, That so much of this appropriation as is necessary to provide facilities for Engineer training of troops may be expended for military construction work of a temporary character at camps and cantonments and in training areas, for training purposes only"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "\$5,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following: "For the purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical warfare gases or other toxic substances, gas masks or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for gas-warfare purposes, including all necessary investigation, experimentation, and operations connected therewith, construction and repair of buildings and equipment and the machinery therefor, expenses incidental to the organization and training of gas troops not otherwise provided for, \$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following:

"For the expense of maintaining upon military reservations, camps for military instruction and training of such citizens as may be selected and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War pursuant to section 54 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of May 12, 1917, and for furnishing said citizens at the expense of the United States, uniforms, subsistence, and transportation by the most usual and direct routes within such limits as to territory as may be prescribed; for such expenditures as are authorized by said section and may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of said camps; for furnishing such equipment, tentage, field equipage, and transportation belonging to the United States as may be necessary; for arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipment, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment, ammunition, targets and their accessories for target practice, and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with said camps, \$250,000: *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be used for the training of any person who is over 45 years of age."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following:

"REPAIRING ROAD DAMAGED BY GOVERNMENT MOTOR TRUCKS, TENAFLY, N. J.

"That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to complete the work of grading and paving that portion of Hickory Avenue lying between Knickerbocker Street and Jefferson Street in the borough of Tenafly, of the county of Bergen, and State of New Jersey, begun but not completed by the Government during the war with Germany: *Provided*, That the said borough shall bear one-half or more of the cost of the above work and the Government shall bear not over one-half of the cost of said work: *Provided further*, That the share to be borne by the Government shall not exceed \$5,200; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,200 for said work, to be paid on the completion of the work: *Provided further*, That the said borough shall contract to assume to pay and discharge all claims arising out of the present uncompleted condition of said Hickory Avenue."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following:

"RIFLES AND ACCESSORIES FOR ORGANIZATIONS OF WAR VETERANS.

"That the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion,' approved February 10, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under rules, limitations, and regulations to be prescribed by him, to loan obsolete or condemned Army rifles, slings, and cartridge belts to posts or camps of organizations composed of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines, for use by them in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other post ceremonial purposes; and to sell such posts and camps blank ammunition in suitable amounts for said rifles at cost price, plus cost of packing and transportation: *Provided, however*, That not to exceed 10 such rifles shall be issued to any one post or camp."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following:

"EMERGENCY COMMISSIONED PERSONNEL.

"That the President is authorized to retain temporarily in service, under their present commissions, or to discharge and recommission temporarily in lower grades, such emergency officers as he may deem necessary; but the total number of officers on active duty, exclusive of retired officers and disabled emergency officers undergoing treatment for physical reconstruction, shall at no time exceed 17,823. Any emergency officer may be discharged when his services are no longer required, and all such officers shall be discharged not later than December 31, 1920. Any emergency officer retained in service having special scientific, technical, or professional qualifications, and who is otherwise eligible for appointment to a field grade may, upon the recommendation of the chief of a staff corps or department of the service and the concurrence of the board of general officers provided for in section 24 of the national defense act as amended at this session of Congress by H. R. 12775, be appointed to the grade of colonel, lieutenant colonel, or major in the Regular Army as therein provided without reference to the minimum age limits therein prescribed for appointments in such grades; but no person under 34 years of age shall be appointed to any field grade. All officers of the Regular Army holding commissions granted for the period of the existing emergency, in whatever grade, shall be discharged therefrom not later than June 30, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment insert the following:

"MEDAL OF HONOR FOR VERDUN.

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, in the name of the Congress and people of the United States, to present to the city of Verdun, France, a suitable memorial medal or tablet as a mark of America's appreciation of the valor of its defenders, the cost to be paid from the appropriation for contingencies of the Army."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HARRY S. NEW,
JOS. S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JULIUS KAHN,
DANIEL R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
S. H. DENT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator having the report in charge what items were in disagreement and what conclusion was reached by the conferees?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There were 93 amendments adopted by the Senate to the bill as passed by the House. I am sure the Senator does not want me to describe all 93 of them and what conclusion was reached on them all.

I may say that the bill as it passed the Senate carried appropriations totaling \$418,000,000. As reported from the conference the amount has been reduced to \$383,000,000. May I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that that amount, \$383,000,000, is in contrast with the estimates of the War Department of, in round figures, \$1,000,000,000. I am sure the Senator from Utah will not contend that the Senate itself or the conference committee has been extravagant in view of what the department has been asking. We believe, however, that the Army can be supported for the ensuing fiscal year with the sum of money provided.

The principal items of increase over the bill as passed by the House, as the Senator will remember, were the appropriations for aviation and also for pay of the Army, the latter increase being due almost entirely to the Army and Navy pay increase bill, which is now a law.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator state what was done with respect to the appropriation for aviation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The House, as the Senator will remember, appropriated \$27,250,000. The Senate increased that amount to \$40,000,000. The conferees have compromised at \$33,000,000, with a proviso that not less than \$6,000,000 of the \$33,000,000 shall be spent in the procurement of new aeroplanes and not less than \$5,250,000 shall be spent in research and experimentation.

Mr. KING. Will the residue be expended in overhead expenses?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The residue will be spent in training fliers, in the maintenance of aviation fields, and various items that go to the maintenance of the aviation service. This is the first time that the Congress has decreed that a certain amount must be spent for building aeroplanes or in research work. Those are the two items that the conferees and the Congress generally regard as the most important work, and we insist that they shall be taken care of before other things.

Mr. KING. I think the conferees have made some improvement in regard to that item, but I regret that they have not required that a larger proportion of the amount should be used in the production of machines, because, as everyone knows, the overhead expense in the Aircraft Division of the Army has been something that has been extravagant in the highest degree and calls for severe condemnation.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what was done in conference with the amendment which I offered with reference to the matter of the transfer of Whipple Barracks to the Public Health Service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Arizona will remember, of course, that the amendment, agreed to upon the floor of the Senate, made it mandatory upon the War Department to transfer Whipple Barracks to the Public Health Service permanently. The House conferees insisted that they would not accept that in a mandatory form, and finally, after a great deal of discussion, it was agreed in conference that the Secretary of War should be authorized, in his discretion, to make the transfer.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is, the conference report leaves it within the power of the Secretary of War to make the transfer without further action by Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word. I am sorry that the conferees made this amendment. I shall raise no question as to the report, but I wish to say for the enlightenment of the Secretary of War, that for 25 years we have struggled to prevent the transfer of Whipple Barracks to the Department of the Interior to be sold under the law applicable in such cases.

Whipple Barracks is of no more advantage to the Army now than any other abandoned post in the Army. When it was first established it was essential, because we were at war with different tribes of Indians, and it was made safe there. Through whatever efforts I could use, I was partially instrumental in keeping it there as long as there was any use for it. There is not a soldier there now. It costs the War Department thousands of dollars every year to maintain and keep in repair those empty buildings.

It is an ideal place for a hospital. Some 300 patients are there now. Those suffering from having been gassed, and especially tuberculosis patients, are there in the most delightful climate in the world. As the Presiding Officer of this body knows, and as many others know who have visited it, there is salubrious, healthy sunshine all the time. A patient can sit out in the fresh air among the pine trees, high enough to be out of the intense heat of the desert; and if you hunted America over you could not find a place better adapted or having as many buildings available for this purpose as at the Whipple Barracks.

I thank the Senator from New York for saving as much as he could of the amendment, and I trust the Secretary of War, when he shall have looked further into the history of this matter and the expense that it will be to the War Department as a military reservation, will soon see the necessity of a permanent transfer to the Public Health Service.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator presenting the conference report what disposition was made of the proceeds of the sale proposed to be authorized of the unused and abandoned arsenals. The Senator will recall that I suggested an amendment, and it was placed on the bill, requiring the proceeds to be used for improvements at Watervliet and at Aberdeen.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were both stricken from the bill. The House conferees refused to accept either of those provisions.

Mr. PHELAN. I probably can not get the information from the Senator, but the Secretary has the power, as I understand, to dispose of these unused arsenals, and the money will be covered into the Treasury.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department has the power to sell them, I understand.

Mr. PHELAN. They only have the power; they are not required to sell.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are not required to sell.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, out of order, I request unanimous consent for the taking up of a bill that has just been reported unanimously from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, can we not have a vote on this conference report first?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's request is not in order at this time.

Mr. PHELAN. I will renew the request later, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Senate committee, Senate amendment numbered 30, as I understand, was changed by the conferees. That amendment relates to certain pay of warrant officers; and apparently, as I hastily glance at the report of the conferees, \$240 annually is given to the warrant officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that in the bill which we recently passed, which increased the compensation of all officers, it was intended fully and fairly to care for the compensation not only of officers but of privates in the Army. This seems to be an addition to the amount allowed in the former bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it is not an addition, because in the Army and Navy pay-increase bill the warrant officers were not covered at all, and on the floor of the Senate when the Army appropriation bill was under consideration the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] offered an amendment to take care of the warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service. That amendment was adopted, with the understanding with me and other members of the Military Affairs Committee that if it was not properly drawn to accomplish the purpose in view it could be redrafted in conference to accomplish the same purpose.

The amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate read as follows:

That warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive the same pay and increases as now are or hereafter may be prescribed for warrant officers in the Navy.

It turns out, on examination, that the warrant officers in the Mine Planter Service and the warrant officers in the Navy are not comparable as to status and pay, and so we submitted the matter to the War Department, and as a result an amendment was adopted which reads, as the Senator has found in the report:

That, commencing January 1, 1920, warrant officers, Army Mine Planter Service, shall be paid, in addition to all pay and allowances now authorized by law, an increase at the rate of \$240 per annum: *Provided*, That this increase shall remain effective until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, unless sooner amended or repealed.

And I may say to the Senator that that limitation of June 30, 1922, is the same limitation as to date which was carried in the Army and Navy pay-increase bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, for information, I should like to ask the Senator whether this is a permanent branch of the service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is, and has been for several years.

Mr. KING. What is the number, approximately?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are 125 warrant officers in the Army Mine Planter Service.

Mr. KING. Was there any reason why a provision could not have been incorporated in the bill giving increased compensation to care for them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all. It was simply forgotten. It was purely an accident that they were not mentioned in the list of persons or officers or enlisted men to receive the benefit of the increase.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator why a different standard of compensation, or of determining the advance in compensation, should be adopted in this instance from that which prevailed in respect to other officers? There, it was a given rate. Here, it is a specific sum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is mistaken about the Army and Navy pay-increase bill as finally passed. When it passed the Senate the increases were fixed by percentages.

Mr. KING. Yes; by percentages.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But when it was finally passed by Congress, the House of Representatives refusing to take the percentage method, lump-sum additions to the base pay were given to officers; so this is exactly in line with what was actually done.

Mr. KING. And this will be a fair rate for these officers, measured by the increased compensation allowed to others?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator with respect to amendment numbered 38. The House, as I recall, allowed \$38,000,000 for transportation of the Army, and a number of

items embraced within that. I observe here that the amount is \$40,000,000. Was it essential to make that increase?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The House appropriated \$38,000,000. The Senate passed a bill appropriating \$45,000,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to \$40,000,000, which we think will barely cover the cost of transportation of the Army.

Mr. KING. I have no further objection.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, are we going to have a vote upon the conference report?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suppose when the Chair gets an opportunity to put the question we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Capper in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH subsequently said: I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the conference report to the Senate. The motion was agreed to.

ARMY REORGANIZATION.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just a few words to say at this time upon the subject of the conference report on the Army reorganization bill.

When that bill was being considered in the Senate I offered amendments seeking (1) to strike out those provisions in the bill providing for universal military training or conscription in time of peace; (2) to strike out the various "services" provided for in the bill; (3) to strike out the provisions creating an Undersecretary of War; (4) to strike out the provision creating separate services out of the old Quartermaster Corps; (5) to strike out the provisions abolishing the various National Guards of the various States; (6) to curtail the numbers and powers of the General Staff given by the proposed bill; (7) and generally to cut down the enormous cost of the proposed measure, estimated by its proponents at something like \$600,000,000, but believed by me to entail, if adopted as proposed, a cost of more than twice that much.

In the Senate the only one of these amendments that was adopted was the one striking out the universal military training feature, and thereupon, over my strong protest, a voluntary training feature was placed in the bill.

I am happy to say, however, Mr. President, that all of these contentions made by me in the Senate have been substantially agreed to in conference and constitute a part of the conference report on the bill. There were a number of other provisions of the bill that I objected to that are still in the bill, but the greatest evils contained in the so-called Wadsworth Army reorganization bill have been eliminated.

It is true that the cost of the bill has been reduced to about \$400,000,000—which, by the way, is about twice as much as Germany, in the heyday of her militarism, ever expended on her army in times of peace—but when we remember that the various estimates of the Wadsworth bill were from \$600,000,000 to more than twice that sum—Mr. MONDELL, of the House, put it at something like \$800,000,000 and the War Department at a billion—I feel that we have accomplished something in the way of reduced cost.

I want to congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House who served as members of the conference committee for the splendid work that they have done in conference on the Army reorganization bill. They are entitled to the thanks of the American people. I am glad that my colleagues of the Senate on the conference agreed to these very wise amendments. I wish they could have gone further and reduced the cost of the Military Establishment even more. I think the bill, even as now agreed to, creates a top-heavy organization, but it is wonderfully better than it was when it passed the Senate.

The House conferees have made the Army reorganization bill an American measure, and while the pending appropriation bill, in order to carry out the terms of the Army reorganization bill, appropriates about \$400,000,000, when we compare it with the un-American, vicious militaristic bill that was reported and passed by the Senate, I say all honor to those splendid men on the conference committee on the part of the House who prevented the passage of such a bill as that. I again say they are entitled to the grateful thanks of the American people.

THE MERCHANT MARINE—HOBOKEN DOCKS.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I desire to occupy a very few moments—I will endeavor to limit my remarks to five minutes—to say a few words in regard to the conference report on the shipping bill.

I understand that the conferees on that measure, in reporting an agreement, recommend the elimination of a portion of section 17, which, in a few words, provides recompense to the city of Hoboken, in the State of New Jersey, for taxes lost because of certain conditions. I understand that that report, in the ordinary course, can not be considered until to-morrow. Unfortunately I can not be here to-morrow, and I simply wish to take advantage of the present opportunity to enter my very emphatic protest against the elimination of the paragraph referred to from the bill.

Briefly the situation is this: The city of Hoboken, a thriving community of New Jersey, has located within its limits, as is well known generally, the American docks of the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd Steamship Lines. When we entered the war very properly the Government took over that property, as alien property, and proceeded to use it for war purposes. The city of Hoboken made absolutely no complaint. Far from doing so, they furnished police protection, fire protection, and all of the other municipal protection that would be supplied by any city. Of course, the taxes that the city had theretofore received immediately ceased. However, when the war closed the War Department still retained control of the docks, and we having constructed a merchant marine, the docks were very properly used for the purposes of a merchant marine, as well as for Army transport purposes. At the present time the docks are being used by the Government of the United States as a commercial proposition. The Government is leasing the docks to private interests, and is receiving whatever income can be derived from that business. At the same time the city of Hoboken is denied any income from that great property, which in the old days represented approximately, as I recall, one-sixth of the entire taxable income of the city.

I thoroughly appreciate that the Government of the United States whenever it needs property at any time or anywhere, in time of peace as well as in time of war—and we are not now discussing the question as it affects conditions in time of war—has a perfect right to take it, and should take it and use it for any purpose for which the Government sees fit and proper to use it; but there is a great difference between the Government occupying property to carry out the usual functions of government, such as the housing of departments or the development of some activity that may be authorized by Congress, and taking over a going concern, as it were, or the property of such a concern, and using it for commercial purposes, receiving income and making a profit on it, as, in this instance, is shown by the report of the Shipping Board, and then deny the city where the property is located the ordinary taxable income which it would otherwise receive. In my opinion, if we can not get an amendment of this character through on a bill which directly relates to the future of the docks at Hoboken, it is incumbent upon Congress to make a clear distinction between the Government in its ordinary functions taking over what has been private property and the Government running a business, and then taking from the city any possible opportunity of receiving a proper income under its tax laws.

Personally, as I have often said, I do not believe in the Government being in business outside of the great business of Government in cooperation with the business of the land; but I do agree that the Government has certain responsibilities in developing the merchant marine, and I am in entire accord with the general fundamental purposes of the bill which will be brought before the Senate for consideration under the terms of the conference report. So long as the Government is going to conduct a business, although it may gradually, as is contemplated, dispose of the merchant marine, in competition with private business interests of the country which pay taxes on whatever docks they own, then I think that the Government is in duty bound, in fairness to the city, in fairness to its own citizens with whom it may be in competition, to pay a reasonable average tax to the city where it conducts the business and where the property is located.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. EDGE. I will be very glad to answer the Senator, if I can.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not object to the Government leasing this property, does he; or is that his objection?

Mr. EDGE. No; I have no objection in the slightest degree to the Government, so long as it continues to administer this business to carry it on in a businesslike manner, leasing the property and receiving all the income it can and running it on business principles.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Government had not leased the property and it were not used at all, so that no income was derived from it, would the Senator still think the Government ought to pay taxes on it?

Mr. EDGE. Absolutely no. I, perhaps, have not made myself clear.

Mr. NORRIS. Would not the Senator rather have the Government use the property and get the incidental benefit that might come from its use than to have the property lie idle and not be used?

Mr. EDGE. There is not the least question possible before us of the property lying idle, for the docks referred to are to-day perhaps the most important docks at any port in the United States from the standpoint of our export commerce and for the receipt of imports.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. In connection with the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska, I should like to state that my information is that three of the six piers are rented by the Government to commercial steamship lines, the Government receiving for the three piers, constituting one-half of the property available, \$540,000 a year.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator for giving me the figures. I am aware that the property is rented at this time. I desire to repeat, so that I may not be misunderstood, that so long as the Government is in business I want it to make all the money it properly can in fair competition with the citizens of the country; but in making this protest I am particularly interested in bringing out the difference between the Government occupying property to administer the affairs of the Government and occupying property and conducting a business for gain. I think the distinction is perfectly clear, and in the latter case I believe that any city wherein lies property so used should receive the same income from it which it receives from a private dock or a dock owned by some steamship corporation which may be located within the city limits. In this case I understand that several of the docks at least are located within the city limits and others immediately adjoining in the city of Jersey City.

I bring up this matter now for the reason I have stated. I can not move that the report be rejected because it is not officially before us, but I wish my protest to be as emphatic as I can make it that it is the duty of Congress, so long as the Government is going to continue in business, to recognize that it shall not have or should not have an advantage over private business in the first place, and, at best, should not take from a municipality—and in the aggregate the municipalities to a large extent form the great Union—an income which, it seems to me from every standpoint, they should have. Certainly in this instance there can be no question that the city of Hoboken is entitled to the relief which the provision in the merchant marine bill was designed to afford.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12530. It is a matter which we have already had up, and we were ready to vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I inquire what the bill is?

Mr. McCUMBER. The pension bill.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask the Senator to yield to me for a moment to make a motion while the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is in the Chamber.

Mr. McCUMBER. A motion for what?

Mr. PHELAN. Before the Senator rose I had asked, out of order, unanimous consent to take up a bill reported from the Military Affairs Committee protecting the Victory button and other war decorations given to soldiers against unauthorized use. It is known as Senate bill 4432. I do not think there is any opposition to it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will there be any discussion at all on it?

Mr. PHELAN. If there is any discussion, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harding	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harris	Nelson	Smoot
Borah	Henderson	New	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Norris	Stanley
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Thomas
Capper	Kendrick	Overman	Trammell
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Page	Underwood
Curtis	Keyes	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dial	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Lenroot	Pittman	Watson
Edge	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Elkins	McCormick	Ransdell	Wolcott
France	McCumber	Sheppard	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	McLean	Smith, Ga.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12530, the pension bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12530) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. McCUMBER. The question, I believe, is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is absent from the Chamber. I do not know whether he has anything further to submit on his motion or not; but, in view of his absence from the Chamber, I shall have to ask for the yeas and nays upon his amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it be stated.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say that the Senator from Utah in order to facilitate the passage of this bill had agreed to submit his amendment to cover certain cases, and this amendment which he offered covers some twenty or thirty cases, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be stated, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from Utah moves to strike out items numbered 6, 7, 15, 48, 84, 94, 101, 109, 117, 118, 127, 140, 151, 160, 163, 183, 198, 203, 212, 219, 225, 251, 252, 265, 272, 276, 289, 302, 313, 318, 326, 329, 335, 337, 338, 353, 360, 361, 362, 364, 368, 370, 420, 441, 472, 475, 480, 482, 518, 531, 542, 549, 557, 564, 574, 584, 597, 603, 605, 607, and 628.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the chairman of the committee explain in a moment what this amendment means and what it will do?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there are some 686 cases on the omnibus pension bill. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] selected a certain class of those cases. I think those which he mentioned as the class were those who had served less than 90 days, and he asked for a vote upon those which fell within that class. I explained at the time that those who had served less than 90 days, included in this bill, were those who had already received pensions because of injuries resulting from service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The roll will be called.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair, with the same explanation that I made yesterday, to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHN-SON] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Has the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That Senator is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and as I agreed to pair with him to-day I withhold my vote.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GAY. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. COMER] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], but I understand that I am released from that pair on this question, and I will let my vote stand.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I notice that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and let my vote stand.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is not present I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—4.			
Dial	King	Thomas	Trammell
NAYS—45.			
Ashurst	Harding	New	Spencer
Ball	Harris	Norris	Sterling
Brandegee	Henderson	Nugent	Townsend
Calder	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Capper	Keyes	Phelan	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lodge	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	McCormick	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	McCumber	Polindexter	Watson
Fernald	McKellar	Ransdell	Williams
France	McLean	Sheppard	
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Hale	Nelson	Smoot	
NOT VOTING—47.			
Beckham	Glass	Knox	Sherman
Borah	Gore	La Follette	Shields
Chamberlain	Gronna	Lenroot	Simmons
Colt	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Comer	Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stanley
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Sutherland
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Swanson
Fletcher	Kellogg	Pomerene	Warren
Gay	Kenyon	Reed	Wolcott
Gerry	Kirby	Robinson	

So Mr. KING's amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. KING. I have several other amendments to offer.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can offer them in the Senate.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, pensions and bonuses are closely linked together, and I have a few remarks I desire to make on the subject of the bonus bill.

Mr. President, the blanket soldier bonus bill which the House passed last Saturday is not at present before the Senate, but is in committee, where not improbably it will remain. Senators therefore may properly refrain if they like from committing themselves on the subject, and may defer the expression of their views until the measure is presented on the floor. I prefer for my own part to say plainly here and now, as I have already many times said in reply to constituents, that I am opposed altogether to an indiscriminate cash bonus to able-bodied service men, either at this time or later, and that I regard any other form of bonus to men who emerged whole from the war as inopportune, unnecessary, and unjustifiable. It is a most important question, concerning which I have many inquiries, and I think that my correspondents are entitled to a straight, explicit answer, without hedging or evasion. I shall for this reason discuss the matter in some detail, and I trust in such fashion as will make clear the grounds of my conclusion, although I shall not undertake to go into all the phases of the problem.

Let me say first of all that I shall be found ready and anxious always to extend the utmost liberality in every way to the dependents of our soldier dead and to the men disabled in our defense. Our very first duty and obligation is to these. Their number is much greater than the public is aware. We are told by the chief medical adviser of the War Risk Insurance Bureau that 641,900 men were discharged for physical disability, of whom 276,327 were held to be disabled seriously, and that the proper care of our wounded and otherwise disabled will cost the Government annually from \$325,000,000 to \$500,000,000. We have expended on their vocational education during the fiscal year now closing the sum of \$37,000,000, but the outlay for that purpose during the fiscal year of 1921 will be \$90,000,000. We must have no stinting of the disabled, however much it may cost to provide for their necessities and rebuild them physically and mentally so far as may be possible. But there must be a

limit somewhere to the demands on the Public Treasury; and since we have neither the right nor the disposition to slight the disabled, the economies which it is absolutely imperative we shall practice must be effected in other directions.

EXISTING LIBERAL PROVISIONS.

So far as the service men are concerned who emerged physically unimpaired, it is often overlooked that we have already provided for them benefits which neither this country nor any other had ever before offered soldiers likewise circumstanced. Every soldier so long as he continued in uniform had the protection of the generous compensation plan, whereby monthly payments were assured his dependents if he died or himself if he became totally disabled, either permanently or temporarily. We made every service man a cash donation of \$60, a straight gratuity, without regard to rank, on his discharge. We provided for him life insurance up to \$10,000 the man at rates which were barely sufficient to pay the face of the premiums, the Government assuming the entire administrative expense. Gentlemen who suppose this to be a small item may be surprised to learn that the total amount of premiums collected from service men from the establishment of the system to April 1, 1920, was only \$325,000,000, while the claims accruing during the same period aggregate \$1,200,300,000. The compensation protection, furthermore, has cost the Government so far upward of \$65,000,000—and more claims are being approved every day.

I yield to no man in admiration of the gallantry of our soldiers and sailors. I did my very utmost in every way open to me to support them during the war, and I would give my right arm to have the satisfaction that is rightly theirs. It is to me a matter of the deepest regret that with some of them I am obliged to disagree. But I should unworthily represent my State if I did not weigh in my mind all the factors involved in every question presented for my decision as a public man, and I am constrained by my conscience and my own understanding to take a positive stand against the bonus proposals which a minority of the service men have caused to be offered in Congress. My conception of the duty that a Senator owes his constituents also requires that, having arrived at a settled conclusion in a matter of such general interest, I shall make it known without delay and in unmistakable terms, regardless of the effect.

I am proud to say, Mr. President, that when this iniquitous measure was on its passage through the House last Saturday everyone of the six South Carolina Members present voted against it, and I congratulate them upon their manly stand in the face of a terrific propaganda.

HYPOCRISY—OR RECKLESSNESS?

We have it from no less an authority than a Republican ex-President that much of the clamor for bonus legislation which comes at this time from politicians of his own party is rank hypocrisy. It is hardly possible to believe that these self-proclaimed saviors of the soldier either expect or desire in their hearts to see the actual enactment of their bonus bills into law. They can not but know that such measures have little chance of passing the Senate at this session, and that even if they should pass, either now or later, they will almost certainly be vetoed. But they figure that by rushing the bills through the House they will be in position to go to the country with the argument that a grateful Republican Party did its utmost, in fact put the bills through one branch of Congress, but was obstructed in its benevolence by a Democratic minority and the Democratic administration. In other words, they would take credit for trying to get the soldier a bonus, at the same time escaping the inconvenient consequences that actual fulfillment of their proposals would involve. I do not believe the country can be so easily bamboozled.

Bonus advocates in Congress are caught between the two horns of a dilemma. Either they do not in good faith expect to carry into effect their bonus bills, in which event they are trying to put over what President Taft calls a most contemptible piece of hypocritical political jobbery to capture the soldier vote, or, on the other hand, if they do seriously contemplate imposing this enormous burden on a people already taxed beyond all reason, they are guilty of an amazing exhibition of irresponsibility and an almost criminal recklessness.

They have before them the solemn warnings of the two men who, more than all others, are entitled to speak authoritatively regarding the finances of this country. Secretary Houston tells us that even without bonus legislation there is no prospect of reducing Federal tax burdens before 1923. And his predecessor, the Hon. CARTER GLASS, serving now as a Senator from Virginia, with the same distinction which made him an ornament to the Cabinet, has declared that "in these fateful days of readjustment, with the people bearing the most extraordinary tax burdens since the world was created, it would be a

frightful misuse and abuse of power for Congress to vote an indiscriminate bonus to able-bodied ex-service men." Can sober and responsible public men of either party disregard warnings so grave and impressive?

CRIPPLING OUR INDUSTRIES.

Let us consider for a moment what it will mean to withdraw from the available capital of the country the great sum that the bonus project would call for. It will mean that the amount of working funds in the money market with which to finance business and industry would be decreased by some \$2,000,000,000, and this, too, at a time when legitimate, productive enterprise is restricted as never before by a scarcity of such funds. The soundest and most useful of our concerns are paying exorbitant rates for the capital which is their lifeblood. Our transportation system, for example, must have money and a great deal of it at once if our fuel and our foodstuffs and the products of our industries are to be moved, otherwise will the cost of living mount quickly to levels never before attained. Yet we find so great a railway as the Pennsylvania unable to borrow on 10 years' time at less than 7½ per cent. A child can perceive what that means for weaker roads.

Now, what is to be done with the vast fund so withdrawn from the market? Is it to continue in useful, productive employment, financing our farmers, our merchants, our manufacturers, our utilities? No; it is to be distributed over the country, among a special class, in \$500 lots, and undoubtedly in most instances will be at once expended to the temporary profit of non-essential enterprises. This will mean incidentally a raising of prices to everybody. The very beneficiaries themselves will suffer by the resulting further increase in the general cost of living.

Nor is it to be doubted that the taxes for raising the bonus money, whatever form they may take, will be promptly relayed on to the ultimate consumer. In fact the Associated Press, in reporting the decision of the House committee to offer the bills, said that members who had participated in drawing them declared that whatever system was followed the consumer would pay.

EFFECT ON LIBERTY BOND VALUES.

We have an inescapable obligation, Mr. President, to protect our citizens who subscribed to the several Liberty bond issues for the purpose of backing up our soldiers. Many of these citizens, as we all know, bought bonds to an extent beyond their means. Many thousands of them have been unable for this reason to hold these securities to maturity, and in all such cases the original patriotic purchasers have already suffered losses which they had no reason to expect. I have a special feeling of responsibility in this matter, because I, like many brother Senators, was active and insistent in persuading my home people to buy bonds. We have the absolute assurance of the Secretary of the Treasury and the governor of the Federal Reserve Board that a soldier bonus means further considerable depreciation in the value of Liberty bonds, and of other Government paper as well. It would humiliate me, Mr. President, to see my own note sell below par, and likewise it is humiliating to us all and damaging to our national prestige to see our bonds, which may be called our joint notes, going at less than face value. Another factor in the situation which all the more constrains us to protect these bonds is that the Federal Reserve Board, in order to force funds needed for other purposes, has felt obliged to force out of the banks a large proportion of Liberty bonds which they have been carrying for their customers.

RETROACTIVE TAXES ARE VICIOUS.

Unfortunately for the ready comprehension by the public of the issues involved, the discussion of the bonus matter has been muddled and confused by the repetition of certain superficially plausible catchwords, of which the misleading phrase "adjusted compensation" is a fair sample. Another instance is the argument so often heard that the vast revenue required can and should be raised in large part by levying a drastic business tax retroactive for three or four years.

Persons urging such legislation display a childlike ignorance of business management. They apparently assume that every man who has derived profit from his operations has laid up in a napkin somewhere every dollar so acquired, and kept the sum total intact and idle—for reasons which our amateur statesmen do not trouble themselves to expound. On the contrary, as anyone acquainted at all with affairs is aware, such earnings have been long since laid out in improvements and extensions, or otherwise put back into production.

Likewise, the stock dividends, which also have excited the cupidity of these gentlemen, are in many cases mere paper distributions of intangible values. Our amateur politico-financial experts conveniently forget the long lean years that went before,

in which stockholders derived from their investments only the lowest dividends or none at all. They forget with an equal facility that in most enterprises which have lately been enabled, by reason of abnormal, fortuitous, and temporary conditions, to declare stock dividends, the distribution falls short of averaging up net returns sufficiently to offset preceding years of inadequate returns or none.

STRAIN ON MONEY MARKET.

War-time earnings could not now be retroactively taxed without immeasurably distressing and demoralizing business throughout the country. The funds which it is proposed thus to tax have been, as I have said, long since expended or tied up in current operations, not put by in a napkin. Business men would simply have to go into the market and borrow the money with which to meet the tax. The sudden and extraordinary demand upon a money market already overstrained would enormously increase the cost of money for financing the community and thus directly increase the cost of living. Therefore, the plan for raising by this means the funds for a gigantic bonus payment is impracticable on the physical facts, even if it were not also open, as it is, to conclusive objections on other grounds.

Retroactive legislation, especially in fiscal matters, is vicious in itself, altogether repugnant to American principles, and destructive of American organization. I should oppose retroactive taxation for this reason, regardless of the particular ends in view. If the question was asked me, "What feature in congressional practice is more hampering, irritating, and burdensome to legitimate private business than any other?" I should unhesitatingly answer that it is impermanence, uncertainty, and capriciousness in regard to taxes and restrictions. Constant changes and fear of changes are fatal to prosperity, paralyzing to initiative, and enervating to the spirit of enterprise. Nobody knows what absurdities in this field a new Congress may perpetuate—and our House of Representatives is renewed every two years. Business is kept continuously disturbed by dread of new and radical legislation or of new interpretations of existing laws. Let us give the American once more at least a fighting chance of working out his own temporal salvation.

HAVE THE SOLDIERS SPOKEN?

I do not undertake to express an opinion regarding the propriety or the good taste of the soldiers themselves demanding at the hands of the country, through Congress, a bonus, "adjusted compensation," arrears of pay, or whatever it is they choose to call it. That is a question for soldiers to decide, each for himself. But as a matter of cold fact, such demand has not yet been presented by anything like a majority of the service men. The American Legion, great and potentially useful organization though it is, comprises so far only a minority of the 4,800,000 men called to the colors and for whom it is often presumed to speak; furthermore, within the legion itself there is anything but unanimity on this subject, and the executive committee, which framed and presented these demands, without a mandate from the rank and file, has found it convenient to ignore the reasonable suggestion that the only way of learning accurately the wishes of the membership is to hold a referendum. I am proud to say that the South Carolina department of the legion has repudiated openly the grab policy of the national executive committee. I have heard, and with deep regret, that in some localities here and there through the country the high position taken when the legion was founded has been forgotten and that membership campaigns are being waged under the slogan, "Join the legion and get a bonus." Certainly that was not the idea which prevailed in the three general sessions of the American Legion which have been held to date, and if such an idea has crept into the organization it has originated from the mistaken and, I believe, misrepresentative policy developed by the executive committee. The South Carolina branch, Mr. President, I am glad to state, is considering withdrawing from the legion if the organization adheres to the policy declared by the committee.

SERVICE NOT COMPENSABLE.

"Adjusted compensation" is a good mouth-filling phrase, and I note with regret that some tried and true soldiers make use of it, without troubling to look into its full meaning. Service men who base their demand for a donation of Government funds on the compensation theory place themselves in very doubtful company. Free countries hold military service in time of war to be a privilege, open only to the able-bodied and honorable. Such service has at no time been regarded as compensable, and the pay of the citizen soldier has been intended merely to cover reasonable incidental requirements not provided for by issue or otherwise, not at all to square accounts between him and his country, for no amount of money could do that. Let those who talk of "adjusted compensation" remember that in

our history only two classes of soldiers have put a price on their courage. The Hessians, whom it is sufficient merely to name, and the substitutes of Civil War days, men who cold-bloodedly calculated their chances of survival against the sums they could extort from the men in whose stead they fought. No man who wore the American uniform in the World War would knowingly class himself alongside either the Hessians or those later mercenaries, the substitutes of the sixties. Yet they do so class themselves, although unintentionally, whenever and to the extent that they put their demands on a compensation basis. I can only believe that service men who make use of the compensation argument do so without following it out to its logical conclusion.

WAR WORKERS' WAGES.

Some advocates of a soldier bonus bear down hard on the contention that civilian laborers, notably the shipyard workers, were overpaid during the war. They will not hear any argument to the contrary from me. Let us consider that fact, however, in relation to soldier-bonus proposals. The soldier, privileged as he is to confront the enemy face to face, has properly the major share of glory and honor, and no free country has dreamed of tendering its soldiers cash settlement for their services, or, in other words, commuting in cash its obligation of gratitude. But unquestionably the cause in which the soldier fights is also very largely dependent on unremitting, arduous, and skillful labor by thousands of men in the shipyards, munition plants, and other establishments, which have been aptly called sectors of the home front. I can see how it might plausibly be argued that the wages of the men held back for this unglamorous though necessary duty may be properly called compensatory and adjusted accordingly.

My own idea about handling the problem is, however, that in time of war, and if necessary, labor should be conscripted precisely as troops are conscripted—which, of course, implies careful advance classification of our man power by special qualifications—and that a man who is exempt from military duty by reason of his skill in some trade, as a shipfitter, for instance, should be quite as firmly held to perform his particular function as the soldier; and I believe the skilled workman of our country will be found as ready as the soldier to subordinate his personal preferences and freedom of action to the welfare of the Nation. It follows, of course, that the Government must then assume the responsibility for safeguarding his rights and not leave this to private or corporate judgment. Let us hope that if we have another great war we shall profit by the lessons the World War has taught and manage better this home labor problem. Meanwhile the overpayment of war workers during the late war may as well be dismissed from further consideration as water that his flowed under the bridge. Whether or not the wages allowed were scandalously high, the plain fact is that we were not organized to handle our skilled labor on a scientific basis, and that, as a practical matter, the pay question had to be treated as secondary to the supreme issue of quantity production at maximum speed.

I do not concede that because we fell into error in this field we must now therefore commit another and a greater error. Nor is it any valid argument for a tremendous bonus payment at this time that extravagant expenditures arose out of the cost-plus contract system, under which of necessity much of the war construction was accomplished. I think, however, that was a pernicious system; it led us into temptation, and it should be abolished as soon as possible in all enterprises.

THE NEGRO AND THE BONUS.

Recklessness and irresponsibility have characterized this cash bonus campaign in Congress from first to last. That is well illustrated by the fact that its relation to the negro problem has been considered only in the most superficial and careless way, if at all. I might go further, and say that its effect on the labor situation generally, profound though it must be, has also been lightly ignored. The labor situation in the South, however, is aggravated immeasurably by reason of its being complicated with the negro problem in all its many phases. We ought not to expect, perhaps, that Members of Congress from other sections shall understand altogether what it will mean to place a windfall of several hundred dollars each in the hands of the negroes who as soldiers, or much more numerous as laborers and stevedores, wore the uniform at some time during the war. But enough is known throughout the country concerning the organization of life in the South to make it reasonable that we should expect of Congressmen, from whatever section they come, at least a sober, candid facing of probable consequences, and a conscientious endeavor to ascertain what those consequences may be.

Gentlemen are much mistaken who think this is a sectional question only. Disorganize southern industry and agriculture

and the effect will be quickly and seriously felt in every home in the land. The South not only comprises the cotton belt, although this fact in itself should suffice to make judicious men pause to think, but it is also a vast producer of foodstuffs. The negroes are already very badly demoralized. The man is exceptional among them who will put in a full week's work at prevailing high wages. No man doubts, who knows negro character at all, that every one of them who receives the cash bonus will cease work altogether until every dollar of the several payments is spent. The certain results of such a distribution of money will be general and complete idleness, demoralization, and an unparalleled orgy of short-lived extravagance. Certain gentlemen who have led the fight for the bonus profess to be great friends of the negro. But it is no kindness to the negro to expose him to such temptations in a time of unrest and of unprecedented need for maintaining and increasing those productive activities in which he is most largely involved. The country at large has finally concluded that southern white men really know a trifle more than others about the handling of the negro problem, and the country will remember that this bonus was voted over the solemn objection of many southern Members, who confront the situation which it raises not as a theory or abstraction but as a grave, actual condition of the utmost practical concern. I have dealt with colored people all my life and in the various capacities of employer, attorney, and banker; I think I am a true friend of the race, and that I am so known among the negroes of my State; but my friendship is grounded on intimate knowledge, not on abstractions; and I say in all earnestness that I see no good to the race in this project, but, on the contrary, immeasurable harm, and a setting back in many lines of the progress which the negro in the South has been making.

I have advocated, Mr. President, during all my business life, fair treatment of the negro. I believe in paying him what you promise and when you promise it, and treating him like a human being. Then, of course, he will stay in his place. It is not brave to impose on him nor is it smart to cheat him, as I have observed so many times in the courthouse and on the stump at home.

WATCH THE LAND LOBBY.

Much propaganda has centered around the land-settlement features in the bonus proposals. I think the country should be extremely distrustful of these features. Some good men are associated with them undoubtedly. But I have not failed to observe that lobbyists have swarmed to Washington to sing the praises of some hopelessly desolate wastes and that these gentlemen continue to hang about the Capitol, with mouths watering over the wholesale hand-out which they confidently expect. I am not particularly concerned with the sectional aspect, but the fact is manifest that the bulk of any funds allotted for soldier settlement will go to the West. It is true that a bid is made for southern support by promises that a quota of the money allowed will be expended in the reclamation of cut-over and swamp lands in the South. The South, I am sure, would pay dearly in other ways for every dollar that might accrue to her under this interesting frame-up. I may add, also, with regard to the attitude of service men themselves, that I have a rather extensive correspondence with those in my own State, and I believe that not more than five altogether have indicated to me that they had the slightest interest in the settlement of service men on reclaimed lands, whether these be alkali deserts or canyon sides in the West or old pine fields or cypress swamps in the South. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that the most rampant demanders of "something for the soldier" happen to be also interested in waste lands.

A BETRAYAL OF TRUST.

Bonus advocates will find interesting reading in the New York Sun. This newspaper, Republican organ though it is, points out that the Republican Party is in control of Congress; it therefore holds that party to direct and full responsibility, and declares that the party will and should be repudiated by the country if it shall permit what it calls this wicked raid on the Treasury. Going further, the Sun asserts:

It is reported that in the present critical condition of the Nation's finances, with debt and taxation piling up so high and heavy that the people can scarcely stagger along under the growing load, there are Congressmen willing and getting ready to vote for the indiscriminate soldier-bonus grab of a billion and a half dollars or thereabouts; and this because congressional elections occur next November and they hope thus to profit politically in their districts. Surely—

Concludes the Sun—

the word traitor has been applied over and over again in history and in fiction to betrayals of trust less shameful in the alleged motive, less disastrous in the consequences, than such a betrayal of trust by the sworn guardians of the public interest, charged with the protection of the Public Treasury.

Since one of the foremost of Republican journals has so severely spoken the bonus bill has been passed in one House of Congress by a vast majority of Republican votes.

A CORRUPTING DONATION.

I think that this matter has been very well summed up by a great authority on government, Dr. Theodore S. Woolsey, professor of international law at Yale. Dr. Woolsey is quoted as saying:

There are two distinct questions involved in the cash bonus proposal. One is simple: Can the finances of the Government stand such a strain without grave disturbances? The Secretary of the Treasury, the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, the writers on finance all say no. In the face of this expert evidence only the reckless could advocate the measure.

The other question is even more serious. It relates to the effect upon our system of government and upon the character of our people. When a huge gratuity is given the members of an army for doing their duty, this gratuity being offered by one political party, or by each party bidding against the other, it then becomes not a gift of gratitude but a corruption fund, debauching both those who give it and those who receive it.

Mr. President, it is not only the soldiers who helped win this war, although, of course, they are entitled to the greatest praise; but the people at home, all good, loyal American people, did all they could. It was a pleasure, while the soldiers were in the trenches abroad, to see our ladies and children get together and make garments for them unceasingly. Even little tots knitted sweaters, wrist warmers, and various articles of comfort that the soldiers needed.

I remember, Mr. President, the particular case of a poor white man in my county who came into my office and wanted to buy a Liberty bond. His means were exceedingly limited. He had rented a little farm on the outskirts of the town, and his horse had recently died, and he had to buy another one on credit. He came in and wanted to buy a bond. I asked him how much he could pay down. He said he could not pay anything. I said to him, "Well, my friend, of course, I am trying to help the Government sell bonds, and we want everybody to buy them that can; but there is no use of your buying a bond if you can not pay anything on it, and I must be candid with you and say that I do not think it is your duty to buy a bond." He was about the only man I told that to during the whole campaign, and the bank with which I am connected raised its quota every time the Government called. That man sat there, and tears ran down his cheeks, and he insisted on my helping him. He said he wanted his name on the honor roll, and I told him his name should be there, and helped him get that bond.

I feel that if the soldiers realized the feeling that existed at home they would not come back here and want us now almost to bankrupt this Government by voting a bonus on the people of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the South Carolina Branch of the American Legion be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State, May 30, 1920.]

SECESSION PROPOSED FOR CAROLINA LEGION—STATE CONVENTION CALLED TO CONSIDER ACTION OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE—FIGHT FOR BONUS CAUSE OF BREACH—WITHDRAWAL MAY FOLLOW NATIONAL CONVENTION SHOULD EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S ACTION BE RATIFIED—SOUTH CAROLINA MEETING IN SPARTANBURG SET FOR JUNE 15.

For the purpose of considering the advisability of withdrawal from the national organization, in case the national convention should ratify the action of the national executive committee in agitating the bonus, the annual convention of the American Legion of South Carolina will be held in Spartanburg June 15, instead of next fall. This decision was reached yesterday at a meeting of the State executive committee held in Columbia. The resolution calling the convention at the earlier date characterizes the action of the national executive committee as "harmful to the best interests of the National and State organizations." The resolution says in part, in speaking of the national executive committee's fight for a cash bonus: "Its action tarnishes the honor and glory which the American soldier and sailor won on the field of battle, and its action, if ratified by the next national convention, renders the further affiliation of the South Carolina department with the national organization harmful to the future of the said department."

On Friday the executive committee decided to hold the annual State convention in Spartanburg one month prior to the national convention, but at the meeting yesterday, which was attended by the entire committee, the decision was reached to move up the annual convention to June 15.

The resolution sets forth that, among other things, the national executive committee from this State has not been duly notified twice of meetings of the national committee.

AGAINST BONUS AGITATION.

The South Carolina department has throughout voted that the American Legion should not take part in a bonus agitation.

The resolution says that the national executive committee disregarded the express orders of the national convention, the governing body of the legion, and the basic principles on which the legion was founded.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas the American Legion was formed with the express purpose of furthering all patriotic causes and not for selfish or political reasons; and

"Whereas the granting of a cash bonus to able-bodied veterans of the Great War would be admittedly harmful to the welfare of the American public; and

"Whereas a request from the American Legion for a cash bonus rightly renders that organization liable to suspicions as to its sincerity and unselfishness of motive and is debasing and inconsistent with the high ideals on which it was founded; and

"Whereas the national convention of the American Legion assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., November 10, 11, and 12, 1919, went on record as disapproving any attempt by the legion to ask or demand of Congress a cash bonus; and

"Whereas the national executive committee of the American Legion has demanded the payment of such a bonus by Congress, thereby disregarding the express orders of the governing body of the American Legion and the basic principles on which the American Legion was founded; and

"ATTEMPT TO IGNORE STATE.

"Whereas the national headquarters of the American Legion has shown a desire to disregard the wishes of the South Carolina department of the American Legion by twice failing to give due notice to the national executive committee from South Carolina of meetings to be held, thereby endeavoring to deprive the said department of its legal voice in the councils of the national organization: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the executive committee of the South Carolina department of the American Legion, That we disapprove the action of the said national executive committee and that we view their motives with suspicion; and

"Resolved, That in our opinion the action of the national executive committee is harmful to the best interests of the National and State organizations, its action tarnishes the honor and glory which the American soldier and sailor won on the field of battle, and its action if ratified by the next national convention renders the further affiliation of the South Carolina department with the national organization harmful to the future of the said department; and

"Resolved, That the adjutant, South Carolina department of the American Legion, be authorized and directed to call upon the various posts of the American Legion in South Carolina to elect delegates to the annual State convention to be held in Spartanburg, S. C., June 15, 1920, for the purpose of considering the advisability of withdrawal of the South Carolina department of the American Legion from association with the national organization."

DISABLED NEED ASSISTANCE.

The committee in a second resolution, adopted yesterday, also strongly condemned any legislation designed to give a cash bonus to the able-bodied ex-service men at this time, when it appears, the committee members thought, that no adequate provision has been made for the disabled who are really entitled to assistance. The resolution follows in full:

"Whereas it appears from statements made by Dr. W. G. Rucker, chief medical adviser of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and other Government officers that 641,900 men were discharged from the Army and Navy with disabilities, of whom 276,327 were seriously disabled, and that less than 5 per cent of the disabled have been cared for by the Federal Board for Vocational Education; and

"Whereas it is estimated by qualified experts that the proper and adequate care of those who have been disabled may cost the Government annually from \$325,000,000 to \$500,000,000: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the executive committee of the American Legion of South Carolina, That we strongly condemn any legislation designed to give a cash bonus to the able-bodied ex-service men at this time, when it appears that no adequate provision has been made for the disabled, who are really entitled to assistance.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Representative in the United States Senate and Congress and published in the State newspapers."

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to Senate bill 4166, which provides a method for conducting contests in regard to the United States Senate. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think there will be no possible objection to the bill. It was felt that it would be desirable, if possible, to have that bill acted upon at this time, if there is no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the pension bill which is before the Senate disposed of in some way, and then I am going to ask to take up the calendar and go through the calendar, so that the bills that may be passed here will reach the House in time to be passed upon before adjournment.

Mr. SPENCER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). The bill is in the Senate. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I would not state that there are not more or less justifiable and probably meritorious increases of pensions provided in the pending bill. Probably some of the items in the bill would receive my approval were I familiar with the facts which were presented to the committee; but this measure seeks to inject into our pension system a policy with which I am not in sympathy, and for that reason, if the items embracing this objectionable policy remain in the measure, I shall be compelled to vote against it, regardless of the fact that it may have some meritorious increases or some new names that possess merit to be added to the pension roll.

I find, Mr. President, that the Government seeks through this bill to reward and care not only for the soldier who fought for his country and to care for his widow, his helpmeet, but it goes a step further and provides pensions for the sons and daughters of the soldiers who served this country during the Civil War. We find, Mr. President, that the bill is filled from beginning to end with items that provide pensions for the sons and for the daughters of late soldiers.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator claim that that has not been the policy of the pension laws ever since we enacted them?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think probably there has been some policy along this line, but I think this bill seeks to carry it still further and to enlarge on it; and the first thing you know the granddaughters and the grandsons of soldiers will be pensioned by the people of this country at the hands of Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, I think if he will examine the bill a little more carefully he will ascertain that these children are all helpless and dependent children or minors under 16 years of age, and they are those cases that have been provided for from the very initiation of the pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War. Every pension bill we have had has dealt with minors and with helpless and dependent children, and we have not expanded it a single inch for 50 years.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I admit that I am not as familiar with the pension laws as the distinguished chairman of the committee and others who have been more directly in touch with it, but my impression is that there is an effort to enlarge this policy, and I am opposed to the policy.

We find in the bill, for instance, on page 64, an item of this kind:

The name of Mary Miller, widow of Ira Miller, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Horace M. Miller, helpless and dependent son of said Ira Miller, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Miller the name of said Horace M. Miller shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary Miller, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

This provision of the bill provides an increase of \$20 per month to the widow on account of dependence; and it does not stop there, but it provides, further, that in the event of the death of the widow the son shall succeed to the pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

We find other items in the bill wherein a pension is granted directly to the son. On page 67 we find this case:

The name of John W. Walker, helpless and dependent child of Otis Walker, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

I have not been able to go over the entire measure and ascertain how many pensions of this character are granted, but I find that the bill, from the very beginning of it to its conclusion, is full of items providing for increases of pension or providing pensions that will go directly to the son or the daughter of a late soldier.

Mr. President, how far are we going with this? I appreciate the services of any person who serves his country, serves it faithfully, loyally, and patriotically. I believe that the Government, in all justice, should recognize that service, and I am not objecting to the pensioning of the soldiers or their widows. I might object to the amount, as far as the monthly sum that is fixed is concerned. It is growing and pyramiding and pyramiding until now it is an enormous burden upon the taxpayers of this country.

But I think, Mr. President, there is some place where we should stop. If we are going to go to the sons and to the daughters, then why not later go to the grandsons and the granddaughters? I dare say, Mr. President, if this policy is perpetuated and continued, after a while, as we look out over the field and see the numerous grandsons and numerous granddaughters, and think about what a wonderful force they will be in the elections of this country, we are likely to reach out and get them.

But I tell you, Mr. President, we can go too far with that proposition. The people of this country who have the tax burden to bear, the people who pay the bills while the fiddling is going on, are entitled to some consideration. I do not for a moment believe that the American people will withhold, or that they desire to withhold, a reasonable expression of gratitude

to those who have defended their country in the hour of peril, but I say, Mr. President, that I believe the people of this country will object if we keep extending and enlarging this pension policy and reaching out and gathering in all of the members of the family of some man who, perchance, in years gone by, has served his country, and I can not support a bill which contains items in it reaching to the sons and to the daughters. However pathetic their cases may be, however much I may personally sympathize with them, I can not, as a Government policy, go beyond the granting of pensions to the soldiers and to their widows.

Back in my State legislature we dealt as liberally and as lavishly as we could with the patriotic heroes of the Civil War who fought upon the Confederate side, and I felt a peculiar pride and an intense interest in trying to foster their interest in the way of making acknowledgment of my State's gratitude to those boys. But now, Mr. President, when it came to a question of pensioning the sons and the daughters, I then challenged my colleagues that if they wanted to extend charity—and that was an extension of charity; I did not consider it an acknowledgment of the State's gratitude—then the legislators should individually contribute that charity, and not, on account of their strong arm as lawmakers, force the taxpayers of that State to be burdened for the purpose of extending the pensions even to the sons and daughters, regardless of however much we may sympathize with those who are helpless or afflicted.

In this country there are a number of loyal, patriotic citizens who are helpless, who need the aid and assistance of charity; but the National Government does not assume the burden, nor does it feel that it is the obligation of the National Government to place them upon the pension roll.

Mr. President, on account of these objectionable features, if the bill is not amended—and it will not be, I am sure—so as to strike out the pensions to the sons and to the daughters, I shall be compelled to vote against it, although I am heartily in sympathy with the idea of the Nation paying tribute of recognition and esteem to the men who served their country in the hour of peril and to their widows. But I do not believe that that service justifies the Congress of the United States in extending pensions to the sons and the daughters, and I am opposed to the policy.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have never been enthusiastic about service pensions, but there is a class of pensions to which I do give my most intense support, the pension or compensation to the man who is really hurt.

We have pending before the Senate a bill which has passed the House, which ought to receive the attention of the Senate before we adjourn next Saturday, to increase the allowance to the injured men who are taking vocational training. It proposes to increase their allowance \$20 a month; to give those without responsibilities \$100 a month and those with responsibilities \$120 a month.

There are now in training, or there were a short time ago—I believe it has increased a little since then—33,600 such men. Of that number 6,300 are in cities of a million inhabitants or more; 5,500 are in cities of 500,000 up to 1,000,000; 5,600 are in training in cities of from 250,000 to 500,000 inhabitants; 3,700 are in training in cities of 100,000 to 250,000 inhabitants. The balance, 12,500, are in cities of less than 100,000 inhabitants.

I understand the objection has been made to this bill that a large number of negroes would receive this increased compensation. In all, there are only 952 colored men who have accepted the invitation and are taking training.

We have the report of the House committee, which shows us that the evidence before them disclosed that it is utterly impossible for a large number of these men to pay their expenses on the present allowances. I have personally seen a number of them. I have personally visited some of these institutions and know the character of men who are receiving the training. They are men with one arm; they are men with one leg; they are men who have received serious injuries in their bodies; they are men who are entirely disqualified from pursuing the vocations which they followed before the wounds or the injuries were received.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator's statement must have been misunderstood, or at least I misunderstood the Senator. I understood the Senator to say that it was impossible for them to pay their expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not mean the expenses of the soldier?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator mean the expenses of those who are dependent upon the soldier?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I mean that in the cities and in many other places the average soldier can not take care of himself on \$80 a month and have anything like a decent living. He pays for his clothes, he pays for his food, he pays for his room, he pays all of his personal expenses, and even in Washington, a man going to the George Washington University, for instance, can not take care of himself on \$80 a month.

Mr. SMOOT. I was thinking that the Senator had reference to the soldiers who were in hospitals, and taking training there.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, no; this does not apply to them at all.

Mr. SMOOT. The soldier there, of course, gets all the care.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. None of those provided for by this bill are at a hospital.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. The Senator gave a class of people who are attending these schools, such as people who lost an arm, or lost a leg, or have been crippled in some other way. We all feel that we ought to give good support and care to those who have been so injured in service. But does the department discriminate as carefully as the Senator has indicated in determining who may have the benefit of this law? I am going to say candidly that I have been informed that there is practically no discrimination whatever, and from a very reliable source I was informed only the other day of a person who is now taking a postgraduate course in medicine at the expense of the Government, whose only injury during the war was to one of his fingers. I do not know how many such cases there are.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then his occupation must have been one which required that finger, and the loss of the finger must have disqualified him from pursuing his former occupation.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think the finger was even lost. I think it was injured somewhat and the joint was stiffened.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will yield to the Senator, but I would like to answer the Senator from North Dakota first.

Mr. KING. I will call attention to matters of the same character. I have seen a number of individuals who are receiving large contributions from the Government for injuries such as described, and they are working and earning large sums, probably a thousand or more dollars per annum, and receiving large sums from the Government, and are taking an education, of course, at the same time. My information is the same as that of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that there is no proper discrimination, and that people with insignificant injuries are receiving nearly as large sums, if not quite as large, as some who have lost an arm.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator must be mistaken. The total number who are receiving training is 33,000. The number who were injured is over 100,000. My own trouble has been from finding cases where I thought men were entitled to the training but were not receiving the training. Naturally there will be a few passed and admitted to training who perhaps ought not strictly to have been passed, but the Government even then is helping prepare an injured soldier for a useful life. I fear there have been a number rejected who ought to have received the training.

I have visited a number of these schools. I have seen the average student at the school, and I have found them entirely disqualified in their existing condition to pursue the calling which they followed before the war.

I have furthermore found that the average student at these schools was a man who, without his injury, would earn from \$150 to \$200 a month. I know that a large number of these men but for their injuries would be earning much more than \$120 a month.

What are we undertaking to do by this training? By giving them from one to three years' opportunity to fit themselves for some other calling we expect to find them able to relieve the Government of what otherwise would be a permanent charge upon the Government.

I maintain that the soldier who was injured and thereby made unable to earn a livelihood or to earn what he could have earned before is entitled from the balance of us who stayed at home to have made up to him his financial losses. If we make a man go to the front and fight our battles and he is shot or cut or otherwise wounded, we can not afford to question the proposition that we ought, so far as money goes, to make him whole.

Now what are the facts? We find from the testimony brought before the committee that charitable institutions have been called upon—and necessarily called upon—to make up to these men a sufficient amount to pay their expenses. I do not think any of us want to have that done. There may be some question about service pay, giving money from taxation to men who were not hurt, and to widows of men who were not hurt, and to children of men who were not hurt—I do not enthrone over any of these pensions—but when it comes to the boy who was wounded, who was injured at the front, I do not believe there is anyone who questions the responsibility of the Government—that is, all of us—to make him in a measure sound.

We are too free with service pensions, and that causes us to be too close with compensation to those suffering from injuries of service origin.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I am in hearty sympathy with that side of the pension problem, and I am willing to go as far as the needs of the men require, the disabled men and the families of those who lost their lives in the service, but I am informed that our present appropriations in behalf of that class of pensioners is but little short of \$500,000,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am confident that is a mistake.

Mr. THOMAS. My authority is, I think, reliable, that it is somewhere between \$450,000,000 and \$500,000,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Thirty-three thousand men at \$80 to \$100 a month would be about \$32,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. There are over 600,000 men who are disabled on the pension roll.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are only 33,000 of those to whom I am referring.

Mr. THOMAS. My statement is not confined to the class of disabilities covered by the Senator's bill but to the entire number of those who have suffered disabilities of some sort in consequence of services in the last war.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That I have not followed out. I have been especially interested in those whom we were fitting to relieve us of our responsibility.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit, I find that I have a clipping upon the subject, dated the 8th of May, stating that there are 641,900 veterans of the World War dependent upon the bounty of the United States for future existence, at an annual cost of \$325,000,000. I stated the figure too high.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There can not be 600,000 who are a charge upon the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. This is from Dr. W. C. Rucker, chief medical adviser of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, who reports this number discharged from the Army and Navy with disabilities, and he then gives the number suffering under different disabilities. One of the chief objections to the bonus for all soldiers regardless of their condition is that it will deprive the men whom the Government should take care of of this support to which they are entitled because of their disabilities.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not advocating the bonus.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very glad the Senator is not.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not advocating the bonus. I am only pressing upon the Senate that here are 33,000 men who will relieve the Government in a year or two of responsibility for them, who no longer can do what they did before, whose physical injuries have disqualified them from continuing in their former avocation, but who are now going through some other course of instruction which, with their remaining physical qualities, will enable them to earn a livelihood.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator thinks \$80 a month is not enough for that class of men, I am willing to join with him in giving them what is deemed a sufficient sum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What I am asking for under the evidence is to give them enough to pay their expenses, which is \$20 a month more than is provided in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the sort of pensions that the Government's largess should be confined to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And especially when by helping those men out we are helping them to relieve the Government from any further responsibility for their care and making it possible for them to return to the pursuits of life as valued citizens.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I am in entire sympathy with the statement made by the Senator that we should properly care for those who have received wounds or injuries, and should afford them every opportunity for vocational rehabilitation, but I wish

to ask the Senator what justification he has for the statement that after they have been rehabilitated and after they have received education or training in some profession that will enable them to earn a livelihood, the Government will be relieved for all time of caring for them.

Let me make this further observation. The Senator will remember that we are now passing pension bills and have passed them calling for millions and tens of millions of dollars, and that large amounts have been paid and are still being paid to men who are worth millions and whose earning capacity has never been impaired at all by any injury received. The Senator will remember that there are many lawyers, many merchants, many bankers, men who have been in the Senate of the United States, who fought in the Civil War, and yet who drew large pensions. A man recently died leaving an estate of \$7,000,000, and yet he was a pensioner receiving \$70 or \$80 a month. At one time for many years he held an important position in the Government, from which he received from \$5,000 to \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year. The Senator's experiences will call to his mind numerous cases where men received large pensions, notwithstanding the fact that they were wealthy and were not in need of them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And the Senator from Utah has never heard me open my lips in behalf of them, whether they were Spanish-War veterans or any other war veterans. I have never cast a vote in favor of any of that class of pensions.

Mr. KING. I was interested in knowing why the Senator thought that any person who may be educated now by the Government and relieved from their distressing situation and put in a position where they may earn a competent livelihood, will not in the future, under pension policies which I have no doubt in the world will be forced through the Congress, receive large gratuities and pensions from the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I had no assurance on the subject. I only feel that if they are put in a position where they can follow successfully an occupation, this should be their compensation, and our case is certainly very much stronger, if we brought before us a man with his leg off or his arm off who had made \$150 or \$200 a month before, and who was not now able to make anything, if we could say to him, "We educated you and you now have a profession from which you make as much or more than you did before." We have then a very much stronger case to resist the claims of the men if they were asking for pensions. Those of us who do not believe in the service pensions and do not believe in piling them up in such large quantities will have a far stronger ground of reply than we otherwise would have. I believe that as a matter of investment it will save our Government millions of dollars. Of course the much higher reason is the joy we should all feel to help make these boys in a measure again successful men.

I only intended to speak for a moment. I beg the pardon of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], because I did not intend to inject a speech on some other subject than his pension bill, but this just seemed to be a good chance to say a word for the boys who are injured. I do hope we will dispose of this matter before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator knows the general situation with reference to the bill to which he has referred. It passed the House and has been reported out in the Senate by the committee of which the Senator is a member. I had intended to move to take up that bill, but the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations felt that the matter could be remedied in the deficiency appropriation bill. We have been working on an amendment which has been submitted to the Senator from Georgia, and of which I think he probably does not entirely approve, but if that can not be worked out in some form that will take care of these boys in cases where they should be taken care of, then I hope the Senator from Georgia, if I am not present, will move to take up this bill, although I shall move to take it up before the close of the session. I believe the other way is really better for all concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood, of course, the position of the chairman of our committee. He reported the bill out favorably, and he has been very busy with official work during the past week and has been kept away from the Senate much of the time. He expressed perfect willingness for me in his absence to refer to it. I just thought that this was a proper time to get the matter before those Senators who are here present. Whether it comes up on an appropriation bill or whether we find it goes out of the appropriation bill, one objection would take it out of the appropriation bill, because

it would be legislation upon an appropriation bill. In that event we hope that the House bill, which requires a very simple amendment, will be adopted with an amendment by the Senate and sent back to the House, and there passed and become a law. If it comes up on the appropriation bill, I hope the Senate will broaden the provision so that it will give the \$20 to each of the 33,000 boys.

EXECUTIVE CONFIRMATIONS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, I desire, as in open executive session, to report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the nomination of Lillian P. Witherow, to be postmaster at Lake Providence, La. I am authorized by the committee to report the nomination favorably, and I ask that it be now confirmed and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). Is there any objection to the confirmation in open executive session? The Chair hears none. The nomination is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified thereof.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent to consider as in open executive session the nominations which I send to the desk. There is no opposition to them. They are unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, and I should like to have them acted upon now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be reported.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. As in open executive session from the Committee on the Judiciary the Senator from Minnesota reports the following:

J. Warren Davis, of Trenton, N. J., to be United States circuit judge, third judicial circuit;

J. Warren Davis, of Trenton, N. J. (now United States district judge), to be United States circuit judge, third judicial circuit;

James L. Bodine, of Trenton, N. J. (now United States attorney), to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey;

James E. Carroll, of St. Louis, Mo., to be United States attorney, eastern district of Missouri; and

Elmer H. Geran, of Matawan, N. J., to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask as in open executive session to make a report from the Committee on Commerce relative to the confirmation of Charles Eldred Herring, to be First Assistant Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the confirmation in open executive session? The Chair hears none. Mr. Herring is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified thereof.

Mr. KING. I desire, as in open executive session, to make a report from the Committee on Immigration of Charles L. Hughes, of Pennsylvania, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Philadelphia, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the confirmation in open executive session? The Chair hears none. Mr. Hughes is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified thereof.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I can not help thinking that the Senate is falling into a very slouchy habit if it begins to do executive business in this way. I am going to serve notice that from this date forward, so long as I am a Member of the Senate, we must go into executive session to transact executive business. I shall not object at this time, of course, but I say, here and now, that I shall object hereafter for this reason. Perchance my desk is loaded with similar matters. Perchance the desks of some of the other Senators have the same sort of matter. The first thing we know we will be unable as a body to pursue a course consecutively for five minutes without interruptions of this sort. We ought to take up one thing and dispose of it, and then go to another thing and dispose of it, and not run around and with a forked stick pick up a rag and put it in the basket and run over here and pick up with a forked stick another rag and put it in the basket, and spend all our time jumping from one thing to another. I hope the Senate will not fall into the bad practice of doing executive business in legislative session.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rise to say that I concur most heartily and earnestly in the suggestion of the Senator that we should dispose of one thing at a time, and the one thing that I should like to have disposed of at this time is the pending pension bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I was about to ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of John Skelton Williams as Comptroller of the Treasury, but in view of the remarks of the Senator from Arizona I shall defer doing so.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12530) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] that ample provision should be made to care for those who rendered military or naval service during the great war through which our country has just passed, and who received injuries or are suffering from disabilities incurred therein, and liberal appropriations should be made to afford them every opportunity for vocational training and to prepare them to assume the responsibilities of life. Upon numerous occasions I have urged a policy which would deal generously with those who have been injured, not only in the great World War but in all the wars in which the United States has participated. While I have insisted that those persons who were injured and who suffered disabilities in the line of service should be cared for and that the widows and children of those who lost their lives in their country's service should likewise be liberally cared for, I have not been able to bring my mind to approve of what has been generally denominated mere service pension bills.

The bill before us, in many respects, does not even rise to the dignity of a service pension bill. As I stated a day or two ago during the debate upon this measure, it contains provisions for pensioning deserters, women who have been married many times but who at one time were married to soldiers, women whose marriages to soldiers were bigamous, women who were married more than 40 years after the close of the Civil War and after the date fixed by general law as the limit beyond which Congress would not go in granting pensions to widows of soldiers, men who served less than 90 days and saw no real service and were neither injured nor incurred any disability; and it also contains increases in pension now enjoyed by some who are recipients of mere service pensions.

The amendment which I offered yesterday, which aimed at the elimination from the bill of the items carrying service pensions for men whose names were upon the rolls for less than 90 days, has just been defeated.

The existing law denies service pensions to those who served less than 90 days. The pending bill has within it 65 names where the service was less than 90 days, and, as I stated in arguing for my motion when it was presented, the purpose evidently of this bill is to try the temper of Congress and the country. If in 65 cases we can break down the law which forbids the payment of service pensions to men who have served less than 90 days, we can supersede or repeal it, and at the next session of Congress, without doubt, there will be hundreds if not thousands, of private pension bills, and perhaps a general law proposed to allow service pensions to men who served for 10 days or 20 days or 30 days or any other number of days less than 90. This proposed legislation is experimental; it is a "feeler" to sound public sentiment, and, if not attacked, to be followed by legislation which will carry millions of dollars more in pensions, and grant them to classes heretofore not considered as being entitled to consideration under any principle of justice or patriotism.

I submit that there should be some strong reason advanced to justify this radical departure and this abandonment of accepted laws and standards as a basis for Government pensions. This bill will prove a dangerous and expensive precedent, and will cost the United States tens of millions of dollars.

Mr. President, it has just been stated by the Senator from Colorado that 641,000 of our boys who participated in the recent World War received injuries or incurred disabilities which either incapacitated them wholly or in part for the discharge of their usual vocations in life. What proportion of that vast number will require aid from the Government I am unable to state. Doubtless many of them under any humane and just pension system will be entitled to receive liberal grants from the Treasury of the United States.

The Senator from Colorado has also called attention to the fact that \$340,000,000 will be required annually to meet the requirements of these injured soldiers and sailors. In my opinion, Mr. President, we will be called upon to meet a larger appropriation than the sum named. In addition, there will be the families of a great number who were killed and their dependents, who should receive generous treatment at the hands of the Government, so that it is quite likely the Government will appropriate annually for years to come to those who were injured or suffered disabilities in the Great War and to the families and dependents of the dead from \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000. Of course that excludes service pensions. If that

policy should be adopted, the expenditure would be so huge as to defy determination at this time.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, we appropriated considerably more than \$200,000,000 as Civil War pensions; the sum appropriated to meet the claims for pension, compensation, and so forth, of those who served in the war with Germany amounts to several hundred millions of dollars. It is quite likely, Mr. President, that the United States will be called upon to pay pensions within the next few years, perhaps next year, from \$500,000,000 to \$700,000,000 per annum. I saw a statement a short time ago to the effect that 1 out of every 30 in the United States was drawing a pension. I make the prophecy, Mr. President, that within the next two or three years there will be a pensioner for every three or four wage earners. This will be a burden upon the producer; it will weigh heavily upon the toilers of our land.

It is a fallacy to suppose that the taxes levied and collected are paid by the possessor of what is called capital. In the final analysis the ultimate consumer and the producer must meet the tax demands of the Government. The wage earners in the United States will be carrying upon their backs the great army of pensioners who will fill the land. This inevitable condition which is upon us should prompt Senators to a serious consideration of all measures which call for appropriations from the Treasury of the United States. If I may be pardoned for so saying, I do not believe that any threatened financial cataclysm would lead us to economy in this lurid hour of private and national extravagance.

Then, in addition to the national pension system, there are State pensions, including municipal, and school pensions, which are constantly increasing. Nor must we forget the civil pension system which the United States has now adopted. This will become more formidable each year, and no one can predict what obligations it will entail upon the Government. The farmer, the miner, the producer of wealth, is not the beneficiary of these pension systems. These creators of wealth bear us all upon their shoulders. It is not too much to say that the pension system will prove a drain upon the financial vitality and vigor and upon the resources of the country.

Prosperity does not result from collecting billions from the people, to be distributed among a part or all of them in the form of pensions or gratuities. Indeed, this policy would soon produce stagnation and disaster.

The wealth of the country does not consist so much of houses and lands, banks and railroads; it depends rather upon the production of its people. Wealth is labor translated into material form; and if there is placed upon the broad, bowed shoulders of labor a vast army of pensioners, obviously the prosperity of the Nation will be impaired and our financial progress will be materially retarded.

Of course, there must be some who should be the recipients of the Government's bounty and justly entitled to its consideration. Justice and humanity demand that certain ones be cared for by the Government, and whether the burden be great or small those persons who are justly entitled to pensions should receive them.

Mr. President, I read a few moments ago a statement to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate. It was made by Comrade Burdett, a member of the Grand Army of the Republic, in a discussion of the question of pensions. He said:

I can see no other answer than that it is setting up our patriotism against pay.

He was speaking of service pensions, of the proposal to give a pension to everybody who had his name upon the rolls of the military or the naval branches of the Government.

When Abraham Lincoln—whose name be blessed forever—cried, "To your tents, O Israel!" the roads and the byways were thronged with the feet of them who rushed to the recruiting stations, and thousands were turned away. That was the grandest sight the sun ever shone upon. A nation of gentlemen and patriots, not asking what the pay should be, came rushing to the front. I protest against spoiling that immortal picture by now calling the remnant of that great host again around the money-changers' table to receive a pittance of \$8 a month. This is a great Republic, and if it lives it is to live upon the unpaid patriotism of its sons. And I protest that the Grand Army, last of all, should set an example for future times of seeking to set a money value upon its services.

These eloquent and patriotic words should be an admonition to proper procedure and conduct not only upon the part of those who have a duty to discharge to their country under their oaths of office, but to those who may be tempted to seek largesses and bounties and pensions at the hands of the Government.

Mr. President, I discussed this bill at some length on the 31st of May, and it is not my purpose to again enter into an analysis of its provisions. At that time I directed attention to the fact that there were 65 items in the bill affecting soldiers, or the dependents of soldiers, who saw less than 90 days' service, and to the fact that we were breaking down the law in

granting pensions to them. I moved to eliminate those items from the bill, and four Members of the Senate supported that motion. We have so far succumbed to the spirit of pensions, to this consuming demand for pensions and subsidies and bounties from the Government, that four Senators only support a meritorious proposition which is founded on justice and on existing law.

I confess that, perhaps, I ought not to be surprised at such a proposal receiving but four votes. It is unusual to receive any votes in this august assembly in the interest of economy or in support of measures aimed at reducing the burdens resting upon the people. If an appropriation is proposed that will take thousands and millions and hundreds of millions and billions out of the Treasury, it will command votes and votes to spare. The unanimity with which we approach the Treasury of the United States and put our hands into it is a picture that is delightful, as it shows the beautiful harmony which exists in our midst and binds and ties us together.

Mr. President, our protestations for economy are in vain. They rise to mock us, and to challenge our sincerity, when we affirm our devotion to the principles of economy in the administration of public affairs. There is not such a thing as economy in the national public service. Executive officials are extravagant; legislative branches of the Government are extravagant; and there is no halting this mad rush to secure appropriations from the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has made a series of able speeches regarding the expenditures of public money. His speeches will be noble parts of the contemporaneous history of our times; but he is making his speeches in the wrong forum. He should be talking to the people.

I have been in the Senate 98 months. During that 98 months I have received an average, so my secretaries say, of 100 telegrams a month, and half of them, or 4,400, are dispatches demanding that I vote for this or that appropriation; and, so far as my office force is able to ascertain, we have never received a telegram urging me to vote against an appropriation.

Is there a Senator here who in his lifetime received a telegram or a letter urging him to oppose an appropriation?

Mr. TRAMMELL and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield? And if so, to whom?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the Senator makes a rather pertinent inquiry in regard to protestations against voting for appropriations, and says that no one has responded in the negative. I should like to have the Senator answer the question as to whether he has not received some protestations occasionally where he has voted for appropriations?

Mr. ASHURST. Not that I recall.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say that I have received many, many protests against appropriations.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). To whom does the Senator yield?

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I have finished. I merely wanted to let the Senator know that I have received many protests; and when he said that he did not believe any Senator had, I wanted to set him right.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish we could have order. I can not tell whether this is a personal experience meeting or whether we are discussing a pension bill.

Mr. KING. We are discussing a pension bill, and it has been my pleasure to yield first to the Senator from Arizona. I then yielded to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Tennessee, and I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, since the testimony so far has served only to reflect upon our several constituencies, let me bear witness to the self-denying quality of the people of Illinois; for I have received telegrams from them protesting not only against appropriations but against appropriations to be expended in my own State.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, that is refreshing—

Mr. KING. I yield for a moment.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to say that generally, when a Senator goes home, the people of his State say: "How much did you succeed in getting out of the Treasury for us?" When the people of the United States say to us, "Sir, we shall repudiate

you at the polls because you voted for such appropriations," we will then vote against appropriations. We will cease to be extravagant when the people no longer demand that we be extravagant.

We reflect public sentiment here. I am swamped every day by telegrams from my own State threatening, imploring, pleading that I vote for some appropriation. How do the people of my State come to overwhelm me with demands for appropriations? Departments here are sending out telegrams and letters in the shape of propaganda, saying, "Wire your Senator for this appropriation"; and we reach our desks in the morning and there is a yellow sheaf of telegrams from all parts of our States urging this and that appropriation. The departments and bureaus here have wired them asking them to wire us. I think the Senator knows that that is true.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator, apropos of his last statement, that he mentions an evil so palpable that it calls for correction; and I can assure the Senator that if he and others will support me, it will be corrected. Some time ago I prepared a bill, and shall ask the Senate to consider it at an early date, making it an offense for Federal officials to seek to obtain appropriations in the indirect and corrupt way referred to by the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator will perform a public service if he will do that. Now, while we are on the subject of appropriations, if the Senator will yield to me further, I am only going to take a minute.

This is the people's Government. They seem to want us to spend their money, and we seem to be able to do it; but, I repeat, we will stop squandering public money only when we are rebuked at the polls for squandering public money. So long as there are votes in pensions, pension bills will pass. There are votes in pension bills; hence, we all vote for pensions.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has the faculty—and it is a very happy one—of saying truthful things in a semihumorous way; but, nevertheless, they cut to the quick, as his remarks now have done.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me further?

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

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

Mr. ASHURST. I want here to say that my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] will perform a public service if he succeeds in putting through and galvanizing into law his budget bill. I believe we should have but one committee in Congress to handle the appropriations, one committee in each House.

Bonus for the soldiers? Bonus for the soldiers? Who is going to look 2,000,000 ex-soldiers in the face and say, "No"? Not this Senate—

Mr. THOMAS. Nor any other Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, an honest confession is good for the soul. I shall have to put myself upon a different platform from my distinguished friend from Arizona.

The Senator from Arizona, though, has called attention to one evil, and I have adverted to it upon a former occasion, namely, the propensity of executive agencies of the Government to carry on a propaganda throughout the States to secure Federal appropriations. Mr. President, as an illustration of the plan pursued, let me cite the following: Several months ago, when we were discussing an Agricultural appropriation bill, I opposed an item, and, as I recall, a majority of the Senate voted to strike it from the bill. Within a short time some person in the Agricultural Department communicated with constituents of mine, and I received telegrams criticizing my course.

The executive departments and instrumentalities of the Government seek to extend their authority; they clamor for huge appropriations. The condition of the country and the Treasury do not influence them. During this Congress we have witnessed demands from executive officers for billions of dollars, when they should have asked but for hundreds of millions. Often, in order to get through appropriations desired, officials of an executive branch of the Government will send letters and telegrams to remote parts of the land for the purpose of organizing movements to force Congress to yield to their demands. In this way they debauch the people, exceed their rights, and pervert our form of government. The executive departments are organized for the purpose of executing the law, administering the law, but they are not satisfied with that. They want to make the law. They want Congress to become a rubber stamp, a passive body, to register their wishes and grant their fiscal demands. So long as executive officials do that, and send their emissaries out through the States—as they are doing and have done for years—organizing the people for the purpose

of having them ask and demand appropriations, we will have a condition such as that to which the Senator from Arizona referred.

Mr. President, I hope some measure will be enacted into law that will make it an offense for any executive official, big or little, high or low, Cabinet officer or otherwise, to carry on campaigns throughout the country to compel Congress to appropriate money to place in their hands for expenditure or to increase their power and jurisdiction. It is indecent. It is against the spirit and form of our Government.

Mr. President, the experience of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is regrettable. It is unfortunate that the American people are not at all moments guided by that high sense of civic duty which sooner or later asserts itself and leads them along the paths of safety and righteousness. It is to be regretted that they at times support measures calling for unwise and extravagant and sometimes unauthorized appropriations.

There are numerous and persistent requests made by constituents of Senators and Representatives for appropriations. Unfortunately there are many who sign requests for aid from the Federal Government without due consideration. They do not always appreciate the situation or the effects of compelling the legislation which they urge to be enacted. There are many "busybodies" and some "ne'er-do-wells" who are always finding pretexts for Federal aid, and they carry on extensive campaigns for the purpose of securing support in behalf of unworthy schemes and chimerical and foolish undertakings as well as measures which are wholly without Federal constitutional authority.

But men in public positions should exercise their independent judgments conscientiously and with due regard to the oaths of office, and determine whether the requests should be complied with, and then act courageously and with sincere devotion to their country and the welfare of the people. This is a representative Government; the President himself must observe the oath of office of his high position in harmony with the Constitution of the United States, and supported by a quickened conscience and a patriotic love of country. Judges may not be swayed from their duty or controlled in their judgments by appeals, petitions, or threats.

The legislative branch of the Government is charged with solemn responsibilities. These responsibilities ought not to be shirked, and they can not with honor be abdicated. There should be the utmost consideration shown for the wishes of the people, and when a great issue has been presented for their consideration and they have spoken, their wishes must be carried into effect.

But in my opinion the American people desire good government and expect their Representatives in Congress to support only those measures which find warrant in the fundamental law and which make for the welfare, prosperity, and happiness of all the people. Thoughtlessly, there are many who will give their support to unwise and dangerous policies and urge measures which invade the Treasury of the United States and lead to extravagance and improper and unwise expedients. But Senators and Representatives are in possession of information which is not always available to the people. They are charged with the responsibility of guarding the Constitution, preserving the honor of our country, and defending all of the people of our great land. We should therefore unflinchingly pursue the patriotic, the courageous, and, above all, the right course. In the long run the Senator or Representative who stands for the right, for justice, for the cause of good government, and for legislation which embodies the high principles of equal and exact justice for all and special privileges for none will be vindicated; and he will receive the gratitude of thoughtful, patriotic, and genuine Americans.

The Senator from Arizona has referred to the extravagance of this Republican Congress. Mr. President, by the time we adjourn this Republican Congress will have appropriated more than \$5,000,000,000, and if we remain in session for two weeks more it will amount, in my opinion, to more than \$7,000,000,000; and I make the prophecy now that at the end of the fiscal year 1921 the Republican Congress will have appropriated or incurred liabilities and obligations that will exceed \$7,000,000,000—an amount so stupendous that we can scarcely conceive of its magnitude. Let me say to my Republican friends you came into power in Congress promising economy; you made pledges that inasmuch as the war was over the Government would be speedily placed on a peace basis and a peace budget adopted. You have forgotten your pledges and promises. You are now, day by day, putting your hands into the Treasury and taking out millions that are not needed, thus increasing the burdens of taxation which will be imposed upon the American people.

I wish that upon this side of the aisle the members of the Democratic Party would pursue an uninterrupted course of opposition to the many wasteful and unnecessary appropriations carried by legislation enacted since the 4th of March, 1919.

The passion for Federal aid is so strong that it often influences members of that party which has always stood for economy and efficiency in public affairs. Jefferson, in the early days of this Republic, laid down the maxims which have guided the great party founded by him. At times we have turned away from our immortal teacher and philosopher.

But his influence pervades the people to-day. His voice, not stilled by death, is vibrant in the land, and those who seek the perpetuity of this Republic and the prosperity and freedom of the people are renewing their faith in the principles of democracy and seeking guidance from the creed which will survive so long as men love liberty and justice.

It may be, as the Senator from Arizona says, that this is the wrong forum in which to appeal for economy. He has had 98 months of experience, as I recall his statement, in pleading for economy. My service in this body is limited to three years. I confess that my efforts in behalf of economy have not been very satisfactory, and probably my future efforts will be as ineffective. It is probable Congress will refuse to practice economy and will continue to make stupendous appropriations and maintain heavy burdens of taxes upon the people; but I want to warn Senators—not only Republican Senators but Democratic Senators—that the zenith of prosperity has been reached. With our contracting foreign commerce, with our diminished domestic commerce, quantitatively at least, there is bound to be a subsidence in the earnings of the people and in the taxable revenues of the people.

At the end of the next year, unless the burdens of taxation are materially increased, we will be compelled to resort to a bond issue, and I want to warn Republicans that when they issue bonds in time of peace they will receive a flagellation at the hands of the American people which they will long remember, and which will result, if the next election does not result in continuing in power the Democratic Party, in the restoration to power of that party in all branches of the Government.

But I believe, Mr. President, that the record of the Republican Party during this year is such that when the people are called to vote in November next they will place the Democratic Party in the control of both branches of Congress. And Democrat as I am, if a Democratic Congress failed to give a just and economical administration I would not regret its defeat at the next election. I would rather have a Republican Congress and a Republican administration that is honest and fair and economical and carries out the spirit of the Constitution and observes its mandates than a Democratic administration which departed from the principles of Jefferson, crippled and impaired the integrity of the States, and burdened the people with taxes to be expended in riotous and extravagant excesses.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much interested in the Senator's analysis, and I was wondering just where the people came in. The Senator said that he hoped if the Republican party* are not more economical than the Democrats will come in, and then if the Democrats are not more economical than the Republicans will come in, and then if the Republicans are not more economical than the Democrats may come in. Where do the people come in?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course parties are merely organizations for the purpose of representing and carrying into effect in governmental affairs the will of the people, and if they defy public sentiment, betray the people, and become sinister and corrupt agencies which threaten the stability of the Government and menace the welfare and safety of the people, there will be organized parties which will stand for good government, for economy, for justice, for the preservation of this Republic, which must be a Government of and for and by the people.

I believe in political parties. I have belonged to the Democratic Party ever since I was old enough to understand politics, and yet the older I grow the less partisan I am and the more I apprehend the fact that too often men and women vote because of party labels rather than because of their own honest convictions and their abiding faith in the political principles and practices of the parties to which they give allegiance.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. With the statement which the Senator has just made I most heartily agree, and I believe that most people

who want to be fair, and are intelligent enough to be fair, must agree that the party label, in all parties whichever have existed up to this time, has meant too much. People have been inclined to follow it regardless of what it might really mean. If the Senator is doing as he says he is, and as he gets older paying less attention to party, since he is such a young man now, I have great hopes that in 40 or 50 years from now, if he keeps on in that course, he will have thrown off this awful party spirit which I think sometimes handles the Senator, as well as the rest of us, and he will have reached a point where he will be a great deal more useful than he is now.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Nebraska does not show the same liberal and progressive spirit that I have exhibited.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been at it so much longer and am so much older, I am so far ahead of the Senator on the nonpartisan score, that I can not look back and see him for the dust.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, we are not showing much progress with this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course I respectfully dissent from the Senator from Nebraska, and he will pardon me for being personal, as he has alluded to my votes here. I have watched the Senator's proceedings here, and I have found but very slight indication of an abatement on his part of the strongest attachment and devotion to the Republican Party, with all of its manifest heresies and reactionary propensities. Whether his partisan action has impaired his usefulness as a Senator I leave that for others to determine. I recall that when I had the honor to serve in the House I as often voted with the Republicans as I did with the Democrats; and I recall that since I have been a Member of the Senate I have often voted with my friends upon the other side of the aisle. As a matter of fact, there are few really partisan matters arising in the course of a session, so that many votes find party lines broken or at least not observed.

Let me say, before returning to the bill which is before us, that I believe that the American people will have a new baptism, and then will be purged away much of the political selfishness that has too often been exhibited; they will with patriotic fervor seek to apply the principles of justice and liberty in the administration of the affairs of State and Nation. More and more they will feel that they are the source and fountain of light and power and that they must maintain that fountain incorruptible and undefiled.

They are going to vote for principles and for men, not for mere party labels, and they will do it more in the future than they have ever done in the past. They will call to account more and more all public servants; the public conscience will be quickened, and a passionate desire for good government will be developed. The American people are making progress. Some of us at times are pessimistic. We see the muddy stream, not the pellucid depths of the mighty ocean. The tide of civic righteousness and justice will mount higher as the days go by, and to-morrow will be brighter than to-day, and the coming years will bring more and more of justice and righteousness, until the sun of liberty shall shine for all the world.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. If the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] will permit me, I shall do so, but I shall be governed by his wishes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I had considerable talk with the Senator from Utah, who I knew was opposed to this bill.

Mr. KING. I am ready to submit my amendment now, and I will not yield if the Senator objects.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator said that he wanted to talk about half an hour the other day, but I did not object if he ran into an hour. However, I really want to get a vote upon this bill, and I hope the Senator will allow us to get a vote this afternoon, and that other Senators will wait for these outside matters until we can get a vote.

Mr. KING. I shall be through in a moment. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that I be permitted to yield for one moment to these Senators who desire to make reports.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I want to be accommodating, and I will do so if the Senator from Utah will try to help me out all he can.

Mr. KING. I will be glad to do all I can to aid the Senator. I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to present a report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which I propose to call up and ask to have considered as soon as opportunity pre-

sents itself. I report back favorably the bill (S. 4475) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service.

I desire to say further that I am going to ask for a night session to consider this bill, in order that we may pass upon it before we adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask the Senator if the bill provides for a decrease for fourth-class postmasters? I ask the question for the reason that if it does provide a decrease for fourth-class postmasters, or for any other postal employees, I propose to vote against that provision, and if there should be a night session, I would want a quorum to pass on the committee's recommendation.

Mr. KING. I want to say to my friend from Michigan that I do not think he ought to ask for a night session to-night. This bill is just reported, none of us will have a chance to examine it, and it ought to be printed. We ought to have before us a bill which appropriates millions. I think the Senator ought not to press it with that undue haste. I have no objection to its being brought up to-morrow.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would not think of pressing the bill for consideration at this time if I did not believe that a great majority of the Senate are favorable to action, and that no action can be taken unless we commence at once to consider the bill. I should hope to have the majority of the Senate present. I do not ask that the bill shall be passed without an understanding. It is not a long bill, but it is a bill which we ought to consider before we adjourn, and if we do not commence the consideration of it at once, we are not going to be able to give it that attention which its merits deserve.

I did not intend to inject anything at this time, but I want to say, in answer to the Senator from Mississippi, that there may be some fourth-class postmasters who get a little less salary, a few dollars a year, than they do under existing law; but there will not be over 2,000 out of 44,000. The majority of them get more, and I think the Senator will be convinced that the bill is founded on justice and equity, having in view a classification of salaries which we have never had in the Postal Service, and which means for the betterment of the service and more contentment among the employees. There are some provisions in this bill which seem to deal rather unjustly as compared with others, due to the fact that we granted level bonuses, we granted level emergency increases, without any regard to the offices themselves, or the work which the men did, and in a very few cases in making this adjustment it is possible that a little less salary will be paid to some of the fourth-class postmasters than they receive now. But I repeat that the great majority of them—all, with the exception, possibly, of 2,000—will get more under this bill than they are at present receiving.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator that I am in sympathy with the purpose of the bill, and I want to cooperate with the Senator. I had understood that perhaps the commission had proposed some decreases unintentionally and was in hopes, perhaps, if it did show a decrease either for fourth-class postmasters or other employees, it could be remedied, and that amendments would be offered whereby that situation would be taken care of.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to state to the Senator that I have the same sympathy he has with fourth-class postmasters. I have been working all the forenoon on some kind of a plan, hoping that I might thereby relieve even the exceptional cases. But I submit, Mr. President, it can not be done without throwing out of joint the system which has been adopted by this commission in establishing the salaries, and I think I can convince the Senator that is true.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope so.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am trespassing upon the goodness of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and shall have to object to any further discussion, much as I should like to hear it.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 12530) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, during the discussion yesterday I invited attention to the fact that under existing law those women who were married to soldiers since July 27, 1905, were not beneficiaries of the pension system.

I find in the bill, notwithstanding, as I stated then, that we recently passed the Fuller bill carrying \$65,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that we are appropriating more than \$220,000,000 for the survivors of the Civil War, for persons who were pensioned therein, 65 of whom have contracted marriages since that time; and I am submitting now, Mr. President, a motion to strike from the pending bill those items which indi-

cate that appropriations are made for widows who have been married since July 27, 1905, and I have adopted the same system with respect to this motion as that which I suggested yesterday with respect to the other motion.

Mr. McCUMBER. How many are covered?

Mr. KING. Sixty-five. I have numbered the paragraphs in the bill from 1 to 680, and I submit upon a separate sheet the numbers corresponding with the same numbers, or the numbers carrying those items in the bill, and they run from 2 to 653; that is, No. 2, No. 8, No. 23, and so forth. Without reading them all, I shall submit the list to the Secretary and ask that in reporting the motion due reference be made to the appropriate items in the bill. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. McCUMBER. None at all. I think that greatly facilitates progress.

Mr. KING. So I move to strike out from the bill all those items which are shown by the figures which I send to the desk and which cover the items carrying appropriations for persons who have been married since 1905.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What will be the annual saving to the country if these items are stricken from this bill?

Mr. KING. These particular items?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KING. I am not able to state, but let me say this to my friend, that this is a precedent, just as the other was. The present law denies service pensions to those who served less than 90 days. Of course, if they only served one day and were injured or sustained any disability, they receive a pension, but under the present law, if they receive no injury, if they are not in need of support, if they are suffering from no disability, they may not obtain a pension unless they served 90 days; and yet we have deliberately now changed that law and permit pensions for persons serving less than 90 days. The amount is not very great for these 65 names, but at the next session there may be hundreds and thousands; no one knows.

An evil precedent, the Senator knows as a lawyer, may sometimes disturb not only an industrial system but the system respecting property, and, indeed, it may affect lives. Here is an evil precedent now that we are about to vote upon, to sanctify or to repudiate it.

Mr. KING's amendment was to strike from the bill the items granting pensions to the following persons, married since July 27, 1905:

Charles Francis Schaeffer.
Caroline Delbert.
Anna Wilcox.
Helen F. Wade.
Abbie H. Lewis.
Frances Watches.
Myrtie I. Arnold.
Nancy J. Pier.
Malissie Sands.
Caroline Greenwold.
Annie Myers.
Julia W. Nichols.
Annie M. Kimball.
Martha Gibson.
Angeline Latty.
Flora B. McCain.
Meda E. Dodge.
Margaret Gress.
Rhoda A. Hunnewell.
Adelia M. Whitcomb.
Louesa T. Dillen.
Grace M. Bacon.
Louisa Jane Holmes.
Nancy A. E. Shanklin.
Anna E. Hudson.
Mary E. Martin.
Elizabeth F. Humbert.
Anna Efnor.
Anna Smith.
Bessie M. Trenor.
Julia Agnes Held.
Nancy Bennett.
Eliza L. Sprague.
Mary C. Donley.
Atala F. Allen.
Katherine Hartleff.
Laura Jane Handshy.
Angeline McVickers.
Delia T. Owen.
Anna Jenkins Dennis.
Melissa O. Downs.

Mary F. Russell.
Isabella Holt.
Lydia Lenora Henson.
Margaret Steele.
Angelia Meredith.
Cora A. Trueblood.
Annie J. Page.
Isabella Gruber.
Elizabeth A. Tuttle.
Elizabeth A. Pease.
Harriett Jordan.
George H. Bowman.
Rhoda Button.
Sarah J. Parks.
Elizabeth Burgess.
Eliza McDanel.
Ida McCoy.
Malinda Kinniston.
Flora A. Nelson.
Samantha Hitchcock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. I shall not ask for a record vote for several reasons, but I shall offer another amendment. I offer the following amendment, to strike from the bill certain items, being 170 in number, which, I take it, carry appropriations for some individual, and the numbers of which are found upon the paper which I send to the desk, starting with No. 1 and the last number being 438, and the corresponding number being found in the paragraphs of the bill which I have before me and which I have shown to the Senator from North Dakota.

Let me state that those items cover cases where there is no valid marriage, or bigamous marriages, cases in which the beneficiary under the law is not entitled to a pension.

Mr. KING's amendment was to strike from the bill the items granting pensions to the following persons, on account of illegal marital relations—can not prove legal marriage:

Margaret Yohe.
Addie L. Hubbard.
Ella Thatcher.
Margaret Donahue.
Leonora Stewart.
Elizabeth Moses.
Hannah D. Jelison.
Sarah J. Casler.
Anna Greer.
Julia Shaw.
Rebecca H. Whiteacre.
Linda Whetsel.
Rita Shafges.
Isabel Burge.
Agnes Anderson.
Matilda Lafwell.
Isabella Kelley.
Christie Fish.
Margaret Elkins.
Alice Swinford.
Mary Ann Ellis.
Cora Mitchell.
Katherine Hallbaugh.
Mary T. Barnard.
Fidelia A. Baker-Boyd.
Elizabeth Shaffer.
Mary J. Cooper.
Harriet L. Cobb.
Belle Crisamore.
Lillie C. Marvin.
Louisiana Thompson.
Margery A. Baker.
Elizabeth F. Humbert.
Amanda Burlett.
Anna Hills.
Marinda E. Hayes.
Rebecca B. Tooley.
Eliza C. Spears.
Ella Goodbrand.
Alice McDowell.
Julia A. Loyd.
Mary E. Harding.
Lucretia A. Crum.
Cornelia F. Huckins.
Maria Mellinger.
Margaret M. Tennant.

Mary Redfield.
 Sarah C. Armstrong.
 Catherine Harless.
 Margaret J. Miller.
 Rose E. Wicoff.
 Roberta R. Havelick.
 Martha J. Hilliard.
 Huldah A. Budd.
 Jane E. Wilcox.
 Luella M. Peterson.
 Adell J. Squires.
 Charlotte I. Johnson.
 Harriet J. Woodbury.
 Kitty Rickabaugh.
 Diantha Barnes.
 Ella Ragan.
 Permelia Reeves.
 Alice Benham.
 Amanda A. Osborn.
 Catherine Duncan.
 Effie Dean.
 Sarah J. Sumpter.
 Sarah E. Burkett.
 Lucinda Hollowell.
 Sarah A. Vaughan.
 Kate Bressler.
 Mary E. Thomas.
 Elizabeth May.
 Sarah A. Burgess.
 Mary L. Taylor.
 Emma F. Smyth.
 Elizabeth Weeks.
 Esther A. Van Camp.
 Edith Butler.
 Elizabeth Cravens.
 Isabella Martin.
 Janet Millage.
 Alice H. Bryant.
 Lenora A. Simmons.
 Elizabeth Marlatt.
 Esmeralda C. Adams.
 Hannah C. Ritter.
 Mary M. Gunzulus.
 Mary A. Kimball.
 Margaret A. Kinney.
 Sarah Blackburn.
 Nancy J. Markham.
 Anna M. Amer.
 Lydia A. Gaines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. I do not ask for a division on that amendment either. The two amendments which I have offered I think received probably three or four votes, evincing the profound interest which Senators take in the matter.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ASHURST. How could the Senator expect an amendment to get three or four votes when there are no votes in his amendment? He could not make any votes for the amendment.

Mr. KING. I can not answer the pertinent question of my friend from Arizona. I am trying to save a little money for the Treasury and trying to establish a pension list so far as I can upon a standard of justice.

I now offer another amendment. I move to strike from the bill Nos. 11 to 629, as found upon the list which I send to the desk, the corresponding numbers of which are found in the bill itself. Those items relate to cases where widows have been married, remarried, and remarried again, and who are not, because of the multitudinous marriages, entitled to pensions. I move to strike from the bill those items.

Mr. KING's amendment was to strike from the bill the items granting pensions to the following persons, widows who have remarried one or more times but are pensionable under the present general law:

Elizabeth G. Young.
 Jennie A. Stephens.
 Emma J. De Yoe Bassett.
 Amanada J. Reynolds.
 Annie S. Marsh.
 Carrie Abbott.
 Jennie Schoefeld.
 Elizabeth A. Murphy.
 Mary E. Flint.

Kate C. Kraig.
 Catherine Balthasar.
 Margaret A. Gruilliams.
 Mary A. Strome.
 Mary E. Cleveland.
 Martha Jane Griffin.
 Martha Benefiel.
 Belle Grisamore.
 Julia M. Ferry.
 Mary Holmes.
 Rebecca J. Kohn.
 Jennie Lego.
 Eliza Murphy.
 Anna Boone.
 Mary Ann Fuller.
 Emily Robinson.
 Martha J. Sutherland.
 Susanah Cooper.
 Julia S. Dunne.
 Rebecca J. Kaylor.
 Emma A. Briles.
 Mary S. Frame.
 Minna Bechtold.
 Mary M. Hancock.
 Margaret A. Stobie.
 Laura A. Moore.
 Lucy A. Dodson.
 Mary A. Watts.
 Amanda Trauger.
 Alice G. Donze.
 Caroline Miller.
 Lucy A. Leach.
 Callie B. Boatright.
 Amanda B. Birch.
 Sibria Armstrong.
 Mary F. Lake.
 Frances E. Parmater.
 Diana Lucas.
 Sarah N. Bollinger.
 Eliza C. Ludwig.
 Sadie C. Steadman.
 Mary E. Bowen.
 Lucy J. Sheldon.
 Nancy Cook.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. I am satisfied that I will please my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] by assuring him that I have no further amendments.

The amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and, on a division, was passed.

Mr. TOWNSEND obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment to have certain pension bills indefinitely postponed?

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the following bills be indefinitely postponed:

The bill (H. R. 7657) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

The bill (H. R. 8536) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

The bill (H. R. 9448) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

The bill (H. R. 10107) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

The bill (H. R. 11310) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

The bill (S. 3746) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The bills were postponed indefinitely.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota if there are any other omnibus bills now pending before the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. McCUMBER. There is; and I want to get it up at the present time.

Mr. KING. Another one?

Mr. McCUMBER. Another one; covering not the Civil War but the Regular Establishment. It will take only a few moments.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope the Senator will insist upon the present consideration of that bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to make the motion at this time, but I do not know whom the Chair has recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4475) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service.

Mr. THOMAS. When was the bill reported from the committee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. A few minutes ago. I reported it to the Senate a few minutes ago. It was reported out from the committee yesterday.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope this motion will not be agreed to. I took occasion last night at the evening session to protest against the abuse of the remainder of this session being devoted to passing bills of tremendous importance without due consideration.

This is a bill whose importance I recognize. I know nothing about it except from the hundreds of pounds of propaganda that have reached my office in behalf of it. I have not had time to consider it. None of the Senators here, in my judgment, outside of the members of the committee, have had time to consider it, and now to take up the bill and make it the unfinished business of the Senate for the purpose of rushing it through in the dying hours of this session is, in my judgment, neither wisdom nor good legislation. If it be true, as the Senator says, that the majority of the Senators are in favor of it and ready to push it through, I suppose it will go through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado object?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall have to object at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then it goes over until to-morrow, under the rule.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States was passed.

Mr. KING. Will not the Senator from Iowa consent to take that up to-morrow?

Mr. KENYON. No. The motion was filed to reconsider this bill. It passed the Senate a week ago Monday and the motion was filed either Tuesday or Wednesday. The parties who filed the motion have not tried at all to take it up, which, I suppose, is not customary when a motion is filed to reconsider, and I have been trying for two or three days to get the matter up. I am not willing to wait any longer. I have been waiting to get the bill up, and if it is not taken up now it will probably result in the failure of this relief, where the Senate has once passed it and the House has passed it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I made the motion to reconsider. I told the Senator from Iowa when he first spoke to me about it that I should not object to his taking it up at any time if I did not do so, but the motion was made largely at the request of Senators who know more about the question than I do. In fact, without violating confidence, I may say that I filed it at the instance of one or two other Senators, and perhaps but for their insistence I should not have done so. Consequently I do not feel at liberty to interpose any objection whatever to its consideration.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], I think, would like to be heard upon it, and it would be only fair to take the time to send to the Committee on Appropriations, where, I understand he is hard at work, and apprise him of the fact of the motion to take it up. That is the only suggestion I have to make.

Mr. KENYON. After the motion is taken up, I shall be glad to have a quorum.

Mr. KING. Would the Senator object to making it the unfinished business and taking it up to-morrow?

Mr. KENYON. I think it ought to be disposed of to-day.

Mr. KING. The only reason why I make the suggestion is that I know that several Senators, one of whom, I understand,

is out of the city, desire to make some observations in regard to the matter; at least that is my understanding. I have no objection to its being made the unfinished business to be taken up to-morrow morning, to give them an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator knows the bill will have to go to conference, and that is why it seems to me it should be disposed of. It has not been brought up yet.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to its being made the unfinished business and the Senator can take it up the first thing in the morning, and I will join with him in that effort.

Mr. KENYON. I will not now make any agreement about it. The motion to reconsider has been here for 10 days. If the Senator wants to have it reconsidered, he is welcome to it. It passed the Senate and passed the House and it ought to be disposed of. If the Senator from Utah knows of Senators who are desirous of speaking on it, and if he wishes to speak himself for the purpose of delay, of course, I can not prevent him.

Mr. KING. I can assure the Senator that one of the Senators who spoke to me about it stated that he desired to be heard, and it is one who is very familiar with the subject. Speaking for myself, I know nothing at all about the matter.

Mr. KENYON. I have made the motion, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think any motion is necessary. There is nothing pending before the Senate. A motion has been entered to reconsider the vote whereby House bill 5726 was passed, and the Chair thinks any Senator has a right to call for the submission of that motion to the Senate at any time when some other matter is not before the Senate. The Chair believes that the motion is now before the Senate, if the Senator from Iowa wants it there.

Mr. KENYON. I ask, then, that the motion be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. WARREN entered the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Wyoming is now present.

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	Harding	McCumber	Simmons
Calder	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	New	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
Elkins	Keyes	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	King	Phipps	Warren
Gay	Lenroot	Ransdell	Watson

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. WADSWORTH answered to their names when called.

Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. ROBINSON answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is the motion to reconsider the vote whereby House bill 5726 was passed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not attack the bill altogether because it is called a minimum-wage bill or because of the principle it embodies; but there are reasons why, in my opinion, we ought to consider this subject more fully than we have had an opportunity to do. The bill as it has passed reaches some points, I think, in the ordinary affairs of life which it was not expected and perhaps not intended should be reached. The bill passed the Senate, as I understand, in regular order on the call of the calendar, but I have not yet been able to find a single Senator who knew when it passed; certainly I do not know, for I was not in the Chamber at the time. Probably the few Senators present at the time were occupied with other legislative matters.

Immediately after the passage of the bill I was approached, among others, by the general manager of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, who stated the conditions that the bill would bring about in the various branch homes. The law creating the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, applying originally to Civil War soldiers, but subsequently extended to the veterans of the World War, provides that the soldiers living at the home shall have furnished them board

and clothing and general supplies as a matter of right. The law does not entail on the members of the homes any duties in the way of labor, but, of course, they are supposed to be obedient and to respect the disciplinary rules provided for the institution.

In the Army, as all of those who are familiar with military matters know, the private soldier is not expected to perform manual labor, except in cases of great exigency, and when he labors he can draw extra pay at 50 cents a day for all over 10 days so employed. So in the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers many of the inmates of those homes, men who have defended the country, and many of whom have been wounded and still more of whom have lost their health, do not feel called upon to perform any labor unless they are rewarded therefor. Consequently, the custom has been—and certainly it is a very good one—for the governors of the homes to employ members of the homes to perform very light labor, at, say, \$15 a month, possibly at \$10 a month, running as high, I believe, in some cases as \$20 a month. They perform the light duties that appertain to the home; for instance, the care of the lawn and of the cows and other live stock, and, particularly, in connection with the firing squads, which, unfortunately, are called into rather frequent service to officiate at the burials which so frequently take place at the homes. The men who perform these services have been very happy with the small stipend which they receive, which, as I have said, on the average is \$15 per month. This added to their pensions, and so forth.

I am informed that the bill, if passed in its present form, will be construed by the auditors or comptroller who would be compelled to pass upon it as compelling the Government to pay \$90 to those men, in addition to the living which is provided for them at the homes. It does not strike me that it is the intention, or that it ought to be the intention, at the present time, when we are endeavoring to economize, to provide the minimum wage required by the bill for those men for the light work they are allowed to perform during part of the day. I would not hesitate to provide liberally for the soldiers who have served the country, for those who are decrepit or who have been wounded and are suffering; but I do not think the bill should pass in its present form, under which it may be construed to include, according to the statements of the comptroller or the auditors, the men to whom I have referred.

Passing that for a moment—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Has any estimate been made of the increased cost to the Government from the passage of this measure? Will it increase the annual expenditure for civil-service employees—those in the public service?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know that it will increase in a general way very, very many, but, of course, it does increase those who may be not competent to do a full day's work but who are employed at a lesser sum to do, perhaps, a quarter or a half of the work that an able-bodied person could perform. In the case of such people as that the Government is at liberty, through the heads of its departments, to fix the price of their labor, and not be confined to this minimum, such as forty or fifty dollars, to some who may have responsibilities but who are really unfitted to do other than very light work. Now, it cuts out persons of that kind. It cuts out a great many women—young women and, for that matter, very elderly women—who are unable to perform heavy duties but can satisfactorily perform light duties at a much less wage; and the result will be that all those persons will suffer discharge, and, instead of receiving a benefit, that class of employees will suffer by this legislation which may be of benefit to others.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the Senator willing to state that it will reduce the expenses of the Government?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think it will. It will have the opposite effect.

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

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming that I saw some figures the other day which showed that it increased the expenses of the Government more than \$5,000,000 a year, and that was just the rough estimate of those who were favorable to the bill.

Mr. WARREN. I might have said that those who favor the bill have stated that the expense would be confined to \$5,000,000 annually. It is possible that counting beforehand on the direct expense, that might be true; but the influence of that bill will not only make it cost \$5,000,000 but a great deal more, because

of its effect outside of the Government service, as well as in such service.

Mr. KING. In view of the fact that a reclassification report has been made reclassifying the employees of the Government and recommending their compensation, may I ask the Senator why this measure should be taken up now in advance of the consideration of that general measure?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is a fair question, and requires a fair answer. I think it is entirely out of place at this time, when we are about to take up this reclassification and carry out what has been accomplished along that line, to undertake to pluck out of the hands of the legislators the power of equalizing salaries with the information which has been brought to us by our special Joint Committee of Classification. I think it will mar the general proposition of starting from the bottom and building up to final completion a system of employment which is just and equitable, and which, I believe, will be satisfactory. It is for the very reason that I have been repeatedly compelled, in conducting the appropriation bills, to refuse to entertain an amendment to increase the salaries of men that I believe ought to be increased; but it was not then the time to do it piecemeal, as we have been doing heretofore, and I contended that we should wait and take up this reclassification.

This proposed law is one of the steps that will lead to the same condition that called for the appointment of this commission to bring in a scheme of reclassification. It has run along here for years. This Senator and that would rise in his place and move an increase for somebody that he was acquainted with, and tell of the hardships that that person was enduring, and have his salary increased, and Members of the House would do the same thing, and it instilled into the minds of the employees the idea that it was all a matter of "pull" as to what recognition they should receive. The consequence was that notwithstanding the civil-service law, notwithstanding they had to submit to these examinations, yet in the case of promotions they beset Senators and Members of Congress as before, not exactly on the line that it was all patronage but that it was a question of "pull," nevertheless, as to promotions and increases of salary.

This is not a large minimum. I think probably there will be few salaries, as conditions are now and as we shall proceed with the reclassification, that would go below the minimum that this bill provides for; but to make that straight line, and say that every one below that line must either be paid that amount or quit, so far as the Government is concerned, or else have the Government pay an uncalled-for and unearned bonus, as would be the case in these soldiers' homes, is that which is not expected and that which I believe is not desirable for us to allow.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I only want to say a word about this bill.

This bill passed the House, as I understand, by nearly a unanimous vote. There were 8 votes cast against it. The fundamental of this bill is that the Government shall pay a living wage to those who work for the Government.

When the bill came to the Senate, and came to the Committee on Education and Labor—

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

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator only last night had, I will not say a colloquy, but some exchange of sentiments here on the women's bureau bill. Does the Senator know—and I think he must know—that the mere fact that this bill has passed, and is supposed to be on its way for approval, has caused I do not know how many but a good many women to be discharged from their places and men put in their places?

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator has in mind what is called the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Commission. Congress some time ago passed a bill providing for a commission in the District of Columbia to fix a minimum wage. They have done that, and it is true, as the Senator has said, that many young women who have been working have lost their positions. We are not talking about that, however. That has nothing to do with the bill passed last night.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that perfectly; but I wanted to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that he, like myself, has stood for the rights of women to the extreme in all cases—

Mr. KENYON. I will not say to the extreme. The Senator can speak for himself.

Mr. WARREN. And I presume he does not want to favor legislation that directly affects them in the adverse way that I think this legislation does. For instance, the Senator speaks

of the District of Columbia having a minimum wage. That is a considerably lower wage than this—

Mr. KENYON. That was fixed by the commission.

Mr. WARREN. And yet that is high enough so that it results in the discharge of women and men being put in their places.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; but that is not limited as this bill is limited at all.

Mr. WARREN. I know; it is not limited entirely to the Government.

Mr. KENYON. It is not limited as to age.

Mr. WARREN. But does not the Senator believe that these salaries that are paid here in Washington, surrounded as we are with Government employees, will affect wages all through, outside of the Government service?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not know. I am merely contending about this bill that the Government should pay its employees a living wage, and there are 66,000 employees of the Government who at this time really are not receiving a living wage, according to the testimony before the committee.

I do not know what to do about the matter. I realize, as the Senator from Wyoming does, the expense of all these matters, and if the Congress feels that it can run the Government without paying to its employees wages that they can live on, of course that is the business of the Congress. That, anyway, is the theory of this bill.

The Senate committee provided in the bill which has passed that a bonus should not be included. I think that is a mistake, but I think there was a feeling that it could not pass without that provision, so that the Senate bill does not affect anything like the number of employees that the House bill affects. Then the Senate also raised the age from 18 to 20 years, so that the provisions of the bill will apply only to those persons who shall have attained the age of 20 years. That lessens very much the number that are affected by the bill.

I come now to the point which the Senator from Wyoming made, the question of the old soldiers at some of the soldiers' homes. I always feel like deferring to the Senator's judgment on those matters, but I think in this instance he is in error. Bear in mind that this bill provides that if employed by the hour the pay shall not be less than 37½ cents an hour. I understand that these soldiers now are paid 50 cents a day, and they do not work many hours. There is a proviso to this bill which reads:

Provided further, That in the case of an employee receiving quarters and subsistence—

As in the case of the old soldiers—

In addition to his compensation, the value of such quarters and subsistence shall be determined by the head of the department, and the compensation of such employees, plus the value of quarters and subsistence, shall in no event be less than the rate fixed by this act.

So that in every case where an employee is receiving quarters and subsistence, that is deducted. That is the point which I understood the Senator from Wyoming to make, and I really believe it is entirely covered in that proviso. It will cost more money. There is no doubt about that. You can not increase the pay of employees without its costing money.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I did not pass my own judgment on that. I stated that I had received information from a man who said he had knowledge concerning it, and it seemed reasonable to me from my remembrance of this legislation. I think Gen. Wood had some conversation with the Senator from New York, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, about the conditions. I do not know that the Senator has the papers here.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know how anybody could hold that the parties would be entitled to less than 37½ cents an hour.

Mr. WARREN. They do not work by the hour. They work by the month.

Mr. KENYON. Well, they work so many hours a day.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no. Some days they work all day, and some days they may not work at all.

Mr. KENYON. How many of these persons are there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Two thousand.

Mr. WARREN. About 2,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think I can make the matter clear to the Senator.

I desire to read an extract from a letter which I received from Gen. George W. Wood, chairman of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, which describes the situation which that institution would be in were the Nolan bill to pass without amendment.

I quote from the letter:

If the Senate reconsiders and takes the bill up, it would surely be to the interest of the members of the home, who number over 2,000 of our employees, to have them excluded from the terms of the bill, because, under the last clause of the bill, it is distinctly provided that the

head of a department can consider food and quarters, where granted, as an element in fixing compensation; but with us, our members receive food and quarters, not by virtue of their employment but by virtue of being members of the home; and, therefore, if we were to employ members under the terms of the Nolan bill as passed we would have to pay them the full pay of \$90 per month, giving them, in addition, food, quarters, and clothing, which would practically give them, say, \$130 to \$135 per month.

Most of these men are old Civil War soldiers.

* In addition to all this, many of them receive pensions under the new law of \$50 or \$60 per month.

Now, here is the situation. A member of the home is any soldier who is admitted, his eligibility having been established under the law laid down by Congress. There are nine of these great homes. They have something like 20,000 of these veterans as members living at the homes. They have rights. One of their rights is quarters and subsistence as members, not as employees. The management of each of these homes employ a limited number of them for some of the light work around the reservation. As the Senator from Wyoming said, one of the employments is as a member of the firing squad, rather a sad duty and function to perform. Two or three times a week there is a funeral at each of these homes; some poor old soldier dies and his comrades escort his casket to the cemetery and give him a military funeral, a very pretty and touching ceremony, one which the management of the home sees is carried out with all regard to the proprieties and the solemnities of the occasion. The members of the firing squad are members of the home. They get a little compensation for performing that function. Under the Nolan bill they get \$90 a month for it. They work by the month.

Mr. KENYON. Do they not work by the hour?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; they work by the month, and plus that they get their quarters and subsistence.

Mr. THOMAS. And a pension besides.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And they also receive their ordinary pensions. The pensions do not lapse when men are living at the home. The management of the home fear that if such a cost is piled upon the management of these homes they will in the very nature of things be compelled to go outside of the membership and secure the help of people who will work 8, 10, or 12 hours a day and not take care of some of these old soldiers who can work but are not expected to work perhaps more than 1 hour or 2 or 4 hours a day.

Mr. KENYON. I would like to ask the Senator if the old soldiers themselves desire to be excluded from this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know; but it is obvious that the drafters of the bill did not realize what it was going to do in the old soldiers' homes.

Mr. KENYON. If it will do what the Senator says, I think that is absolutely true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what it does. This comes from the president of the board of managers, Gen. Wood.

Mr. KENYON. I am anxious to know whether they are desirous of being excluded or not.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say whether there has been any action by the organizations in the District of Columbia, but I can say that delegations of old soldiers have called upon me and asked to be excluded from the provisions of the bill. They have called my attention to numerous cases in the District where old soldiers are employed around private homes to care for the lawns and to do the chores around the place. They are receiving about \$50 a month. Many times these old soldiers are given places just out of consideration of the fact that they are old soldiers. Under the bill they will be excluded from taking such employment; and I will say to the Senator that they ask to be excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to read another paragraph from Gen. Wood's letter, which amplifies what I have just read. He continues:

Now, many—the majority—of these positions now filled by members are such as company commanders, company sergeants, headquarters orderlies, firing squad (who several times a week march to the cemetery and fire three volleys over the graves of comrades), and do not require an able-bodied man in any sense of the word, but which are of great help in enabling us to run the home on an economical basis and also give a certain amount of employment to crippled men, thereby rendering them much more contented with the home life and give them a little extra money. All this system is completely wiped out by the terms of the Nolan bill.

I purpose, Mr. President, if the vote to reconsider is adopted, to offer an amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Under the statement made by the Senator from New York, I would not resist the motion to reconsider. I think this matter should be straightened out, and straightened out properly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have an amendment prepared.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. There is one other question. As I understand it, the Home of the Regular Army here in this city is self-supporting. There is no appropriation made at all by the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is another kind of a home. I have not referred to that.

Mr. NELSON. These other homes are supported by public appropriations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are.

Mr. NELSON. The effect of this measure would be to take more money out of the resources of this Regular Army home, and make them pay more than they are now paying out of their own funds, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure that it would, Mr. President. As I understand it, the Soldiers' Home here in the District of Columbia is for the soldiers of the Regular Army only.

Mr. NELSON. It is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And the home is supported by 25 cents a month withdrawn from the pay of soldiers in the Regular Army; or, at least, that used to be the case.

Mr. WARREN. There used to be a draft made on them years ago, but we did away with that because they had a sufficient reserve fund; so that unless the law has been reenacted there is now nothing taken. But this home is in command of a general of the Army, and is a United States establishment. As the Senator from Minnesota says, it supports itself. First there was a gift of the property where it is located, then they received all fines imposed by courts-martial for little misdemeanors in the Regular Army. They all go to that fund. The last provision was, I think, for 10 or 12 cents a month from the pay of Regular Army soldiers—probably it was 25 cents in the first place—but finally we dropped that out, and to my knowledge it has not been since imposed.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct. The resources of the home, aside from the two hundred thousand or so which Gen. Scott brought back from Mexico, have come from the old soldiers of the Regular Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They come from the soldiers on active duty, the soldiers in the Army.

Mr. NELSON. From court-martial fines and a certain monthly deduction. But that deduction from the pay of the men has been obsolete for a good many years, repealed, because they had funds enough. The institution is supported, not by the Federal Government but by the accumulated resources of the old soldiers, which they have furnished themselves.

Mr. WADSWORTH. While they were in the Army.

Mr. NELSON. While they were in the Army.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. Will not the Senator let us act on the motion to reconsider, and then let the Senator from New York offer his amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will be glad to have the motion to reconsider passed. I was just going to say that we ought to reconsider it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill ordered to a third reading and was passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not sure that I have the last print of the bill, but I offer this amendment: On page 2, line 3, after the word "Panama Canal Zone," I move to insert the words "nor to members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers employed at or in connection with the home."

Mr. SMOOT. I would like to add a clause to that so as to exclude the veterans of the Civil War.

Mr. WARREN. Why the veterans of the Civil War alone? Why not the veterans of any war?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how far that would go.

Mr. KENYON. We would not want to exclude the old veterans from the benefits of this act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, I think this bill is of very grave importance. It passed the other day without consideration of this matter, and there are other matters which may be involved that were not considered. I am very much afraid the bill would turn people out of their jobs instead of giving them more money. That is what it amounts to, and I think it ought to be looked into further. I hope it will not be pressed to-night.

Mr. KENYON. No, Mr. President; it will not be pressed to-night. The Senator from New York desires to offer his amendment to-night, and then it will be the unfinished business.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Alabama will admit that the necessity of the amendment I offered is very obvious.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not opposing the Senator's amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I will think this subject over to-night, and see if I can not cover the case of old soldiers who are working in the District for private individuals who would be affected. My attention was called to this matter only night before last, and my informant said to me, "I have an old soldier who works for me. All he does is cut the grass on the lawn and look after the flowers." He said, "Senator SMOOT, if the bill passes, I can not employ that old man any longer." I know the Senator from Iowa would not want to put that old soldier out of his position.

Mr. KENYON. Not at all. I will be very glad to talk to the Senator about it and agree on an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the introduction of this amendment? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 3, after the words "Panama Canal Zone," insert the words "nor to members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers employed at or in connection with said home."

Mr. SMOOT. There are a number of Senators who desire an executive session, and if there is no other business—

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill 11984, to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIAL.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is in the Chamber, and I was going to ask him if he would not call up House bill 13329, to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. I yield to him for the purpose of calling up that bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from North Carolina called my attention to a bill which was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs at its last meeting. It has to do with the transfer of certain surplus material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture; that is, the transfer to come from the War Department.

It seems that under a decision of the auditor or the comptroller or some one who makes decisions and interprets the statute, under the provisions of the bill which passed many months ago authorizing the War Department to turn over to the Agricultural Department machinery useful and valuable in road making—

Mr. SIMMONS. Tractors.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Tractors and mobile repair shops were not deemed to be included, although it was the expectation of the Congress, and certainly of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that a tractor was just as fit to be included in that definition as a traction engine and various other kinds of heavy machinery which are used in road building. This bill passed the House and was referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and was reported from the committee with two amendments. It is that bill for which I ask unanimous consent for present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the same subject matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, and an amendment was offered to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. In the hearings upon that amendment it developed by testimony from officials of the War Department that they did not have tractors now, other than those that they want to use for the Army, and therefore the amendment was not put upon the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill as far as it affected tractors.

I do not know just what the effect of the passage of the bill would be. I would not want it to take tractors away from the War Department that they claim they must keep for the use of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill merely provides for turning over such motor tractors as are now in the possession of the department. Undoubtedly they have some. I think there must be some mistake about that.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it.

Mr. SIMMONS. If they have no surplus machines of this sort the bill would be absolutely ineffective.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how many they have. All I am stating is what was stated before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill provides for the turning over only of such as the Army does not need for its use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13329) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 3, to strike out the word "five" and insert the words "not to exceed five"; in line 4, after the word "parts," to insert the words "not to exceed"; in line 5, page 2, to strike out the words "shop machinery and machine tools and equipment suitable for repairs and rebuilding shops for motor-propelled vehicles"; and on page 3, line 12, to strike out section 4 in the following words:

SEC. 4. That the Department of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to procure or provide suitable and adequate storage facilities for the proper storage and care of all road-building materials, equipment, and supplies transferred to it by the War Department for use in the improvement of highways and roads under the provisions of section 7 of the act approved February 28, 1919, and that the cost of procuring or providing such storage facilities may be paid from any funds available from appropriations heretofore made for the Department of Agriculture.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of Agriculture, under the provisions of section 7 of the act approved February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1920, and for other purposes," for use in the improvement of highways and roads as therein provided, the following war materials, machinery, and equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment as are or may hereafter be found to be surplus and not required for military purposes, to wit: Not to exceed 500 10-ton caterpillar tractors complete with spare parts; not to exceed 200 mobile machine shop units complete with spare parts.

SEC. 2. That freight charges incurred in the transfer of the property provided for in this act shall not be defrayed by the War Department, and if the War Department shall load any of the said property for shipment the expense of said loading shall be reimbursed the War Department by the Department of Agriculture by an adjustment of the appropriations of the two departments: *Provided, however,* That any State receiving any of said property for use in connection with the improvement of public highways shall, as to the property it receives, pay to the Department of Agriculture the amount of 20 per cent of the estimated value of said property as fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture or under his direction, against which sum the said State may set off all freight charges paid by it on the shipment of said property, not to exceed, however, 20 per cent.

SEC. 3. That any State highway department to which is assigned such materials, machinery, and equipment transferred herein to the Department of Agriculture may, in its discretion, arrange for the use of such materials, machinery, and equipment for the purpose of constructing or maintaining public highways, with any State agency or municipal corporation at a fair rental, which shall not be less than the cost of maintenance and repair of said materials, machinery, and equipment. The title to said materials, machinery, and equipment shall be and remain vested in the State for use in the improvement of the public highways, and no such materials, machinery, and equipment in serviceable condition shall be sold or the title to same transferred to any individual, company, copartnership, or corporation.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 1, after the word "Establishment," I move to strike out down to and including the word "and," in line 2, the words proposed to be stricken out being "as are or may hereafter be found to be surplus, and," so that the sentence will read "and equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment not required for military purposes, to wit," and so forth.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator want to make it mandatory that tractors shall be turned over whether the Army needs them or not?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to take away the fiction that I understand has been existing for some time about declaring something to be surplus. This does not make it mandatory. It does not take anything away that is required for military purposes, but it makes it unnecessary to go through the formality of declaring something surplus.

As I understand it, practically this same provision was included in the Army appropriation bill and nothing has ever been done about it, because they do not declare anything to be surplus. My amendment only strikes out the declaring of a surplus, which is only a fiction anyway.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think that would impair the effectiveness of the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I have talked with the Senator's colleague about it, who is not now in the Chamber, and he is very much in favor of the amendment. I have also talked with the author of the bill in the House in regard to it. I have his letter in my hands now.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from New York will accept the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It brings up a rather important matter of policy. It seems to me the War Department should take official action first.

Mr. NORRIS. They would do so if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I doubt it. I think the things should be definitely and officially declared surplus.

Mr. SMOOT. And then divided in the way the War Department decides that they should be distributed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The language "hereafter found to be surplus" has been used in all such bills, and they have declared as surplus millions and millions of dollars worth of material. They have declared surplus \$1,250,000,000 worth, and to my knowledge there are \$600,000,000 worth more on the way to be declared a surplus within the next two or three weeks. I think it should be officially declared surplus, because then you can center upon the War Department the responsibility for saying yes or no, this thing is surplus or it is not.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but they would know exactly how many tractors there were that were surplus, and not take out one to-day and one to-morrow and two next week. The whole number, when it is declared surplus, is known, and then the distribution can be made equitably to all the States, and not allow one State to get all that they may have as surplus.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the language left is only "not required for military purposes" the material could be dribbled out.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but they may not require them to-day for military purposes, and they might take all of them, and then, perhaps in the future, we would have to buy those same machines back.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe this brings the question down to where it is going to be dribbled out, as the Senator from New York suggests. The matter would still remain in the control of the War Department as to what they needed for military purposes. They would pass on that.

Mr. SMOOT. They may not need many of them to-day, and with the wording of the bill as it would be with those words stricken out it would apply to the number of tractors that the War Department needs to-day and that may not be needed at all to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. I submit to the Senator that the same thing might happen if the words "as are or may hereafter be found surplus" were left in the bill. They would declare surplus what existed to-day, and if they decided they did not want to dispose of them they would decide as of to-day probably, but I assume that they would take into consideration the future needs of the Army and what they were going to use them for to-morrow. If they did want them for to-morrow they would still be required for military purposes and they would not turn them over.

Mr. SMOOT. There is quite a difference between the number of tractors that will be required for military purposes and a surplus.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to state that the Member of the House who introduced the bill referred me to the hearings where the evidence is to be found, but I have not had time to read the hearings. However, he states in his letter to me that—

There are 6,800 of five and ten caterpillar tractors in the possession of the War Department which are exposed to the elements and have been in open storage since November, 1918. They are scattered throughout the various camps in all parts of the United States and have not been disposed of because of a contract made by the Hope Manufacturing Co., of Illinois, from whom they were originally purchased, which prevents disposition of the same.

Does the Senator from New York know whether that is true or not? Did the Government make a contract with the manufacturers of these tractors by which they agreed they would not sell them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I never heard of it. I do not know about it.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what this Member of the House said in his letter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a most unusual thing. I never heard of any such contract.

Mr. NORRIS. It is an unusual thing; but the man who writes this is a careful man, and he is one of the men who has been making an investigation on the part of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. But the department has already made disposition of a number of tractors.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, turning them over to the Agricultural Department or to the States, I presume, would not be a violation of the contract; but he says that it ought to be made mandatory, because of that provision in the contract, which probably would cause the War Department not to comply with the request as freely as it otherwise would.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It seems to me that if we follow the bill as reported it will accomplish that very purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I think if these words were out it would help considerably. The Senator is going to be a member of the conference committee. This does not enact it into law. I do

not want to cripple the War Department any more than the Senator does. The Senator will still have it within his control.

I have faith not only in his ability but in his honesty to carry out the wishes of the Senate if he thinks he is able to carry them out. What is the objection to letting the amendment be made in the Senate, and then the conferees can consider it as fully as they see fit; and if they find that this language is necessary, which I do not believe they will—and I think if the Senator investigates it he will agree that it ought to go out—there will be no objection on my part nor, I presume, on the part of any other Senator to having it stricken out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had hoped, let me say in reply to the Senator from Nebraska, that the amendments which the committee inserted in the bill would be concurred in by the House without a conference. They are quite harmless with respect to the purpose of the bill itself. They are simply perfecting, except as to section 4, which we have stricken out, and which, to my mind, is indefensible.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that the 20 per cent provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; section 4, which we strike out, is the section which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to procure and provide suitable and adequate storage facilities for all this material. There is a duplication of storage, and we struck out that section.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will accept this amendment and let it go to conference, and if the amendment is not agreed to there I shall have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. The House may yield on the Senate amendments, and then the Senator from New York could not do a thing.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what the Senator has been saying. In my judgment, the House will not yield, but they will ask for a conference and we will grant it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is this way, let me say to the Senator: I fear his amendment. If it is put in, it is done by the Senate. The Senator from Nebraska says that I will be a member of the conference committee. If so, I shall have to stand up for what the Senate has done. That is why I oppose the amendment now. If the amendment is agreed to, of course the Senate conferees will do their duty.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think the amendment is a dangerous one, as the Senator from New York has stated, because I think if the language sought to be stricken out by the Senator from Nebraska were eliminated from the bill the War Department would have the decision of the question as to how many of these tractors were needed for military purposes, and would have to turn over under the legislation only such as in their judgment were held not to be necessary for military purposes.

However, I think the Senator from New York is probably correct, that the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska might jeopardize the passage of the bill at this session of Congress. I think the House will accept the amendments which the committee has reported, but it may not accept without a conference if the additional amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska is attached to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMERICAN LEGION ENCAMPMENT, VINCENNES, IND.

Mr. NEW. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the American Legion Post, No. 73, Vincennes, Ind., necessary cots for use at the State encampment of the American Legion to be held at Vincennes, Ind., on June 28 and 29, 1920. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I do not think it will require a moment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KENYON. Is House bill 5720 still before the Senate, and if so, will it lose its place if the request of the Senator from Indiana is granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill referred to by the Senator from Iowa has been temporarily laid aside, as the Chair understands.

Mr. KENYON. Was it laid aside as the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate does not take up some other measure and adjourn while such measure is under consideration, the bill of the Senator from Iowa will be the unfinished business.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I will state the facts in connection with the joint resolution reported by me, which has already passed the House. The American Legion of Indiana is to hold its State encampment on the 28th and 29th of June at Vincennes, and the resolution provides for the loaning of cots to the American Legion post there for the accommodation of the men who will attend the encampment. The War Department has the equipment on hand, as it has officially stated, and approves of the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

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

MAGNESITE ORES.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 414, being the bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Washington was not present when the action was taken, but there is a bill before the Senate which has been temporarily laid aside for the various matters which have intervened, and the motion of the Senator would supplant that bill. Is that the Senator's desire?

Mr. POINDEXTER. To what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. KENYON. The motion to reconsider the vote whereby what is known as the minimum-wage bill was passed was agreed to. The bill is before the Senate with an amendment, which has been offered, with the understanding that it shall be taken up to-morrow. I do not want to have that bill displaced, and if the Senate now adjourns or takes a recess it will become the unfinished business.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say that if the magnesite bill is taken up it will give rise to extended discussion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to that; I rather anticipated that it would. My object is to get the bill up.

Mr. KENYON. If that bill goes up the other bill goes down.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, June 3, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1920.

CONSULAR SERVICE.

CLASS 3.

Charles D. Westcott, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be consul of class 3.

Arthur N. Young, of Princeton, N. J., to be consul of class 3.

CLASS 4.

Dana G. Munro, of Princeton, N. J., to be consul of class 4.

Frederic E. Lee, of Hyattsville, Md., to be consul of class 4.

Maurice Parmelee, of New York City, to be consul of class 4.

CLASS 7.

W. M. Parker Mitchell, of Richmond, Va., to be consul of class 7.

Winthrop R. Scott, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be consul of class 7.

Avra M. Warren, of Ellicott City, Md., to be consul of class 7.

Chester W. Davis, of Utica, N. Y., to be consul of class 7.

Monnett B. Davis, of Sterling, Colo., to be consul of class 7.

Renwick S. McNiece, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be consul of class 7.

Herbert O. Williams, of Sacramento, Calif., to be consul of class 7.

Edgar C. Soule, of Dallas, Tex., to be consul of class 7.

William F. Burns, of Evanston, Ill., to be consul of class 7.

John Corrigan, jr., of Atlanta, Ga., to be consul of class 7.

George Orr, of Atlantic City, N. J., to be consul of class 7.

Newton Adams, of Summit, N. J., to be consul of class 7.

Sanford Griffith, of Chicago, Ill., to be consul of class 7.

Philip D. Wesson, of Worcester, Mass., to be consul of class 7.
 Leighton Hope, of Oxford, Miss., to be consul of class 7.
 Robert W. Jones, of Columbia, Mo., to be consul of class 7.
 George J. Crosby, of Phillipsburg, N. J., to be consul of class 7.
 John Douglas Wise, of Warrenton, Va., to be consul of class 7.

Promotions.

CLASS 3.

Carlton Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia, from consul general of class 4 to consul general of class 3.
 William Coffin, of Kentucky, from consul general of class 4 to consul general of class 3.
 Edwin S. Cunningham, of Tennessee, from consul general of class 4 to consul general of class 3.
 David F. Wilber, of New York, from consul general of class 4 to consul general of class 3.
 Evan E. Young, of South Dakota, from consul general of class 4 to consul general of class 3.
 Carl F. Deichman, of Missouri, from consul of class 4 to consul general of class 4.
 George H. Pickerell, of Ohio, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Charles S. Winans, of Michigan, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Arminius T. Haeberle, of Missouri, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Calvin Milton Hitch, of Georgia, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 John E. Kehl, of Ohio, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 William P. Kent, of Virginia, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Hernando de Soto, of California, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 North Winship, of Georgia, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 George E. Chamberlin, of New York, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Roger Culver Tredwell, of Indiana, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Wesley Frost, of Kentucky, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 De Witt C. Poole, jr., of Illinois, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Chester W. Martin, of Michigan, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 Philip Holland, of Tennessee, from consul of class 4 to consul of class 3.
 John Q. Wood, of Hawaii, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Frederick Simpich, of Washington, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Maxwell K. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 William Dawson, of Minnesota, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Edward J. Warton, of Tennessee, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Cornelius Ferris, jr., of Colorado, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Nelson T. Johnson, of Oklahoma, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Henry S. Culver, of Ohio, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Frederick T. F. Dumont, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Otis A. Glazebrook, of New Jersey, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Lewis W. Haskell, of South Carolina, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Douglas Jenkins, of South Carolina, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.
 Claude I. Dawson, of South Carolina, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 3.

CLASS 4.

John K. Caldwell, of Kentucky, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Stuart K. Lupton, of Tennessee, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 William W. Masterson, of Kentucky, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Emil Sauer, of Texas, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.

Jesse B. Jackson, of Ohio, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Wilbur T. Gracey, of California, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Ralph C. Busser, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Joseph E. Haven, of Illinois, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Edwin L. Neville, of Ohio, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 José de Olivares, of Missouri, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 John A. Gamon, of Illinois, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Charles M. Freeman, of New Hampshire, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Harold D. Clum, of New York, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Clarence Carrigan, of California, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Alfred W. Donegan, of Alabama, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Homer M. Byington, of Connecticut, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 W. Roderick Dorsey, of Maryland, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Ross Hazeltine, of Indiana, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Mahlon Fay Perkins, of California, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Leslie A. Davis, of New York, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 David J. D. Myers, of Georgia, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Wallace J. Young, of Illinois, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Graham H. Kemper, of Kentucky, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Ezra M. Lawton, of Ohio, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Tracy Lay, of Alabama, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.
 Harry A. McBride, of Michigan, from consul of class 5 to consul of class 4.

CLASS 5.

Mason Mitchell, of New York, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Benjamin F. Chase, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 John M. Savage, of New Jersey, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Lucien N. Sullivan, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Henry C. A. Damm, of Tennessee, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Claude E. Guyant, of Illinois, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Edward I. Nathan, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Bertil M. Rasmussen, of Iowa, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Henry P. Starrett, of Florida, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Henry M. Wolcott, of New York, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Charles M. Hathaway, jr., of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Henry H. Balch, of Alabama, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Arthur C. Frost, of Massachusetts, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Wilbur Kobliger, of Virginia, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Oscar S. Heizer, of Iowa, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 Theodore Jaeckel, of New York, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.
 James B. Young, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

John K. Davis, of Ohio, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

John R. Putnam, of Oregon, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Walter F. Boyle, of Georgia, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Louis G. Dreyfus, jr., of California, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

John W. Dye, of Minnesota, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Edwin Carl Kemp, of Florida, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Albro L. Burnell, of Maine, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

O. Gaylord Marsh, of Washington, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

George S. Messersmith, of Delaware, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Thomas B. L. Layton, of Louisiana, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Thomas D. Bowman, of Missouri, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Harry Campbell, of Kansas, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Edward A. Dow, of Nebraska, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Charles H. Albrecht, of Pennsylvania, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Addison E. Southard, of Kentucky, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Thornwell Haynes, of Alabama, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Alfred R. Thomson, of Maryland, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Hasell H. Dick, of South Carolina, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

Charles E. Asbury, of Indiana, from consul of class 6 to consul of class 5.

CLASS 6.

William J. Yerby, of Tennessee, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Robertson Honey, of New York, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Henry C. Von Struve, of Texas, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

John J. C. Watson, of Kentucky, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

G. Russell Taggart, of New Jersey, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Bartley F. Yost, of Kansas, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Frank Bohr, of Kansas, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Keith Merrill, of Minnesota, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Leslie E. Reed, of Minnesota, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Hamilton C. Claiborne, of Virginia, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Donald D. Shepard, of the District of Columbia, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

W. Duval Brown, of Virginia, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Dana C. Sycks, of Ohio, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Frank C. Lee, of Colorado, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Ernest L. Ives, of Virginia, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

Charles E. Allen, of Kentucky, from consul of class 7 to consul of class 6.

William H. Hunt, of New York, from consul of class 8 to consul of class 6.

James G. Carter, of Georgia, from consul of class 8 to consul of class 6.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Mrs. Annette Abbott Adams, of San Francisco, Calif. (now United States attorney, northern district of California), to be Assistant Attorney General, vice William L. Frierson, nominated to be Solicitor General.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Theodore B. Hacker, Quartermaster Corps, from May 26, 1920.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors.

Capt. Haskett L. Conner, Medical Corps, from April 6, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edward B. Macon, Medical Corps, from April 27, 1920, subject to examination by law.

Capt. Percy J. Carroll, Medical Corps, from May 10, 1920.

Capt. James V. Falisi, Medical Corps, from May 16, 1920.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Kutz, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Maj. Gilbert A. Youngberg, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1920.

To be majors.

Capt. Donald H. Connolly, Corps of Engineers (General Staff), from June 1, 1920.

Capt. Raymond F. Fowler, Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Lucius Du B. Clay, Corps of Engineers, from February 27, 1920.

First Lieut. Lloyd E. Mielenz, Corps of Engineers, from February 28, 1920.

First Lieut. Pierre A. Agnew, Corps of Engineers, from March 16, 1920.

First Lieut. Alexander M. Neilson, Corps of Engineers, from April 2, 1920.

First Lieut. Hoel S. Bishop, jr., Corps of Engineers, from April 2, 1920.

First Lieut. Charles E. McKee, Corps of Engineers, from April 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Robert H. Elliott, Corps of Engineers, from April 12, 1920.

First Lieut. Samuel D. Sturgis, jr., Corps of Engineers, from April 17, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas H. Nixon, Corps of Engineers, from April 18, 1920.

First Lieut. Anderson T. W. Moore, Corps of Engineers, from April 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Reginald Whitaker, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Eugene M. Caffey, Corps of Engineers, from May 4, 1920.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS (BY PROMOTION) IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

Provisional First Lieut. Leonard B. Gallagher, Corps of Engineers, from May 11, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

Provisional First Lieut. F. Russel Lyons, Corps of Engineers, from May 12, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

Provisional First Lieut. Fernando T. Norcross, Corps of Engineers, from May 25, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

Provisional First Lieut. William N. Thomas, jr., Corps of Engineers, from June 1, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Joseph S. Tate, Cavalry, from April 26, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Arthur M. Harper, Cavalry, from May 5, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. John W. Confer, jr., Cavalry, from May 8, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Herbert N. Schwarzkopf, Cavalry, from May 8, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Robert N. Kunz, Cavalry, from May 8, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Charles S. Kilburn, Cavalry (Signal Corps), from May 11, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Charles R. Johnson, jr., Cavalry, from May 11, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Bertrand Morrow, Cavalry (Ammunition Train), from May 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Wallace J. Redner, Cavalry, from May 21, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Guy H. Doshier, Cavalry, from May 21, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Myer S. Silven, Cavalry, from May 22, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William F. H. Godson, jr., Cavalry, from October 9, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. William L. Barriger, Cavalry, from October 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Fenn, Cavalry (Ordnance Department), from October 13, 1919.

Second Lieut. Elmer Q. Oliphant, Cavalry, from October 13, 1919.

Second Lieut. Jonathan L. Holman, Cavalry, from October 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Francis E. Rundell, Cavalry, from October 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. George B. Hudson, Cavalry, from October 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harry C. Mewshaw, Cavalry, from October 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Peter L. A. Dye, Cavalry, from October 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frank T. Turner, Cavalry, from October 28, 1919.

Second Lieut. George G. Eddy, Cavalry, from October 30, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles E. Morrison, Cavalry, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Christian Knudsen, Cavalry, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Francis B. Valentine, Cavalry, from November 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas T. Thornburgh, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. David A. Taylor, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ronald A. Hicks, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Elmer V. Stansbury, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edwin L. Hogan, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. John C. Hamilton, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Mark Rhoads, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Joseph K. Baker, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Leng, jr., Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Albert W. Johnson, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Willard A. Holbrook, jr., Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. James C. Styron, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Samuel P. Walker, jr., Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Fred G. Sherrill, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Sol M. Lipman, Cavalry, from November 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ira P. Swift, Cavalry, from November 8, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harris F. Scherer, Cavalry, from November 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. James B. Rivers, Cavalry, from November 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harrison H. D. Heiberg, Cavalry, from November 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Paul A. Donnally, Cavalry, from November 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. William W. Jervey, Cavalry, from November 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. William H. Wenstrom, Cavalry, from November 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Hugh B. Waddell, Cavalry, from November 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. James H. Phillips, Cavalry, from November 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. John E. Leahy, Cavalry, from November 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Drury, Cavalry, from November 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Virgil F. Shaw, Cavalry, from November 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Paul A. Noel, Cavalry, from December 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Hugh F. T. Hoffman, Cavalry, from December 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. David S. Holbrook, Cavalry, from December 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. William D. McNair, Cavalry, from December 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. William J. Crowe, Cavalry, from December 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Noble, Cavalry, from December 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Bryan, Cavalry, from December 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. John H. Collier, Cavalry, from December 20, 1919.

Second Lieut. Vincent C. McAlevy, Cavalry, from December 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. George G. Elms, Cavalry, from December 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph F. Stearley, Cavalry, from December 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Donald H. Nelson, Cavalry, from January 5, 1920.

Second Lieut. Horace P. Sampson, Cavalry, from January 5, 1920.

Second Lieut. Dale W. Maher, Cavalry, from January 5, 1920.

Second Lieut. Robert J. Merrick, Cavalry, from January 9, 1920.

Second Lieut. William L. McEnery, Cavalry, from January 10, 1920.

Second Lieut. Martin A. Fennell, Cavalry, from January 11, 1920.

Second Lieut. Albert S. J. Stovall, jr., Cavalry, from January 23, 1920.

Second Lieut. Daniel P. Buckland, Cavalry, from January 24, 1920.

Second Lieut. Fred W. Makinney, jr., Cavalry, from January 25, 1920.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Child, Cavalry, from January 26, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Woodrow W. Woodbridge, Field Artillery, from September 28, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Wilbur C. Carlan, Field Artillery, from October 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Edmund B. Edwards, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1919.

First Lieut. John H. Carriker, Field Artillery, from December 2, 1919.

First Lieut. William G. Gough, Field Artillery, from December 3, 1919.

First Lieut. Azel W. McNeal, Field Artillery, from December 12, 1919.

First Lieut. William B. Wright, jr., Field Artillery, from January 3, 1920.

First Lieut. Wendell L. Beven, Field Artillery, from January 20, 1920.

First Lieut. Richard T. Guthrie, Field Artillery, from January 25, 1920.

First Lieut. Ittai A. Luke, Field Artillery, from February 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Alan A. Campbell, Field Artillery, from February 5, 1920.

First Lieut. Oscar B. Ralls, jr., Field Artillery, from February 11, 1920.

First Lieut. John H. Larkin, Field Artillery, from February 24, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. George J. Downing, Field Artillery, from February 25, 1920.

First Lieut. Wallace W. Crawford, Field Artillery, from March 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Christianity Pickett, Field Artillery, from April 20, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. William H. Barlow, Field Artillery, from September 9, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Ernest C. Norman, Field Artillery, from September 10, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles R. Gildart, Field Artillery, from September 11, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Gerald A. O'Rouark, Field Artillery, from September 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles E. Hixon, Field Artillery, from September 13, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Bryan Evans, Field Artillery, from September 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Francis A. March 3d, Field Artillery, from September 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. John S. Winn, jr., Field Artillery, from September 14, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Roger W. Autry, Field Artillery, from September 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Myrl M. Miller, Field Artillery, from September 16, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Alfred N. Bergman, Field Artillery, from September 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. Stuart M. Bevans, Field Artillery, from September 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. John H. Lewis, jr., Field Artillery, from September 16, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Alfred M. Gruenther, Field Artillery, from September 17, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Benjamin M. Hedrick, Field Artillery, from September 20, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Williston B. Palmer, Field Artillery, from September 20, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Robert G. Gard, Field Artillery, from September 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Herbert M. Jones, Field Artillery, from September 23, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Orville W. Martin, Field Artillery, from September 23, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. John P. Kennedy, Field Artillery, from September 23, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Alexander S. Bennet, Field Artillery, from September 24, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. George S. Price, Field Artillery, from September 25, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Philip S. Lauben, Field Artillery, from September 25, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Wyburn D. Brown, Field Artillery, from September 26, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Robert M. Montague, Field Artillery, from September 27, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Charles P. Jones, Field Artillery, from September 28, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Anthony C. McAuliffe, Field Artillery, from September 29, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Robert L. Johnson, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Albert R. S. Barden, Field Artillery, from October 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Romeo F. Regnier, Field Artillery, from October 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Louis B. Ely, Field Artillery, from October 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Julius E. Slack, Field Artillery, from October 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Bertram F. Hayford, Field Artillery, from October 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Ernest A. Bixby, Field Artillery, from October 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Robert R. Raymond, jr., Field Artillery, from October 4, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Ernest J. Riley, Field Artillery, from October 4, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Thomas B. Hedekin, Field Artillery, from October 6, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Joseph V. Phelps, Field Artillery, from October 7, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Charles N. McFarland, Field Artillery, from October 7, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Charles A. Pyle, Field Artillery, from October 9, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Alexander G. Kirby, Field Artillery, from October 10, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Herbert W. Semmelmeier, Field Artillery, from October 10, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. William W. Barton, Field Artillery, from October 12, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Maurice P. Chadwick, Field Artillery, from October 14, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Foster J. Tate, Field Artillery, from October 15, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Richard T. Bennisson, Field Artillery, from October 15, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Henry J. D. Meyer, Field Artillery, from October 16, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Elton F. Hammond, Field Artillery, from October 19, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Francis G. McGill, Field Artillery, from October 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Oscar A. Saunders, Field Artillery, from October 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. John J. Burns, Field Artillery, from October 25, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Leslie E. Jacoby, Field Artillery, from October 28, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Clarence J. Kanaga, Field Artillery, from November 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Edwin V. Kerr, Field Artillery, from November 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Thomas McGregor, Field Artillery, from November 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. James E. Parker, Field Artillery, from November 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Edward L. Strohbehn, Field Artillery, from November 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Maurice K. Kurtz, Field Artillery, from November 6, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Eugene McGinley, Field Artillery, from November 6, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Augustine F. Shea, Field Artillery, from November 11, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Marion P. Echols, Field Artillery, from November 12, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Francis O. Wood, Field Artillery, from November 14, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Ellis V. Williamson, Field Artillery, from November 14, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. John B. Murphy, Field Artillery, from November 18, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Michael G. Smith, Field Artillery, from November 18, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Henry E. Sanderson, jr., Field Artillery, from November 30, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Hugh G. Elliott, jr., Field Artillery, from November 30, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Douglas A. Olcott, Field Artillery, from November 30, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Walter T. O'Reilly, Field Artillery, from December 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Edward O. Hopkins, Field Artillery, from December 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Urban Niblo, Field Artillery, from December 3, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. John M. Works, Field Artillery, from December 7, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Clarence E. Cotter, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Gordon B. Welch, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Cedric F. Maguire, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Edward E. Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Marshall M. Williams, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from November 11, 1919.

First Lieut. Edward C. Seeds, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 4, 1919.

First Lieut. Edison A. Lynn, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Guy H. Drewry, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Raphael S. Chavin, Coast Artillery Corps (Ordnance Department), from December 15, 1919.

First Lieut. John L. Scott, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Alva F. Englehart, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 20, 1919.

First Lieut. Harold R. Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps (Ammunition Train), from December 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Morris K. Barroll, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Walter W. Warner, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Walter F. Vander Hyden, Coast Artillery Corps (Ordnance Department), from December 29, 1919.

First Lieut. Ira A. Crump, Coast Artillery Corps (Ordnance Department), from December 29, 1919.

First Lieut. Elbert L. Ford, jr., Coast Artillery Corps (Ordnance Department), from December 29, 1919.

First Lieut. James L. Hayden, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1919.

First Lieut. Scott B. Ritchie, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 31, 1919.

First Lieut. George S. Beurket, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Burnett R. Olmsted, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 17, 1920.

First Lieut. Joel G. Holmes, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 17, 1920.

First Lieut. James A. Code, jr., Coast Artillery Corps (Signal Corps), from February 11, 1920.

First Lieut. William Sackville, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Leroy H. Lohmann, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 10, 1920.

First Lieut. Christian G. Foltz, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Aaron Bradshaw, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from April 7, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Harry R. Pierce, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 20, 1920.

First Lieut. Lawrence C. Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Alexander H. Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 22, 1920.

First Lieut. Marvil G. Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 24, 1920.

First Lieut. John R. Nygaard, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 25, 1920.

First Lieut. James L. Keane, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Albert A. Allen, Coast Artillery Corps, from May 7, 1920.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. David H. Whittier, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Clarence E. Burgher, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Walter E. Bullock, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. Rollin F. Risen, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. William I. Allen, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. George R. Burgess, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Paul L. Harter, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Lester DeL. Flory, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Isaac H. Ritchie, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Roy A. Moore, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 22, 1919.

Second Lieut. Hobart Hewett, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Richard T. Rick, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Waldemar S. Broberg, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 28, 1919.

Second Lieut. Nathaniel A. Burnell, 2d, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 28, 1919.

Second Lieut. James L. Harbaugh, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from October 30, 1919.

Second Lieut. Willard G. Wyman, Coast Artillery Corps, from October 30, 1919.

Second Lieut. John L. Whitelaw, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Henry B. Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles F. Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. George W. MacMillan, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Dean Luce, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick B. Dodge, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from November 8, 1919.

Second Lieut. William H. J. Dunham, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Raymond F. Kilroy, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas L. Waters, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles M. Wolff, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 23, 1919.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Crichlow, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. James W. Boyd, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Galen M. Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edgar M. Gregory, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. William R. Bready, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. John C. Hyland, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 7, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas G. Cranford, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edwin R. Samsey, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 9, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Horace Speed, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 10, 1919.

Second Lieut. John H. Madison, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Halvor H. Myrah, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. David B. Latimer, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. Gordon L. Chapline, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 23, 1919.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. William Wallace, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Ferdinand W. Kobbe, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. George L. Byroade, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

Maj. Edward S. Walton, Infantry (Quartermaster Corps), from May 27, 1920.

Maj. Alfred T. Smith, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

Maj. Fred L. Munson, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

To be major.

Capt. Gustave A. Wieser, Infantry, from May 27, 1920.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Hugh P. Schively, Infantry, from January 24, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. John D. Joanidy, Infantry, from January 27, 1920.

First Lieut. Gilmer M. Bell, Infantry, from January 29, 1920.

First Lieut. Roy Sloan, Infantry, from January 31, 1920.

First Lieut. Bryce F. Martin, Infantry, from February 2, 1920.

First Lieut. Glenn D. Hufford, Infantry, from February 6, 1920.

First Lieut. Paul R. Hudson, Infantry, from February 7, 1920.

First Lieut. Ralph Hall, Infantry, from February 11, 1920.

First Lieut. Benjamin H. Hensley, Infantry, from February 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Hawthorne C. Gray, Infantry, from February 21, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald J. Neumuller, Infantry, from February 24, 1920.

First Lieut. Jerome Pickett, Infantry, from February 24, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Lebbeus M. Cornish, Infantry, from February 25, 1920.

First Lieut. William S. Rumbough, Infantry (Signal Corps), from February 26, 1920.

First Lieut. George A. Murray, Infantry, from February 26, 1920.

First Lieut. Joseph E. Young, Infantry, from March 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry T. J. Weishaar, Infantry, from March 7, 1920.

First Lieut. John E. Stullken, Infantry, from March 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Herman H. Meyer, Infantry, from March 9, 1920.

First Lieut. Carleton More, Infantry, from March 11, 1920, subject to examination required by law.

First Lieut. Edward P. Sheppard, Infantry, from March 15, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry J. Matchett, Infantry, from March 19, 1920.
 First Lieut. Vincent S. Burton, Infantry, from March 24, 1920.
 First Lieut. Griffith Wight, Infantry, from March 25, 1920.
 First Lieut. Curtis P. Miller, Infantry, from March 27, 1920.
 First Lieut. John W. Bulger, Infantry, from March 30, 1920.
 First Lieut. Roy W. Voegel, Infantry, from April 5, 1920.
 First Lieut. Vernon L. Burge, Infantry, from April 9, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Simon Fostiak, Infantry, from April 15, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Edwin L. Dittmar, Infantry, from April 16, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Frank M. Child, Infantry, from April 18, 1920.
 First Lieut. Frederic M. Lee, Infantry, from April 20, 1920.
 First Lieut. Hurley E. Fuller, Infantry, from April 21, 1920.
 First Lieut. Larry McHale, Infantry, from April 22, 1920.
 First Lieut. John P. Horan, Infantry, from April 28, 1920.
 First Lieut. Augustus B. O'Connell, Infantry, from May 1, 1920.
 First Lieut. Charles C. Fitzhugh, Infantry, from May 3, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Hiram G. Fry, Infantry, from May 8, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Richard W. Cooksey, Infantry, from May 13, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Edwin W. Grimmer, Infantry, from May 15, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lieut. Frank E. Haskell, Infantry, from May 28, 1920.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Harold W. Gould, Infantry, from October 9, 1919.
 Second Lieut. George B. Barth, Infantry, from October 9, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Harry B. Sherman, Infantry, from October 11, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. John T. Newland, Infantry, from October 12, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Carroll Tye, Infantry, from October 12, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin R. McBride, Infantry, from October 13, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Thomas Q. Donaldson, jr., Infantry, from October 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Philip E. Gallagher, Infantry, from October 16, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Carroll K. Leeper, Infantry, from October 16, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Edward N. Jones, 3d, Infantry, from October 17, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Harold B. Lewis, Infantry, from October 17, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Charles Q. Lifsey, Infantry, from October 17, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Hugh McC. Wilson, jr., Infantry, from October 18, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Dwight T. Francis, Infantry, from October 19, 1919.
 Second Lieut. William N. Davis, Infantry, from October 20, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Dorr Hazlehurst, Infantry, from October 20, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Robert T. Foster, Infantry, from October 20, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Edwin D. Dando, Infantry, from October 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Frederick von H. Kimble, Infantry, from October 22, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Wells, Infantry, from October 23, 1919.
 Second Lieut. William B. Miller, Infantry, from October 25, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Richard C. Babbitt, Infantry, from October 25, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Hammond McD. Monroe, Infantry, from October 25, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John W. Middleton, Infantry, from October 26, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Frank J. Cunningham, Infantry, from October 28, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Edward W. Smith, Infantry, from October 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John B. Sherman, Infantry, from October 29, 1919.

Second Lieut. John J. Breen, Infantry, from October 30, 1919.
 Second Lieut. James A. Kehoe, Infantry, from October 30, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Frederick Pearson, Infantry, from October 30, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Charles F. Colson, Infantry, from October 30, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Donald F. Carroll, Infantry, from November 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Robert A. Schow, Infantry, from November 1, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John H. Stokes, jr., Infantry, from November 1, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Jesse E. Graham, Infantry, from November 1, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Jerome D. Cambre, Infantry, from November 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Burrowes G. Stevens, Infantry, from November 2, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Alexander T. McCone, Infantry, from November 5, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Thomas M. Brinkley, Infantry, from November 5, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John K. Buchanan, Infantry, from November 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Ivins LaR. Browne, Infantry, from November 7, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth W. Leslie, Infantry, from November 7, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Beverly St. G. Tucker, Infantry, from November 10, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Vincent J. Conrad, Infantry, from November 10, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Reginald W. Hubbell, Infantry, from November 11, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John M. Tatum, Infantry, from November 11, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Paul W. Kendall, Infantry, from November 11, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. John F. Farley, Infantry, from November 11, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Moore, jr., Infantry, from November 12, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. James W. Freeman, Infantry, from November 13, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Alexander J. Mackenzie, Infantry, from November 14, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Wiley V. Carter, Infantry, from November 15, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Wilbur E. Dunkelberg, Infantry, from November 15, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. James H. C. Hill, Infantry, from November 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Victor C. Broome, Infantry, from November 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Thomas R. Denny, Infantry, from November 18, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Frank M. Corzeliuss, Infantry, from November 18, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Julius L. Piland, Infantry, from November 18, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Pulsifer, Infantry, from November 18, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Farrin A. Hillard, Infantry, from November 18, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. William J. Mason, Infantry, from November 21, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Elliott Watkins, Infantry, from November 22, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Francis J. Gillespie, Infantry, from November 22, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Jessie L. Gibney, Infantry, from November 23, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Robert H. Vesey, Infantry, from November 24, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Clarence M. Mendenhall, jr., Infantry, from November 24, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Kester L. Hastings, Infantry, from November 25, 1919.
 Second Lieut. George McK. Williamson, jr., Infantry, from November 26, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Howard W. Brimmer, Infantry, from December 1, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Smith, jr., Infantry, from December 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lieut. Albert B. Goodin, Infantry, from December 1, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Walter J. Muller, Infantry, from December 2, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Harry L. Rogers, jr., Infantry, from December 2, 1919.
 Second Lieut. George B. Conrad, Infantry, from December 2, 1919.
 Second Lieut. William S. Murray, Infantry, from December 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Harry Krieger, Infantry, from December 2, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Raymond W. Odor, Infantry, from December 4, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. James C. Welch, Infantry, from December 4, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Miner W. Bonwell, Infantry, from December 4, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. John P. Pence, Infantry, from December 4, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Joseph M. Glasgow, Infantry, from December 5, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Elmer M. Jenkins, Infantry, from December 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. James L. Keasler, Infantry, from December 5, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Rutherford D. McGiffert, Infantry, from December 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Richard B. Wheeler, Infantry, from December 5, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Thomas R. Aaron, Infantry, from December 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Charles L. Gorman, Infantry, from December 5, 1919, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Forrest E. Cookson, Infantry, from December 6, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Carl S. Molitor, Infantry, from December 7, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Harlan N. Hartness, Infantry, from December 9, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Carl Robinson, Infantry, from December 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Ernest M. Brannon, Infantry, from December 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Luther L. Hill, Infantry, from December 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John W. Sheehy, Infantry, from December 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John R. Vance, Infantry, from December 15, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Richard P. Ovenshine, Infantry, from December 16, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Leo C. Paquet, Infantry, from December 16, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Thomas M. Crawford, Infantry, from December 17, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Carlisle V. Allan, Infantry, from December 17, 1919.
 Second Lieut. John E. McCarthy, Infantry, from December 17, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Leander D. Syme, Infantry, from December 19, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Leroy C. Wilson, Infantry, from December 20, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Cyril E. Faine, Infantry, from December 20, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Arthur M. Parsons, Infantry, from December 21, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Harry W. Barrick, Infantry, from December 23, 1919.
 Second Lieut. William T. Van de Graaff, Infantry, from December 23, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Howard R. Perry, jr., Infantry, from December 24, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Edwin H. Young, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Nathan A. Smith, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Gerald St. C. Mickle, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Farrar, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Walter S. Winn, jr., Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Edward H. Bowes, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edwin M. Sutherland, Infantry, from December 29, 1919.
 Second Lieut. Joseph A. Holly, Infantry, from January 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Robert F. Carter, Infantry, from January 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Nathan F. Twining, Infantry, from January 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. L. Hoyt Rockafellow, Infantry, from January 5, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Percy E. Hunt, Infantry, from January 5, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Roland W. McNamee, Infantry, from January 8, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John C. Raaen, Infantry, from January 8, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Winfred G. Skelton, Infantry, from January 8, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Lambert B. Cain, Infantry, from January 9, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Edmund B. Sebree, Infantry, from January 11, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Ignatius L. Donnelly, Infantry, from January 12, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Merritt B. Booth, Infantry, from January 12, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Raymond C. Barlow, Infantry, from January 12, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Frank G. Davis, Infantry, from January 12, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Emmett J. Bean, Infantry, from January 13, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Donald A. Fay, Infantry, from January 13, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth Pierce, Infantry, from January 13, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John Endler, Infantry, from January 13, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John D. Armstrong, Infantry, from January 15, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John V. Domminey, Infantry, from January 15, 1920.
 Second Lieut. James V. Cole, Infantry, from January 15, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Ralph B. Kindley, Infantry, from January 15, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John A. Bruckner, jr., Infantry, from January 16, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Clarence A. Frank, Infantry, from January 21, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Clarkson D. McNary, Infantry, from January 21, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Bernard A. Byrne, jr., Infantry, from January 21, 1920.
 Second Lieut. George L. Dillaway, jr., Infantry, from January 23, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Warren W. Christian, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Robert B. Hutchins, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph W. Kullman, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. George D. Rogers, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Landon G. Daniel, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Irvin Alexander, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. George E. Bruner, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Thomas H. Dameron, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Roger S. Evarts, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Kenneth S. Olson, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Robert M. Springer, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Russell J. Nelson, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Simon Foss, Infantry, from January 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Edward M. Starr, Infantry, from January 25, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph S. Bradley, Infantry, from January 26, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Arthur L. Moore, Infantry, from January 28, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Ralph H. Bassett, Infantry, from January 28, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harold A. Brown, Infantry, from February 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Donald C. Hardin, Infantry, from February 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Wayne C. Zimmerman, Infantry, from February 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John T. Keeley, Infantry, from February 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph C. Odell, Infantry, from February 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Josiah T. Dalbey, Infantry, from February 2, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Logan O. Shutt, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Stuart Little, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Hilton E. Heineke, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John F. Lavagnino, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Royal W. Park, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Philip McI. Whitney, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Christopher Hildebrand, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph H. Warren, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John D. Frederick, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Richard R. Coursey, Infantry, from February 3, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Dwight L. Adams, Infantry, from February 4, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Lester G. Degnan, Infantry, from February 4, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Henry B. Sheets, Infantry, from February 5, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Archie W. Cooley, Infantry, from February 8, 1920.
 Second Lieut. William R. McMaster, Infantry, from February 8, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Paul R. Carl, Infantry, from February 8, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Cornelius E. O'Connor, Infantry, from February 10, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Joseph A. Cranston, jr., Infantry, from February 11, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Maurice L. Rosenthal, Infantry, from February 12, 1920, subject to examination required by law.
 Second Lieut. Willard L. Isaacs, Infantry, from February 12, 1920.
 Second Lieut. William B. Kean, jr., Infantry, from February 14, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Harold R. Emery, Infantry, from February 16, 1920.
 Second Lieut. David S. McLean, Infantry, from February 17, 1920.
 Second Lieut. William J. Moroney, Infantry, from February 18, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Russell L. Williamson, Infantry, from February 19, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Howard D. Johnston, Infantry, from February 20, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Franklin L. Rash, Infantry, from February 20, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Edgar H. Snodgrass, Infantry, from February 20, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Claude D. Ferenbaugh, Infantry, from February 21, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Adna C. Hamilton, Infantry, from February 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Harold S. Ruth, Infantry, from February 24, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Sterling E. Whitesides, jr., Infantry, from February 25, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Lewis S. Sorley, jr., Infantry, from February 26, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Infantry, from February 27, 1920.
 Second Lieut. John L. Denny, Infantry, from February 27, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Roswell B. Hart, Infantry, from February 28, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Herbert J. Riess, Infantry, from February 29, 1920.

Second Lieut. Henry I. Szymanski, Infantry, from March 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Ulric L. Fomby, Infantry, from March 1, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Frederick B. Porter, Infantry, from March 2, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Bryan S. Halter, Infantry, from March 2, 1920.
 Second Lieut. Hughes Steele, Infantry, from March 2, 1920.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

James B. Harwic to be postmaster at Midland City, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.
 Sophie Harris to be postmaster at Childersburg, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.
 Walter Gaines to be postmaster at Wetumpka, Ala., in place of M. E. Cain, resigned.
 Otis O. Bayles to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ala., in place of S. M. Roberts, resigned.
 William C. Starnes to be postmaster at Lanett, Ala., in place of D. M. Swint, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.
 James W. Snipes to be postmaster at Florala, Ala., in place of M. A. George, jr., resigned.
 William W. Perry to be postmaster at West Blocton, Ala., in place of W. W. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.
 Sidney A. Borom to be postmaster at Hurtsboro, Ala., in place of S. A. Borom. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.
 James F. Manley to be postmaster at Citronville, Ala., in place of J. F. Manley. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.
 James F. Hodge to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ala., in place of J. F. Hodge. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.
 Hortense Rowe to be postmaster at Camp Hill, Ala., in place of Hortense Rowe. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.
 Ernest A. Townsend to be postmaster at Tuscaloosa, Ala., in place of S. F. Clabaugh, resigned.
 Rush S. Hickman to be postmaster at Ensley, Ala., in place of D. F. Sugg, resigned.
 Oscar Sheffield to be postmaster at Pine Hill, Ala., in place of Oscar Sheffield. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

ALASKA.

William E. Root to be postmaster at Seward, Alaska, in place of W. E. Root. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.
 Martin Conway to be postmaster at Skagway, Alaska, in place of Martin Conway. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.
 Zina M. Bradford to be postmaster at Juneau, Alaska, in place of Z. M. Bradford. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.
 Charles H. Scheffler to be postmaster at Cordova, Alaska, in place of C. H. Scheffler. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

ARIZONA.

Ethel M. Lacy to be postmaster at Gilbert, Ariz. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.
 Otellia E. Buchanan to be postmaster at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., in place of I. E. Carty, deceased.
 Hugh E. Laird to be postmaster at Tempe, Ariz., in place of H. E. Laird. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.
 Charles Metcalfe to be postmaster at Kingman, Ariz., in place of Charles Metcalfe. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.
 Lannes L. Ferrall to be postmaster at Grand Canyon, Ariz., in place of L. L. Ferrall. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.
 Milville C. Hankins to be postmaster at Douglas, Ariz., in place of M. C. Hankins. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.
 William B. Kelly to be postmaster at Clifton, Ariz., in place of W. B. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

ARKANSAS.

Roy Wilson to be postmaster at Tyronza, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.
 Bertha E. Millian to be postmaster at Lexa, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.
 Lulu Brown to be postmaster at Stephens, Ark., in place of Fred Smith, resigned.
 John W. Pinnell to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark., in place of J. W. Pinnell. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Whitley L. Jarman to be postmaster at Helena, Ark., in place of W. L. Jarman. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

Red Thomas to be postmaster at Fordyce, Ark., in place of Red Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Isham V. Echols to be postmaster at Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of I. V. Echols. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1920.

Logan Ruppel to be postmaster at Truman, Ark., in place of L. N. Douglas, removed.

Stephen I. Garrett to be postmaster at Altheimer, Ark., in place of Anne Patton, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Edna M. Sheridan to be postmaster at Montrie, Calif. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Charles C. Taylor to be postmaster at Kernville, Calif. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Nell M. Ellis to be postmaster at El Segundo, Calif. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Eileen J. Shrieve to be postmaster at Engelmine, Calif. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Harry E. Meyers to be postmaster at Yuba City, Calif., in place of H. E. Meyers. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Earle R. Hawley to be postmaster at Stockton, Calif., in place of L. F. Kuhn, resigned.

Ora A. Woods to be postmaster at Winters, Calif., in place of O. A. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Isidore J. Proulx to be postmaster at Willows, Calif., in place of I. J. Proulx. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Virginia Mason to be postmaster at Suisun City, Calif., in place of Virginia Mason. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Mary G. Mails to be postmaster at San Quentin, Calif., in place of M. G. Mails. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

John J. McGrath to be postmaster at San Mateo, Calif., in place of J. J. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Ernest R. Rhymes to be postmaster at Sanitarium, Calif., in place of E. R. Rhymes. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Louis P. Miller to be postmaster at Rio Vista, Calif., in place of L. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Edgar J. Murphy to be postmaster at Redondo Beach, Calif., in place of E. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William H. Kelly to be postmaster at Palo Alto, Calif., in place of W. H. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John B. Barnard to be postmaster at Niles, Calif., in place of J. B. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Richard L. Dixon to be postmaster at Newman, Calif., in place of R. L. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Lee Darneal to be postmaster at Los Gatos, Calif., in place of Lee Darneal. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Michael G. Gallagher to be postmaster at Livermore, Calif., in place of M. G. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

John E. Nolan to be postmaster at Jamestown, Calif., in place of J. E. Nolan. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Merton Blackford to be postmaster at Fullerton, Calif., in place of Merton Blackford. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Fleming J. Mathews to be postmaster at Fort Jones, Calif., in place of F. J. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John H. Bacon to be postmaster at Fellows, Calif., in place of J. H. Bacon. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Cary D. McNeil to be postmaster at Corona, Calif., in place of C. D. McNeil. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Joseph C. Beard to be postmaster at Burlingame, Calif., in place of J. C. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Rufus A. Berry to be postmaster at Berkeley, Calif., in place of R. A. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Ralph Cole to be postmaster at Ross, Calif., in place of L. E. Green, resigned. Office became presidential October 3, 1918.

George W. Nygren to be postmaster at Parlier, Calif., in place of C. E. Tabler, deceased.

Melissa B. Wilson to be postmaster at Dixon, Calif., in place of G. E. McElroy, resigned.

Arthur F. Donaldson to be postmaster at Byron, Calif., in place of May Lent, resigned.

George B. Morgridge to be postmaster at Sierra Madre, Calif., in place of G. B. Morgridge. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Edward M. Drury to be postmaster at Fowler, Calif., in place of E. M. Drury. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Charles F. Evers to be postmaster at Fortuna, Calif., in place of C. F. Evers. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

COLORADO.

Edna A. Gates to be postmaster at Sedgwick, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Andreita M. Vigil to be postmaster at Trinidad, Colo., in place of A. M. Vigil. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James L. Allison to be postmaster at Woodmen, Colo., in place of J. A. Rutledge, resigned.

William E. King to be postmaster at Sterling, Colo., in place of W. E. King. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Stephen P. Ilgenfritz to be postmaster at Ordway, Colo., in place of S. P. Ilgenfritz. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Llewellyn F. Allen to be postmaster at Littleton, Colo., in place of L. F. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Rhoda J. Yersin to be postmaster at Burlington, Colo., in place of R. J. Yersin. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Thomas J. Chancellor to be postmaster at Brighton, Colo., in place of T. J. Chancellor. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John O. Miller to be postmaster at Boulder, Colo., in place of J. O. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Walter E. Rogers to be postmaster at Berthoud, Colo., in place of W. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Charles V. Engert to be postmaster at Lyons, Colo., in place of M. J. Scanlon, resigned.

Nellie E. Pyles to be postmaster at Fountain, Colo., in place of L. T. Core, resigned.

Anna C. Miller to be postmaster at Crested Butte, Colo., in place of A. J. Horan, deceased.

Irving P. Beckett to be postmaster at Craig, Colo., in place of V. C. Ledford, resigned.

Jerry F. Halloran to be postmaster at Victor, Colo., in place of J. F. Halloran. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

CONNECTICUT.

John F. Oates to be postmaster at Windsor Locks, Conn., in place of J. F. Oates. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Harry W. Crane to be postmaster at Wethersfield, Conn., in place of H. W. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Robert D. Burns to be postmaster at Saybrook, Conn., in place of R. D. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

George Forster to be postmaster at Rockville, Conn., in place of George Forster. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Willis S. Gilbert to be postmaster at Ridgefield, Conn., in place of W. S. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Clarence L. Clark to be postmaster at Lyme, Conn., in place of C. L. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Nelson M. Watson to be postmaster at Kent, Conn., in place of N. M. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Daniel F. Finn to be postmaster at Jewett City, Conn., in place of D. F. Finn. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Edward B. Sullivan to be postmaster at Guilford, Conn., in place of E. B. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James F. Holden to be postmaster at Forestville, Conn., in place of J. F. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James W. Green to be postmaster at Eagleville, Conn., in place of J. W. Green. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1920.

Patrick L. Shea to be postmaster at Derby, Conn., in place of P. L. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Daniel J. Kelley to be postmaster at Deep River, Conn., in place of D. J. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William A. Hayes to be postmaster at Bristol, Conn., in place of W. A. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George W. Fairgrieve to be postmaster at Bantam, Conn., in place of G. W. Fairgrieve. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John G. St. Ruth to be postmaster at Windsor, Conn., in place of J. G. St. Ruth. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1920.

FLORIDA.

George W. Brown to be postmaster at New Smyrna, Fla., in place of G. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Richard J. Mays to be postmaster at Monticello, Fla., in place of R. J. Mays. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Ernest C. Mahaffey to be postmaster at Quincy, Fla., in place of R. E. L. McFarlin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1919.

Rex Holley to be postmaster at Lake Worth, Fla., in place of A. A. Jones, resigned.

GEORGIA.

Edward B. Oxford to be postmaster at Rutledge, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Henry C. Hays to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

May S. Holmes to be postmaster at Culloden, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Leland H. Williams to be postmaster at Collegepark, Ga., in place of M. E. Hogan, resigned.

Commodore D. Stewart to be postmaster at Buchanan, Ga., in place of H. S. McCalman, resigned. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Julian G. Hicks to be postmaster at Reynolds, Ga., in place of J. G. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Anna C. Williams to be postmaster at Lumpkin, Ga., in place of A. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John H. Boone to be postmaster at Hazlehurst, Ga., in place of J. H. Boone. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Thomas B. Banks to be postmaster at Grantville, Ga., in place of T. B. Banks. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Mary A. Rudisill to be postmaster at Forsyth, Ga., in place of M. A. Rudisill. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Paul Latimer to be postmaster at Fairburn, Ga., in place of P. Latimer. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1920.

William E. Dunham to be postmaster at Cochran, Ga., in place of W. E. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Sam M. Barnett to be postmaster at Chatsworth, Ga., in place of S. M. Barnett. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Stephen B. Pace to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ga., in place of S. B. Pace. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1920.

Mattie N. Riley to be postmaster at Butler, Ga., in place of M. N. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Louis J. Leavy, jr., to be postmaster at Brunswick, Ga., in place of L. J. Leavy, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Lonnie E. Sweat to be postmaster at Blackshear, Ga., in place of L. E. Sweat. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Dan A. McMillan to be postmaster at Bartow, Ga., in place of D. A. McMillan. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

James L. Brooks to be postmaster at Austell, Ga., in place of J. L. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

James P. McGriff to be postmaster at Hawkinsville, Ga., in place of R. D. Brown, resigned.

John B. Crawford to be postmaster at Cairo, Ga., in place of J. B. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Robert M. Edge to be postmaster at Jasper, Ga., in place of N. L. Pressley. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

HAWAII.

William E. Smith to be postmaster at Koloa, Hawaii. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

William C. Irwin to be postmaster at Waialua, Hawaii, in place of W. C. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

IDAHO.

Charles E. Mitchell to be postmaster at Wilder, Idaho. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Floyd E. Reynolds to be postmaster at Richfield, Idaho, in place of K. G. Phelps, resigned.

Richard A. McDonald to be postmaster at Bovill, Idaho, in place of Arno Albrecht, resigned.

Frank Dvorak to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Idaho, in place of Georgia Toner, resigned.

Milo P. Strecker to be postmaster at Stites, Idaho, in place of M. P. Strecker. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Ole P. Jensen to be postmaster at Shelley, Idaho, in place of O. P. Jensen. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Don C. D. Moore to be postmaster at Sandpoint, Idaho, in place of D. C. D. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Josephine Ervin to be postmaster at Mullan, Idaho, in place of J. Ervin. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

John F. Brown to be postmaster at Kendrick, Idaho, in place of J. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Christopher O. Dice to be postmaster at Glens Ferry, Idaho, in place of C. O. Dice. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Samuel D. Riggs to be postmaster at Emmett, Idaho, in place of S. D. Riggs. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William Laurensen to be postmaster at Downey, Idaho, in place of W. Laurensen. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Willis M. Sears to be postmaster at Albion, Idaho, in place of W. M. Sears. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Albert E. White to be postmaster at Payette, Idaho, in place of E. T. Bowman, resigned.

George C. Jacobsen to be postmaster at Nampa, Idaho, in place of H. E. King, resigned.

David O. Castater to be postmaster at Parma, Idaho, in place of D. O. Castater. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

ILLINOIS.

William L. South to be postmaster at Hammond, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Henry S. Rolwing to be postmaster at Thebes, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Timothy B. Lyons to be postmaster at Winchester, Ill., in place of T. B. Lyons. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Charles J. Paar to be postmaster at Warsaw, Ill., in place of C. J. Paar. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Kate M. Weis to be postmaster at Teutopolis, Ill., in place of K. M. Weis. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Edward Streng to be postmaster at Stewardson, Ill., in place of E. Streng. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Elmer Lummis to be postmaster at Quincy, Ill., in place of E. Lummis. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

W. Carroll Bush, jr., to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Ill., in place of W. C. Bush, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

H. Bruce Shroyer to be postmaster at New Windsor, Ill., in place of H. B. Shroyer. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Edward C. Fahy to be postmaster at New Berlin, Ill., in place of E. C. Fahy. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Herman J. Hemann to be postmaster at New Baden, Ill., in place of H. J. Hemann. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Charles F. McHenry to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ill., in place of C. F. McHenry. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Joseph W. Davis to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Ill., in place of J. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Willis M. Humphreys to be postmaster at Alexis, Ill., in place of W. M. Humphreys. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Eber C. Burkett to be postmaster at Xenia, Ill., in place of J. H. Henson, resigned.

Laura A. Gregory to be postmaster at Willisville, Ill., in place of G. C. Gregory, deceased.

Henry H. Pierce to be postmaster at Royaltown, Ill., in place of G. M. Martin, declined.

Francis A. Thomure to be postmaster at Livingston, Ill., in place of J. W. Donaldson, deceased.

Lottie M. Jones to be postmaster at Antioch, Ill., in place of F. B. Huber, resigned.

Edward P. Devine to be postmaster at Somonauk, Ill., in place of E. P. Devine. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Sarah McGinnis to be postmaster of Shabbona, Ill., in place of Sarah McGinnis. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

John F. Knight to be postmaster at Sandoval, Ill., in place of J. F. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Richard J. Marlaire to be postmaster at St. Anne, Ill., in place of R. J. Marlaire. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

William W. Sloan to be postmaster at Rockton, Ill., in place of W. W. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Nathaniel J. Highsmith to be postmaster at Robinson, Ill., in place of N. J. Highsmith. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

Albert Schrieber to be postmaster at Red Bud, Ill., in place of Albert Schrieber. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William T. Clopper to be postmaster at Polo, Ill., in place of W. T. Clopper. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

James L. Mishler to be postmaster at Pearl City, Ill., in place of J. L. Mishler. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Thomas P. McCann to be postmaster at Oglesby, Ill., in place of T. P. McCann. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

John M. Sheets to be postmaster at Oblong, Ill., in place of J. M. Sheets. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Peter J. Yentes to be postmaster at Morton, Ill., in place of P. J. Yentes. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Calvin D. Miller to be postmaster at Milledgeville, Ill., in place of C. D. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Louis Wolter to be postmaster at Marissa, Ill., in place of Louis Wolter. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William G. Wack to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ill., in place of W. G. Wack. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Thomas J. Walsh to be postmaster at McHenry, Ill., in place of T. J. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Joseph H. Mulligan to be postmaster at Kewanee, Ill., in place of J. H. Mulligan. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Robert L. Downing to be postmaster at Joy, Ill., in place of R. L. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Albert P. Ferguson to be postmaster at Griggsville, Ill., in place of A. P. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Pearl A. Hollingsworth to be postmaster at Fisher, Ill., in place of P. A. Hollingsworth. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Joseph H. Wagoner to be postmaster at Glenellyn, Ill., in place of J. H. Wagoner. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1920.

Bert J. Ritson to be postmaster at Farmington, Ill., in place of B. J. Ritson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Alexander L. White to be postmaster at Fairmount, Ill., in place of A. L. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Robert W. Perkins to be postmaster at Erie, Ill., in place of R. W. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Max Geisenhoner to be postmaster at East Dubuque, Ill., in place of Max Geisenhoner. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Albert Hilboldt to be postmaster at Dongola, Ill., in place of A. W. Hilboldt. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Jesse J. Wesse to be postmaster at Dalton, Ill., in place of J. J. Wesse. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

James E. Simpson to be postmaster at Collinsville, Ill., in place of J. E. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

James Wyatt to be postmaster at Chrisman, Ill., in place of James Wyatt. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Frank Johnston to be postmaster at Charleston, Ill., in place of F. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

James H. Bumsted to be postmaster at Carpentersville, Ill., in place of J. H. Bumsted. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1920.

John Dooley to be postmaster at Belvidere, Ill., in place of J. Dooley. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

William Campbell to be postmaster at Athens, Ill., in place of W. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

William H. Smith to be postmaster at Apple River, Ill., in place of W. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Fay L. Quilter to be postmaster at Walnut, Ill., in place of H. M. Oakford, resigned.

Ralph C. Waters to be postmaster at Newman, Ill., in place of J. T. Hinds, resigned.

Charles H. James to be postmaster at Meredosia, Ill., in place of C. J. Schmitt, resigned.

James R. Lewis to be postmaster at Mazon, Ill., in place of D. S. Small, resigned.

Nora M. Aull to be postmaster at Kincaid, Ill., in place of I. J. Aull, resigned.

Robert W. Briscoe to be postmaster at Kansas, Ill., in place of O. E. Boyer, resigned.

Oren V. Grant to be postmaster at Hollywood, Ill., in place of R. C. Stubbe, resigned. Office became presidential July 1, 1919.

George W. Frame to be postmaster at Woodstock, Ill., in place of G. W. Frame. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Charles E. Carlson to be postmaster at Woodhull, Ill., in place of C. E. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

John E. Wyatt to be postmaster at White Hall, Ill., in place of J. E. Wyatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

John H. Farquharson to be postmaster at Western Springs, Ill., in place of J. H. Farquharson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Thomas J. Hopkins to be postmaster at Wenona, Ill., in place of T. J. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Grove Harrison to be postmaster at Viola, Ill., in place of Grove Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

George E. Combs to be postmaster at Villa Grove, Ill., in place of G. E. Combs. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

James E. Heflin to be postmaster at Versailles, Ill., in place of J. E. Heflin. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

John Gilchrist to be postmaster at Utica, Ill., in place of John Gilchrist. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Timothy J. Kelly to be postmaster at Seneca, Ill., in place of T. J. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Rolla L. Russell to be postmaster at Princeton, Ill., in place of R. L. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

George Reinemann to be postmaster at Madison, Ill., in place of George Reinemann. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

John C. Kohn to be postmaster at Elgin, Ill., in place of J. C. Kohn. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Edward J. Milligan to be postmaster at Bradley, Ill., in place of E. J. Milligan. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

INDIANA.

William A. Michael to be postmaster at St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

George A. Wilhelm to be postmaster at Dupont, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Charles M. Sparks to be postmaster at Shirley, Ind., in place of S. B. Rashi, resigned.

J. Clyde Davis to be postmaster at Carmel, Ind., in place of E. M. Stroud, resigned.

George P. De Hoff to be postmaster at Winona Lake, Ind., in place of G. P. De Hoff. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Alden H. Baker to be postmaster at Westfield, Ind., in place of A. H. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Verner A. Hahn to be postmaster at Wakarusa, Ind., in place of Vern Hahn. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

John T. Scott to be postmaster at Valparaiso, Ind., in place of J. T. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William T. Newton to be postmaster at Rosedale, Ind., in place of W. T. Newton. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William F. Wake to be postmaster at Roanoke, Ind., in place of W. F. Wake. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Frank W. Boren to be postmaster at Owensville, Ind., in place of F. W. Boren. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Elmer E. Stull to be postmaster at North Liberty, Ind., in place of E. E. Stull. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Charles Bates to be postmaster at New Carlisle, Ind., in place of Charles Bates. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Frank D. Haimbaugh to be postmaster at Muncie, Ind., in place of F. D. Haimbaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Maurice L. Cory to be postmaster at Kingman, Ind., in place of M. L. Cory. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Guy C. Hart to be postmaster at Kendallville, Ind., in place of G. C. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Daniel A. Riley to be postmaster at Greentown, Ind., in place of D. A. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Harry M. Van Lear to be postmaster at Garrett, Ind., in place of H. M. Van Lear. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Elmer Ritter to be postmaster at Fremont, Ind., in place of Elmer Ritter. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

John C. Ring to be postmaster at Frankton, Ind., in place of J. C. Ring. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Guy Longest to be postmaster at English, Ind., in place of Guy Longest. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Herbert P. Carpenter to be postmaster at Elwood, Ind., in place of H. P. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William H. Johnston to be postmaster at Crawfordsville, Ind., in place of W. H. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Otto A. Minear to be postmaster at Claypool, Ind., in place of O. A. Minear. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Grover C. Luther to be postmaster at Clay City, Ind., in place of G. C. Luther. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Louis H. Kocher to be postmaster at Churubusco, Ind., in place of L. H. Kocher. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

J. Ross Robertson to be postmaster at Brownstown, Ind., in place of J. R. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Nicholas Volz to be postmaster at Batesville, Ind., in place of Nicholas Volz. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

John L. Fraley to be postmaster at Anderson, Ind., in place of J. L. Fraley. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

James P. Simons to be postmaster at Monticello, Ind., in place of J. P. Simons. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Henry O. Eldridge to be postmaster at Lagrange, Ind., in place of H. O. Eldridge. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

John M. Wickizer to be postmaster at Argos, Ind., in place of J. M. Wickizer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Irvin A. Cox to be postmaster at Columbus, Ind., in place of I. A. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

IOWA.

Clifford Bowman to be postmaster at Royal, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Anthony J. Schreiber to be postmaster at Fort Atkinson, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

David F. Kirkpatrick to be postmaster at Wellman, Iowa, in place of D. F. Kirkpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Everett T. McShane to be postmaster at Springville, Iowa, in place of E. T. McShane. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Therides V. Barnard to be postmaster at Schaller, Iowa, in place of T. V. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Martin P. Klindt to be postmaster at St. Ansgar, Iowa, in place of M. P. Klindt. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

George Ritz to be postmaster at Rockwell City, Iowa, in place of G. Ritz. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William J. Casey to be postmaster at Knoxville, Iowa, in place of W. J. Casey. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Ezekiel S. Thompson to be postmaster at Eldora, Iowa, in place of E. S. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Nicholas E. Sheridan to be postmaster at Bancroft, Iowa, in place of N. E. Sheridan. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Daniel J. Rhoads to be postmaster at Woodward, Iowa, in place of D. J. Rhoads. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Edwin E. Cole to be postmaster at Woodbine, Iowa, in place of E. E. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Joseph J. McMahon to be postmaster at Toledo, Iowa, in place of J. J. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Edward M. Bratton to be postmaster at Shellsburg, Iowa, in place of E. M. Bratton. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William H. Ward to be postmaster at Ryan, Iowa, in place of W. H. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

Sylva E. E. Thompson to be postmaster at Roland, Iowa, in place of S. E. E. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Joseph G. Geister to be postmaster at Primghar, Iowa, in place of J. G. Geister. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

L. Harold Neville to be postmaster at Orient, Iowa, in place of L. H. Neville. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Fred H. Jamison to be postmaster at Oelwein, Iowa, in place of F. H. Jamison. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John A. McNeerney to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, Iowa, in place of J. A. McNeerney. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Stephen E. Magner to be postmaster at Lorimer, Iowa, in place of S. E. Magner. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George F. Smith to be postmaster at Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of G. F. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Dennis A. Ray to be postmaster at Humboldt, Iowa, in place of D. A. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Albert F. Steffen to be postmaster at Hull, Iowa, in place of A. F. Steffen. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Arthur B. Peters to be postmaster at Hawkeye, Iowa, in place of A. B. Peters. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Curran F. Swift to be postmaster at Harlan, Iowa, in place of C. F. Swift. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Fred L. Ives to be postmaster at Hamburg, Iowa, in place of F. L. Ives. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Robert A. Donahoe to be postmaster at Griswold, Iowa, in place of R. A. Donahoe. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Dorothy Parden to be postmaster at George, Iowa, in place of Dorothy Parden. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Charles F. Irons to be postmaster at Garrison, Iowa, in place of C. F. Irons. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

William H. May to be postmaster at Exira, Iowa, in place of W. H. May. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Gladys H. McDowell to be postmaster at Emerson, Iowa, in place of G. H. McDowell. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Joseph C. Palmer to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Iowa, in place of J. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James Steele to be postmaster at Clearfield, Iowa, in place of James Steele. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Edgar W. Penly to be postmaster at Central City, Iowa, in place of E. W. Penly. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Isaac T. Street to be postmaster at Center Point, Iowa, in place of I. T. Street. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James B. Thompson to be postmaster at Casey, Iowa, in place of J. B. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Lloyd L. Anspach to be postmaster at Bussey, Iowa, in place of L. L. Anspach. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

John R. Herron to be postmaster at Boone, Iowa, in place of J. R. Herron. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Kenneth F. Baldridge to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Iowa, in place of K. F. Baldridge. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Frank M. Beymer to be postmaster at Avoca, Iowa, in place of F. M. Beymer. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William M. Bausch to be postmaster at Ashton, Iowa, in place of W. M. Bausch. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Lester R. Hudgel to be postmaster at Anthon, Iowa, in place of L. R. Hudgel. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

Henry E. Button to be postmaster at Alden, Iowa, in place of H. E. Button. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Oscar M. Farb to be postmaster at Albert City, Iowa, in place of O. M. Farb. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George F. Althouse to be postmaster at Ackley, Iowa, in place of G. F. Althouse. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Patrick J. Grace to be postmaster at Adair, Iowa, in place of P. J. Grace. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

George P. Martin to be postmaster at Peterson, Iowa, in place of G. P. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Anna B. Berry to be postmaster at Marquette (late North McGregor), Iowa, in place of A. B. Berry. Change of name of office.

Charles H. Howe to be postmaster at Janesville, Iowa, in place of C. H. Howe. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Calvin P. Luther to be postmaster at Guttenberg, Iowa, in place of C. P. Luther. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Amos Ingalls to be postmaster at Greene, Iowa, in place of Amos Ingalls. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Oliver S. Barber to be postmaster at Creston, Iowa, in place of O. S. Barber. Incumbent's commission expires June 29, 1920.

John W. Blake to be postmaster at Atlantic, Iowa, in place of J. W. Blake. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

KANSAS.

Olive Green to be postmaster at Whiting, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Dale Stark to be postmaster at Perry, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Malinda L. Hoerman to be postmaster at Linn, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

James L. Reeves to be postmaster at Gridley, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Ida T. Willis to be postmaster at Troy, Kans., in place of E. R. McGalliard, declined.

Vernon L. Durand to be postmaster at Hoisington, Kans., in place of J. H. Roemer, not commissioned.

Harry J. Davis to be postmaster at Elkhart, Kans., in place of T. J. Masterson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William M. Stehley to be postmaster at Woodston, Kans., in place of W. M. Stehley. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John Q. Adams to be postmaster at Stockton, Kans., in place of J. Q. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

George A. Pierce to be postmaster at St. Paul, Kans., in place of G. A. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Richard W. Moorhead to be postmaster at Sabetha, Kans., in place of R. W. Moorhead. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Charles E. Van Vleck to be postmaster at Rossville, Kans., in place of C. E. Van Vleck. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

James E. Leach to be postmaster at Randolph, Kans., in place of J. E. Leach. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Cecil Calvert to be postmaster at Quinter, Kans., in place of Cecil Calvert. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Everett G. Gillidett to be postmaster at Plains, Kans., in place of E. G. Gillidett. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Alexander Burgess to be postmaster at Mulvane, Kans., in place of Alexander Burgess. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Christina Walker to be postmaster at Moline, Kans., in place of Christina Walker. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Fred N. Adam to be postmaster at Longton, Kans., in place of F. N. Adam. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Vardie V. Goeden to be postmaster at Lakin, Kans., in place of V. V. Goeden. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1920.

Rodney Torrey to be postmaster at La Crosse, Kans., in place of R. Torrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Burton M. Palmer to be postmaster at Jewell, Kans., in place of B. M. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Daniel G. M. Keen to be postmaster at Greenleaf, Kans., in place of D. G. M. Keen. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1920.

Catherine T. Butler to be postmaster at Glasco, Kans., in place of C. T. Butler. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

William L. Ringo to be postmaster at Girard, Kans., in place of W. L. Ringo. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

George W. Long to be postmaster at Galena, Kans., in place of G. W. Long. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Edward Grauerholz to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of E. Grauerholz. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Alexander Niernberger to be postmaster at Ellis, Kans., in place of A. Niernberger. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John H. Rathbun to be postmaster at Downs, Kans., in place of J. H. Rathbun. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Bessie Young to be postmaster at Dighton, Kans., in place of Bessie Young. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

James D. Stevenson to be postmaster at Claflin, Kans., in place of J. D. Stevenson. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Timothy J. Foley to be postmaster at Chapman, Kans., in place of T. J. Foley. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

William A. Morgan to be postmaster at Burrton, Kans., in place of W. A. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

George E. Bentley to be postmaster at Burr Oak, Kans., in place of G. E. Bentley. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1920.

Jacob H. Hostetler to be postmaster at Belleville, Kans., in place of J. H. Hostetler. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Bessie M. Williams to be postmaster at Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of B. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Charles L. Smith to be postmaster at Baxter Springs, Kans., in place of C. L. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

George W. Edwards to be postmaster at Alta Vista, Kans., in place of G. W. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Nell E. Bevans to be postmaster at Mulbery, Kans., in place of N. E. Bevans. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

James P. Newman to be postmaster at Galesburg, Kans., in place of J. P. Newman. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Thomas A. Stevens to be postmaster at Caney, Kans., in place of T. A. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

KENTUCKY.

John T. Wickersham to be postmaster at Lebanon Junction, Ky. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Archie A. Bridwell to be postmaster at Jeffersonton, Ky. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

James L. Chadwick to be postmaster at Vanceburg, Ky., in place of J. L. Chadwick. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1919.

Roland T. Huffman to be postmaster at Pikeville, Ky., in place of R. T. Huffman. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

J. Walter Payne to be postmaster at Paris, Ky., in place of J. W. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Judith W. Montgomery to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ky., in place of J. W. Montgomery. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Garland G. Lanum to be postmaster at Fordsville, Ky., in place of G. G. Lanum. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Matty L. Harris to be postmaster at Auburn, Ky., in place of M. L. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Cyrus M. Preston to be postmaster at Ashland, Ky., in place of C. M. Preston. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Tarleton C. Hobbs to be postmaster at Anchorage, Ky., in place of T. C. Hobbs. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

William A. Dickinson to be postmaster at Trenton, Ky., in place of W. A. Dickinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Joe Ely to be postmaster at Benton, Ky., in place of Joe Ely. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

LOUISIANA.

Emile Aubert to be postmaster at Abita Springs, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Alvyn L. Woods to be postmaster at Lusher, La., in place of A. L. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1920.

Jesse A. Melton to be postmaster at Coushatta, La., in place of J. A. Melton. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

Edith E. Steckler to be postmaster at Jeanerette, La., in place of E. L. Chaney, resigned.

Clair M. Cazayonx to be postmaster at New Roads, La., in place of Ellet B. Juvell, declined.

Floyd C. Mitchell to be postmaster at Zwolle, La., in place of F. C. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

John T. Bryant to be postmaster at Monroe, La., in place of J. T. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Charlton Fort to be postmaster at Minden, La., in place of Charlton Fort. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Susie Jones to be postmaster at Glenmora, La., in place of Susie Jones. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Albert Nunez to be postmaster at Arabi, La., in place of Albert Nunez. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Octave H. Deshotels to be postmaster at Kaplan, La., in place of O. H. Deshotels. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Lillian P. Witherow to be postmaster at Lake Providence, La., in place of A. J. McKee, resigned.

MAINE.

Ray L. Lisherness to be postmaster at Stratton, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Francis L. Talbot to be postmaster at East Machias, Me., in place of S. M. Rose, resigned.

H. Clair Miller to be postmaster at Winthrop, Me., in place of H. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Rena M. Bates to be postmaster at Strong, Me., in place of R. M. Bates. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William K. Foster to be postmaster at South Windham, Me., in place of W. K. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George B. McMennamin to be postmaster at Rumford, Me., in place of G. B. McMennamin. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Theodore C. Haley to be postmaster at Rangeley, Me., in place of T. C. Haley. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Joseph W. Small to be postmaster at Northeast Harbor, Me., in place of J. W. Small. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Irvin H. Ellis to be postmaster at North Anson, Me., in place of I. H. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Carroll N. Staples to be postmaster at Norridgewock, Me., in place of C. N. Staples. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Donald L. Brown to be postmaster at Milo, Me., in place of D. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

John Durgan to be postmaster at Lubec, Me., in place of J. Durgan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James L. Foster to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, Me., in place of J. L. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

George H. McIntosh to be postmaster at Lisbon Falls, Me., in place of G. H. McIntosh. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Wilbur F. Goodwin to be postmaster at Kennebunkport, Me., in place of W. F. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

John H. Cooper to be postmaster at Kennebunk, Me., in place of J. H. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James T. Kneeland to be postmaster at Harrison, Me., in place of J. T. Kneeland. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Gertrude S. Henneberry to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, Me., in place of G. S. Henneberry. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Charles H. Leland to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Me., in place of C. H. Leland. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Bion B. Anderson to be postmaster at Dover, Me., in place of B. B. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

James M. Haley to be postmaster at Cornish, Me., in place of J. M. Haley. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Mark P. Hamilton to be postmaster at Corinna, Me., in place of M. P. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Isalah G. Elder to be postmaster at Brunswick, Me., in place of I. G. Elder. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Elwin A. Sampson to be postmaster at Brownville, Me., in place of E. A. Sampson. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Franklin K. Jack to be postmaster at Bowdoinham, Me., in place of F. K. Jack. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Henry S. Perkins to be postmaster at Boothbay Harbor, Me., in place of H. S. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George H. Williams to be postmaster at Alfred, Me., in place of G. H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

MARYLAND.

William T. McPherson to be postmaster at La Plata, Md., in place of J. V. Padgett, jr., resigned.

Wilmer L. Barnes to be postmaster at Bel Air, Md., in place of William W. Hopkins, resigned.

Oscar S. Barrick to be postmaster at Woodshoro, Md., in place of O. S. Barrick. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Frank J. Shriner to be postmaster at Union Bridge, Md., in place of F. J. Shriner. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

John B. Sweeney to be postmaster at Hagerstown, Md., in place of J. B. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

Rose C. Foreman to be postmaster at Emmitsburg, Md., in place of R. C. Foreman. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Nancy S. Harley to be postmaster at South Hanson, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Arthur J. Coughlan to be postmaster at Maynard, Mass., in place of A. J. Coughlan. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Charles W. Swift to be postmaster at Yarmouth Port, Mass., in place of C. W. Swift. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Martin Ratigan to be postmaster at Whitman, Mass., in place of Martin Ratigan. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1920.

John P. McKay to be postmaster at Wellfleet, Mass., in place of J. P. McKay. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Stephen C. Luce to be postmaster at Vineyard Haven, Mass., in place of S. C. Luce. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Charles T. Farrell to be postmaster at Stoughton, Mass., in place of C. T. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Joseph L. McGrath to be postmaster at Sharon, Mass., in place of J. L. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

John Adams to be postmaster at Provincetown, Mass., in place of John Adams. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1920.

John P. O'Connor to be postmaster at Palmer, Mass., in place of J. P. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Thomas F. Meehan to be postmaster at Orange, Mass., in place of T. F. Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

William W. McLehose to be postmaster at Norton, Mass., in place of W. W. McLehose. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Perry F. Brown to be postmaster at Northampton, Mass., in place of P. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

John F. Williams to be postmaster at Marblehead, Mass., in place of J. F. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John A. Bell to be postmaster at Leicester, Mass., in place of J. A. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

James J. Murtaugh to be postmaster at Hopkinton, Mass., in place of J. J. Murtaugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Edmund Daly to be postmaster at Hingham, Mass., in place of E. Daly. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

James E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Gilbertville, Mass., in place of J. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

James H. Hoar to be postmaster at Fall River, Mass., in place of J. H. Hoar. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

William M. Allen to be postmaster at Fairhaven, Mass., in place of W. M. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

J. William Byron to be postmaster at Concord, Mass., in place of J. W. Byron. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Joseph F. Murrman to be postmaster at Clinton, Mass., in place of J. F. Murrman. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

William P. Lovejoy to be postmaster at Barnstable, Mass., in place of W. P. Lovejoy. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

MICHIGAN.

Andrew H. Campbell to be postmaster at Mattawan, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Edwin L. Groger to be postmaster at Concord, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Fred Gibbs to be postmaster at White Cloud, Mich., in place of F. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Emanuel Wilhelm to be postmaster at Traverse City, Mich., in place of E. Wilhelm. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Charles L. Bennett to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Mich., in place of C. L. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Paul D. Palmer to be postmaster at Sunfield, Mich., in place of P. D. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Evert S. Dyckman to be postmaster at South Haven, Mich., in place of E. S. Dyckman. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Harry M. Royal to be postmaster at Shelby, Mich., in place of H. M. Royal. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Charles Powers to be postmaster at Saugatuck, Mich., in place of C. Powers. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Riley L. Compton to be postmaster at Rockford, Mich., in place of R. L. Compton. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Alva McCarty to be postmaster at Oxford, Mich., in place of A. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

William G. White to be postmaster at Ovid, Mich., in place of W. G. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

James A. Hull to be postmaster at Oscoda, Mich., in place of J. A. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Thomas Maveety to be postmaster at Olivet, Mich., in place of T. Maveety. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Patrick F. Heenan to be postmaster at North Branch, Mich., in place of P. F. Heenan. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Frederick W. Richter to be postmaster at Niles, Mich., in place of F. W. Richter. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Elmer Bremer to be postmaster at Montgomery, Mich., in place of E. Bremer. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1920.

Charles Hunter to be postmaster at Marlette, Mich., in place of C. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Samuel Folz to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of S. Folz. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

George M. Hubbard to be postmaster at Hudsonville, Mich., in place of G. M. Hubbard. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Patrick J. Scanlan to be postmaster at Hubbell, Mich., in place of P. J. Scanlan. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

William O. Van Eyck to be postmaster at Holland, Mich., in place of W. O. Van Eyck. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Fred J. O'Melay to be postmaster at Hillsdale, Mich., in place of F. J. O'Melay. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Archie D. Himebaugh to be postmaster at Hesperia, Mich., in place of A. D. Himebaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William H. Blashfield to be postmaster at Hartford, Mich., in place of W. H. Blashfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Harold Murphy to be postmaster at Harbor Beach, Mich., in place of H. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Edward J. Marrinane to be postmaster at Grass Lake, Mich., in place of E. J. Marrinane. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Willa A. Flinn to be postmaster at Whitehall, Mich., in place of James L. Klett, deceased.

Albert Steinen to be postmaster at Painesdale, Mich., in place of Daniel A. Lacrosse, resigned.

Edward D. Ahearn to be postmaster at Kinde, Mich., in place of John B. Ahearn, declined.

Myron B. Gallagher to be postmaster at Byron, Mich., in place of Floyd W. Downing, deceased.

Robert E. Vickers to be postmaster at Gobleville, Mich., in place of R. E. Vickers. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1920.

Helen A. Collier to be postmaster at Gaylord, Mich., in place of H. A. Collier. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John O'Meara to be postmaster at Escanaba, Mich., in place of John O'Meara. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Harry F. Brainard to be postmaster at Elsie, Mich., in place of H. F. Brainard. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1920.

Alfred F. Skarritt to be postmaster at Edmore, Mich., in place of A. F. Skarritt. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William L. Ferry to be postmaster at Eau Claire, Mich., in place of W. L. Ferry. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

David R. Brown to be postmaster at Deckerville, Mich., in place of D. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Thomas T. Fralick to be postmaster at Copemish, Mich., in place of T. T. Fralick. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Jerry S. Walling to be postmaster at Coopersville, Mich., in place of J. S. Walling. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Frank D. McCaren to be postmaster at Carsonville, Mich., in place of F. D. McCaren. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Nathan C. Thomas to be postmaster at Caledonia, Mich., in place of N. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Clio S. Case to be postmaster at Brighton, Mich., in place of C. S. Case. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

Miles L. Hadsall to be postmaster at Birch Run, Mich., in place of M. L. Hadsall. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

William P. Nisbett to be postmaster at Big Rapids, Mich., in place of W. P. Nisbett. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Arthur E. Dann to be postmaster at Beaverton, Mich., in place of A. E. Dann. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Ephraim S. Reist to be postmaster at Ashley, Mich., in place of E. S. Reist. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1920.

Roy P. Hallock to be postmaster at Almont, Mich., in place of R. P. Hallock. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Charles H. Hudkins to be postmaster at East Jordan, Mich., in place of C. H. Hudkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

James Cotter to be postmaster at Auburn, Mich., in place of James Cotter. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

MINNESOTA.

Emily E. McGrath to be postmaster at Kinney, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Elizabeth T. Uvaas to be postmaster at Kensington, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

John R. Norgren to be postmaster at Foreston, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Frederick S. Purdy to be postmaster at Russell, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Steve Blanchett to be postmaster at Marshall, Minn., in place of Steve Blanchett. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Charles E. Wise to be postmaster at Mankato, Minn., in place of C. E. Wise. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John O. Backman to be postmaster at Mabel, Minn., in place of J. O. Backman. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John N. Gayner to be postmaster at Litchfield, Minn., in place of J. N. Gayner. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

James M. Benson to be postmaster at Lindstrom, Minn., in place of J. M. Benson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

George A. Boyd to be postmaster at Le Roy, Minn., in place of G. A. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

James Lynch to be postmaster at Lanesboro, Minn., in place of James Lynch. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Alice L. Eriksen to be postmaster at Lakefield, Minn., in place of A. L. Eriksen. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Ora M. Goodfellow to be postmaster at Kenyon, Minn., in place of O. M. Goodfellow. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Alphonso B. Kobe to be postmaster at Kelliher, Minn., in place of A. B. Kobe. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Nels J. Enquist to be postmaster at Isanti, Minn., in place of N. J. Enquist. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1920.

Jerry Sullivan to be postmaster at Heron Lake, Minn., in place of Jerry Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Frederick F. Achatz to be postmaster at Harmony, Minn., in place of F. F. Achatz. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Edward C. Feely to be postmaster at Farmington, Minn., in place of E. C. Feely. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John M. Brown to be postmaster at Ely, Minn., in place of J. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Frank L. Frye to be postmaster at Elk River, Minn., in place of F. L. Frye. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

John Engebretson to be postmaster at Elbow Lake, Minn., in place of John Engebretson. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

Henry J. Bock to be postmaster at Delano, Minn., in place of H. J. Bock. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Denis E. Murphy to be postmaster at Dassel, Minn., in place of D. E. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Ernest A. Schilling to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. A. Schilling. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Ignatius Kremer to be postmaster at Cold Spring, Minn., in place of Ignatius Kremer. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Arthur M. Loberg to be postmaster at Cokato, Minn., in place of A. M. Loberg. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1920.

Mary E. Demel to be postmaster at Buhl, Minn., in place of M. E. Demel. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Ernest W. Rebstock to be postmaster at Buffalo Lake, Minn., in place of E. W. Rebstock. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Lambert Irsfeld to be postmaster at Browerville, Minn., in place of Lambert Irsfeld. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Edward H. Herbert to be postmaster at Bricelyn, Minn., in place of E. H. Herbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Paul J. Johnson to be postmaster at Boyd, Minn., in place of P. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

John K. Jasper to be postmaster at Bovey, Minn., in place of J. K. Jasper. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William E. Lawson to be postmaster at Benson, Minn., in place of W. E. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1920.

William J. Murphy to be postmaster at Blue Earth, Minn., in place of W. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Alexander J. Irwin to be postmaster at Belleplaine, Minn., in place of A. J. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Walter C. Galbraith to be postmaster at Balaton, Minn., in place of W. C. Galbraith. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Oliver Erickson to be postmaster at Atwater, Minn., in place of O. Erickson. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Ennis N. Brandon to be postmaster at Annandale, Minn., in place of E. N. Brandon. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Carlyle H. Day to be postmaster at Albert Lea, Minn., in place of C. H. Day. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Charles E. Gravel to be postmaster at Pierz, Minn., in place of C. E. Gravel. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Francis T. O'Gorman to be postmaster at Goodhue, Minn., in place of F. T. O'Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

John Kasper to be postmaster at Faribault, Minn., in place of John Kasper. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

James H. Pelham to be postmaster at Menahga, Minn., in place of J. H. Pelham. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Fred Gay to be postmaster at Moose Lake, Minn., in place of Fred Gay. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1920.

Ward J. Struble to be postmaster at Mora, Minn., in place of W. J. Struble. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Peter W. Gorrie to be postmaster at Morristown, Minn., in place of P. W. Gorrie. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Mary A. Mogren to be postmaster at Ortonville, Minn., in place of M. A. Mogren. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Sidney D. Wilcox to be postmaster at Park Rapids, Minn., in place of S. D. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William A. Huntington to be postmaster at Paynesville, Minn., in place of W. A. Huntington. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Louis C. Stromberg to be postmaster at Red Wing, Minn., in place of L. C. Stromberg. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Henry J. Essler to be postmaster at St. Peter, Minn., in place of H. J. Essler. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Joseph A. Schoenhoff to be postmaster at Sauk Center, Minn., in place of J. A. Schoenhoff. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Sadie A. Lane to be postmaster at Sherburn, Minn., in place of S. A. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Richard F. Lamb to be postmaster at Slayton, Minn., in place of R. F. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William R. Hodges to be postmaster at Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of W. R. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Bennie H. Holte to be postmaster at Starbuck, Minn., in place of B. H. Holte. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Joseph J. Meighen to be postmaster at Twin Valley, Minn., in place of J. J. Meighen. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Jessie J. W. Hogue to be postmaster at Tyler, Minn., in place of J. J. W. Hogue. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

George A. Phelps to be postmaster at Walker, Minn., in place of G. A. Phelps. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Fred T. Moody to be postmaster at Warroad, Minn., in place of F. T. Moody. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John A. Timpane to be postmaster at Waterville, Minn., in place of J. A. Timpane. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Otto P. Miller to be postmaster at Welcome, Minn., in place of O. P. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Frank M. Clark to be postmaster at Wells, Minn., in place of F. M. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

George E. Le Tourneau to be postmaster at Windom, Minn., in place of G. E. Le Tourneau. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Michael H. Baskfield to be postmaster at Zumbrota, Minn., in place of M. H. Baskfield. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

MISSISSIPPI.

William C. Tyler to be postmaster at Duck Hill, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Andrew V. Lamar to be postmaster at Vardaman, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Hubert R. Tatum to be postmaster at Merigold, Miss., in place of Harry B. Brooks, resigned.

Walter W. Holmes to be postmaster at McComb, Miss., in place of William W. Robertson, deceased.

Mary F. Johnston to be postmaster at Friar Point, Miss., in place of Daisy M. Fisher, resigned.

James H. Crawford to be postmaster at Tylertown, Miss., in place of J. H. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John A. Smallwood to be postmaster at Ripley, Miss., in place of J. A. Smallwood. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

Tamora C. Epperson to be postmaster at Raymond, Miss., in place of T. C. Epperson. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

William T. Smith to be postmaster at New Albany, Miss., in place of W. T. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Coke B. Wier to be postmaster at Quitman, Miss., in place of C. B. Wier. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Robert W. Magruder to be postmaster at Port Gibson, Miss., in place of R. W. Magruder. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Thaddeus C. Barrier to be postmaster at Philadelphia, Miss., in place of T. C. Barrier. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

Thirza I. Clarke to be postmaster at Marks, Miss., in place of T. I. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expired March 24, 1920.

Hugh M. Drane to be postmaster at McCool, Miss., in place of H. M. Drane. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Robert B. Waldrop to be postmaster at Houston, Miss., in place of R. B. Waldrop. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Jefferson D. Fogg to be postmaster at Hernando, Miss., in place of J. D. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Malcolm S. Graham to be postmaster at Forest, Miss., in place of M. S. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Tommie A. Hamill to be postmaster at Sturgis, Miss., in place of T. A. Hamill. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

James L. Cooper to be postmaster at Maben, Miss., in place of J. L. Cooper. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Cornelius T. Sweatt to be postmaster at Ethel, Miss., in place of C. T. Sweatt. Incumbent's commission expired January 1, 1920.

Will N. Guyton to be postmaster at Blue Mountain, Miss., in place of W. N. Guyton. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1920.

Emma L. Whyte to be postmaster at Bond, Miss., in place of E. L. Whyte. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

George S. Neal to be postmaster at Clinton, Miss., in place of G. S. Neal. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Benjamin F. Hill to be postmaster at Canton, Miss., in place of B. F. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

Harry L. Callicott to be postmaster at Coldwater, Miss., in place of H. L. Callicott. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Mary L. Yatum to be postmaster at Edwards, Miss., in place of Mary E. Luster. Name changed by marriage.

Bennett A. Truly to be postmaster at Fayette, Miss., in place of B. A. Truly. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

MISSOURI.

Delaus J. Buford to be postmaster at Rutledge, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Fleety Palmer to be postmaster at Jonesburg, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Violet C. Van Horn to be postmaster at Jerico Springs, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Isaac P. Hopkins to be postmaster at Edgerton, Mo., in place of E. L. Morrison, resigned. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

William Vogel to be postmaster at De Soto, Mo., in place of W. L. Smith, resigned.

Frances F. Hulet to be postmaster at Sturgeon, Mo., in place of Thomas F. Benson, deceased.

Harry N. Smith to be postmaster at Eldorado Springs, Mo., in place of John S. Smith, deceased.

William L. Peoples to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Mo., in place of W. L. Peoples. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Joseph K. Joiner to be postmaster at Richmond, Mo., in place of J. K. Joiner. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1920.

William M. Brown to be postmaster at Polo, Mo., in place of W. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

Bristol French to be postmaster at Piedmont, Mo., in place of B. French. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

William T. Murphy to be postmaster at Parma, Mo., in place of W. T. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Cris Ogden to be postmaster at Oronogo, Mo., in place of C. Ogden. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Leonidas P. Driskill to be postmaster at Oran, Mo., in place of L. P. Driskill. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas P. Diggs to be postmaster at New Haven, Mo., in place of T. P. Diggs. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Zachariah T. Casebolt to be postmaster at Miami, Mo., in place of Z. T. Casebolt. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Clyde G. Eubank to be postmaster at Madison, Mo., in place of C. G. Eubank. Incumbent's commission expired April 10, 1920.

Oliver P. Gentry to be postmaster at Liberty, Mo., in place of O. P. Gentry. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Thomas E. Heatherly to be postmaster at La Grange, Mo., in place of T. E. Heatherly. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Baylis Steele to be postmaster at Kansas City, Mo., in place of B. Steele. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

William B. Ellis to be postmaster at Elsberry, Mo., in place of W. B. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Carrie E. McCandless to be postmaster at Downing, Mo., in place of C. E. McCandless. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

James E. Harris to be postmaster at Conway, Mo., in place of J. E. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Joseph A. Voelker to be postmaster at Clyde, Mo., in place of J. A. Voelker. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

James S. Divilbiss to be postmaster at Braymer, Mo., in place of J. S. Divilbiss. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1920.

William A. Roberts to be postmaster at Belton, Mo., in place of W. A. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Collins J. Johnson to be postmaster at Palmyra, Mo., in place of C. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

John C. Frazier to be postmaster at North Kansas City, Mo., in place of J. C. Frazier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1920.

Peter McKee to be postmaster at Knox City, Mo., in place of Peter McKee. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

William P. Spillman to be postmaster at Grant City, Mo., in place of W. P. Spillman. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

MONTANA.

Bernelda A. Miller to be postmaster at Terry, Mont., in place of M. W. Shaw, removed.

Charles E. Mullikin to be postmaster at Hingham, Mont., in place of John Budge, removed.

John P. Heaton to be postmaster at Dodson, Mont., in place of Chauncey W. Griffin, resigned.

John C. Tipton to be postmaster at White Sulphur Springs, Mont., in place of J. C. Tipton. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Joseph A. Lemire to be postmaster at Ronan, Mont., in place of J. A. Lemire. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Maurice J. Keenan to be postmaster at Hobson, Mont., in place of M. J. Keenan. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Carl E. Bowman to be postmaster at Hardin, Mont., in place of C. E. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Fred B. Hedge to be postmaster at Grassrange, Mont., in place of F. B. Hedge. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Frank K. Hollenbeck to be postmaster at Forsyth, Mont., in place of F. K. Hollenbeck. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Thomas Downen to be postmaster at Chinook, Mont., in place of Thomas Downen. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1920.

Philip B. C. Goodwin to be postmaster at Butte, Mont., in place of P. B. C. Goodwin. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Alban C. Sipe to be postmaster at Broadview, Mont., in place of A. C. Sipe. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

NEBRASKA.

Garrett H. Lorenz to be postmaster at Ashton, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Loren W. Harper to be postmaster at Allen, Nebr., in place of I. P. Foreman, resigned.

Edwin C. Pickett to be postmaster at Mullen, Nebr., in place of Joseph J. Hulan, resigned.

Ethel Chubb to be postmaster at Haigler, Nebr., in place of Ambrose E. Sherwood, resigned.

Owen T. Thompson to be postmaster at Farnam, Nebr., in place of J. M. Liggitt, resigned.

Charles F. Gilbert to be postmaster at York, Nebr., in place of C. F. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

David D. O'Kane to be postmaster at Wood River, Nebr., in place of D. D. O'Kane. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Carl P. Lundgren to be postmaster at Wausa, Nebr., in place of C. P. Lundgren. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Ernest J. Kaltenborn to be postmaster at Waco, Nebr., in place of E. J. Kaltenborn. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Carl Carlson to be postmaster at Valparaiso, Nebr., in place of Carl Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William B. Day to be postmaster at Ulysses, Nebr., in place of W. D. Day. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Anthony R. Kovanda to be postmaster at Table Rock, Nebr., in place of A. R. Kovanda. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Emmor C. Ratcliff to be postmaster at Stratton, Nebr., in place of E. C. Ratcliff. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

George M. Sandusky to be postmaster at Sterling, Nebr., in place of G. M. Sandusky. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Otto S. Larson to be postmaster at Shickley, Nebr., in place of O. S. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Anton B. Helms to be postmaster at Randolph, Nebr., in place of A. B. Helms. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas O. Norman to be postmaster at Oxford, Nebr., in place of T. O. Norman. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Michael H. McCarthy to be postmaster at O'Neill, Nebr., in place of M. H. McCarthy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Oscar E. Swanson to be postmaster at Cakland, Nebr., in place of O. E. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Grover C. Hoback to be postmaster at Nehawka, Nebr., in place of G. C. Hoback. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

William C. Rusmisell to be postmaster at Mason City, Nebr., in place of W. C. Rusmisell. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James R. Durrie to be postmaster at Laurel, Nebr., in place of J. R. Durrie. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Orla C. Lamb to be postmaster at Guide Rock, Nebr., in place of O. C. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Samuel A. Tobey to be postmaster at Gresham, Nebr., in place of S. A. Tobey. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Henry P. Wilson to be postmaster at Geneva, Nebr., in place of H. P. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

John Wilson to be postmaster at Franklin, Nebr., in place of John Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Daniel Kavanaugh to be postmaster at Fairbury, Nebr., in place of Daniel Kavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William A. Nyrop to be postmaster at Elgin, Nebr., in place of W. A. Nyrop. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

George W. Nicholas to be postmaster at De Witt, Nebr., in place of G. W. Nicholas. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas J. Hinds to be postmaster at David City, Nebr., in place of T. J. Hinds. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James M. Crews to be postmaster at Culbertson, Nebr., in place of J. M. Crews. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Louis H. Deaver to be postmaster at Cody, Nebr., in place of L. H. Deaver. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

Charles A. Payne to be postmaster at Clearwater, Nebr., in place of C. A. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Francis A. Thompson to be postmaster at Clay Center, Nebr., in place of F. A. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

Benjamin A. Brewster to be postmaster at Chadron, Nebr., in place of B. A. Brewster. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

William F. Nick to be postmaster at Cedar Bluffs, Nebr., in place of W. F. Nick. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John W. Henthorn to be postmaster at Blue Springs, Nebr., in place of J. W. Henthorn. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Thomas J. Lane to be postmaster at Bloomington, Nebr., in place of T. J. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Calvin A. Demarest to be postmaster at Bethany, Nebr., in place of C. L. Demarest. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Harry A. Crosby to be postmaster at Beemer, Nebr., in place of H. A. Crosby. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Xander Y. Zuhlke to be postmaster at Bancroft, Nebr., in place of X. Y. Zuhlke. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John H. Grosvenor to be postmaster at Aurora, Nebr., in place of J. H. Grosvenor. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

William S. Morgan to be postmaster at Atkinson, Nebr., in place of W. S. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William C. Rosecrans to be postmaster at Ashland, Nebr., in place of W. C. Rosecrans. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

James C. Badger to be postmaster at Arlington, Nebr., in place of J. C. Badger. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Melvin A. Brinegar to be postmaster at Alexandria, Nebr., in place of M. A. Brinegar. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Martin G. Doering to be postmaster at Battle Creek, Nebr., in place of M. G. Doering. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Patrick J. Melia to be postmaster at Gretna, Nebr., in place of P. J. Melia. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John J. McCarthy to be postmaster at Ogallala, Nebr., in place of J. J. McCarthy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

NEVADA.

Mildred Robison to be postmaster at Overton, Nev. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Merritt A. Macfarlane to be postmaster at Winnemucca, Nev., in place of M. A. Macfarlane. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

James J. McQuillan to be postmaster at Tonopah, Nev., in place of J. J. McQuillan. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

George W. Likes to be postmaster at Fallon, Nev., in place of G. W. Likes. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Etna M. George to be postmaster at Battle Mountain, Nev., in place of E. M. George. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Michael E. Nevin to be postmaster at Virginia City, Nev., in place of M. E. Nevin. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1920.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward S. Perkins to be postmaster at Sunapee, N. H., in place of E. S. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

John A. Willey to be postmaster at Sanbornville, N. H., in place of J. A. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Gardner Grant to be postmaster at Salmon Falls, N. H., in place of G. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Philip W. Sherburne to be postmaster at Pittsfield, N. H., in place of P. W. Sherburne. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

George F. Sanborn to be postmaster at Meredith, N. H., in place of G. F. Sanborn. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Duncan P. Noyes to be postmaster at Henniger, N. H., in place of D. P. Noyes. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Elmer T. Ford to be postmaster at Hanover, N. H., in place of E. T. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Samuel Runlett to be postmaster at Durham, N. H., in place of Samuel Runlett. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

George H. Sherry to be postmaster at Dover, N. H., in place of G. H. Sherry. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Frank L. Marston to be postmaster at Conway, N. H., in place of F. L. Marston. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Edwin M. Allen to be postmaster at Canaan, N. H., in place of E. M. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Joseph Warren to be postmaster at Rochester, N. H., in place of Joseph Warren. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

NEW JERSEY.

Hiram H. Shepherd to be postmaster at South Boundbrook, N. J. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

James F. Gleason to be postmaster at Harrington, N. J. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Anna G. Rockhill to be postmaster at Columbus, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Richard M. Crawford to be postmaster at Westville, N. J., in place of R. M. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Joseph E. Charles to be postmaster at Wenonah, N. J., in place of J. E. Charles. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Philip E. Rockafellow to be postmaster at Stockton, N. J., in place of P. E. Rockafellow. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Joseph E. Harris to be postmaster at Roebling, N. J., in place of James A. Mahaney, removed.

Joseph Rezniczak to be postmaster at Maurer, N. J., in place of Anton J. Mikolajczak, deceased.

Wilbur H. Le Compte to be postmaster at Haworth, N. J., in place of William E. Kastendike, resigned.

Patrick V. Doran to be postmaster at Convent Station, N. J., in place of Harry F. Hinchman, resigned.

S. Dana Ely to be postmaster at Rutherford, N. J., in place of S. Dana Ely. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

William Gerard to be postmaster at Rockaway, N. J., in place of W. Gerard. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1920.

Harrison Hollinger to be postmaster at Port Norris, N. J., in place of H. Hollinger. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

David S. Pancoast to be postmaster at Pitman, N. J., in place of D. S. Pancoast. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Richard F. White to be postmaster at Perth Amboy, N. J., in place of R. F. White. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Paul F. Edwards to be postmaster at Newfield, N. J., in place of P. F. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Joseph H. Barcklow to be postmaster at Moorestown, N. J., in place of J. H. Barcklow. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1920.

George E. Halladay to be postmaster at Manville, N. J., in place of G. E. Halladay. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Charles E. Paxton to be postmaster at Jamesburg, N. J., in place of C. E. Paxton. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Charles L. Kent to be postmaster at Hamburg, N. J., in place of C. L. Kent. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Mary A. Hyde to be postmaster at Franklin, N. J., in place of M. A. Hyde. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Frank N. Hughes to be postmaster at Florence, N. J., in place of F. N. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Alexander A. Yard to be postmaster at Farmingdale, N. J., in place of A. A. Yard. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Harvey H. VanDerveer to be postmaster at Englishtown, N. J., in place of H. H. VanDerveer. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Willard N. Apgar to be postmaster at Dunellen, N. J., in place of W. N. Apgar. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John H. Lindemann to be postmaster at Closter, N. J., in place of J. H. Lindemann. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

John Y. Bellis to be postmaster at Clinton, N. J., in place of J. Y. Bellis. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Thomas Quinn to be postmaster at Chrome, N. J., in place of T. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Sol Needles to be postmaster at Cape May, N. J., in place of Sol Needles. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Joseph A. Brady to be postmaster at Caldwell, N. J., in place of J. A. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Walter H. Fish to be postmaster at Beverly, N. J., in place of W. H. Fish. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

William L. Scheuerman to be postmaster at Basking Ridge, N. J., in place of W. L. Scheuerman. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Charles R. Grover to be postmaster at Atlantic Highlands, N. J., in place of C. R. Grover. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

James J. McAviney to be postmaster at Arlington, N. J., in place of J. J. McAviney. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

James D. Moriarty to be postmaster at Orange, N. J., in place of J. D. Moriarty. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

NEW MEXICO.

Arthur F. Jones to be postmaster at Portales, N. Mex., in place of A. F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Edgar Savage to be postmaster at Elida, N. Mex., in place of E. Savage. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Charles S. Davidson to be postmaster at Texico, N. Mex., in place of Skillman C. Hunter, resigned.

NEW YORK.

Anna M. Auch Moedy to be postmaster at Rosendale, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Frank L. Vedder to be postmaster at Leeds, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Bertha M. Burt to be postmaster at Hague, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Maurice W. Welch to be postmaster at Holcomb, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

William B. Phillips to be postmaster at Greenwood Lake, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Benjamin F. Lent to be postmaster at Ithaca, N. Y., in place of B. F. Lent. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Joseph McFee to be postmaster at Sharon Springs, N. Y., in place of Eugene Smith, resigned.

George F. Ketchum to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Y., in place of G. F. Ketchum. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Mansfield F. McLean to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in place of M. F. McLean, N. Y. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Fred Burns to be postmaster at Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Ernest D. Joslin to be postmaster at Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of E. D. Joslin. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

William H. Weise to be postmaster at Valley Stream, N. Y., in place of W. H. Weise. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Uri H. Mersereau to be postmaster at Union, N. Y., in place of U. H. Mersereau. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Clark E. DeForest to be postmaster at Unadilla, N. Y., in place of C. E. DeForest. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

George Sinnott to be postmaster at Tarrytown, N. Y., in place of George Sinnott. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

J. Frank Lackey to be postmaster at Tannersville, N. Y., in place of J. F. Lackey. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1920.

Leonard A. Govern to be postmaster at Stamford, N. Y., in place of L. A. Govern. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Dominick W. Gilligan to be postmaster at Shortsville, N. Y., in place of D. W. Gilligan. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Timothy J. Dacey to be postmaster at Sherrill, N. Y., in place of T. J. Dacey. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Jesse H. Shepard to be postmaster at Sherburne, N. Y., in place of J. H. Shepard. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

David B. Reamer to be postmaster at Savannah, N. Y., in place of D. B. Reamer. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Michael Daly to be postmaster at Rye, N. Y., in place of Michael Daly. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Girdell V. Brower to be postmaster at Rockville Center, N. Y., in place of G. V. Brower. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

W. Irving Williams to be postmaster at Rensselaer, N. Y., in place of W. I. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Walter F. Brown to be postmaster at Remsen, N. Y., in place of W. F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Louis S. Martin to be postmaster at Redwood, N. Y., in place of L. S. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

William G. Phippin to be postmaster at Red Creek, N. Y., in place of W. G. Phippin. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

James McNamara to be postmaster at Ravena, N. Y., in place of James McNamara. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

George W. Niece to be postmaster at Port Leyden, N. Y., in place of G. W. Niece. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

James P. Gillen to be postmaster at Port Jervis, N. Y., in place of J. P. Gillen. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Lewis O. Davis to be postmaster at Port Jefferson, N. Y., in place of L. O. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Andrew F. Burke to be postmaster at Port Chester, N. Y., in place of A. F. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Robert E. Purcell, jr., to be postmaster at Philadelphia, N. Y., in place of R. E. Purcell, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

George W. Salisbury to be postmaster at Phelps, N. Y., in place of G. W. Salisbury. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Patrick H. Cantillon to be postmaster at Perrysburg, N. Y., in place of P. H. Cantillon. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Garrett D. Roche to be postmaster at Perry, N. Y., in place of G. D. Roche. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

John H. Meehan to be postmaster at Penn Yan, N. Y., in place of J. H. Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Frederick M. Welsh to be postmaster at Patchogue, N. Y., in place of F. M. Welsh. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Samuel H. Hunt to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. Y., in place of S. H. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Lewis N. S. Rockwell to be postmaster at Otisville, N. Y., in place of L. N. S. Rockwell. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Frederick B. Huxley to be postmaster at Ontario, N. Y., in place of F. B. Huxley. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

Joseph Thiel to be postmaster at North Collins, N. Y., in place of Joseph Thiel. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William B. Hoxter to be postmaster at North Cohocton, N. Y., in place of W. B. Hoxter. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

William D. Schaffer to be postmaster at Newfane, N. Y., in place of W. D. Schaffer. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

John J. Peake to be postmaster at Newburgh, N. Y., in place of J. J. Peake. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Henry F. Hoornbeek to be postmaster at Napanoch, N. Y., in place of H. F. Hoornbeek. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Isaac W. Turner to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, N. Y., in place of I. W. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

Ezra H. Welling to be postmaster at Monroe, N. Y., in place of E. H. Welling. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Daniel B. Sweeney to be postmaster at Middletown, N. Y., in place of D. B. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Charles M. Hodges to be postmaster at Marion, N. Y., in place of C. M. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

George Staplin, jr., to be postmaster at Mannsville, N. Y., in place of George Staplin, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Eugene J. Smith to be postmaster at Lyons, N. Y., in place of E. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

George W. Batten to be postmaster at Lockport, N. Y., in place of G. W. Batten. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Francis H. Alvord to be postmaster at Liverpool, N. Y., in place of F. H. Alvord. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Maurice A. Borden to be postmaster at Liberty, N. Y., in place of M. A. Borden. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Timothy D. Mulcahy to be postmaster at Lawrence, N. Y., in place of T. D. Mulcahy. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Roy E. Dietrich to be postmaster at La Fargeville, N. Y., in place of R. E. Dietrich. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Wilber W. Wilcox to be postmaster at Lacona, N. Y., in place of W. W. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Charles H. Stokes to be postmaster at Kerhonkson, N. Y., in place of C. H. Stokes. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Frederick W. Schadt to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, N. Y., in place of F. W. Schadt. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Matthew J. Murtha to be postmaster at Irvington, N. Y., in place of M. J. Murtha. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Charles R. Dixon to be postmaster at Hobart, N. Y., in place of C. R. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

James E. Robinson to be postmaster at Hermon, N. Y., in place of J. E. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Lee R. Smith to be postmaster at Hammond, N. Y., in place of L. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Fred B. Fuller to be postmaster at Gouverneur, N. Y., in place of F. B. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Thomas J. Gallagher to be postmaster at Geneva, N. Y., in place of T. J. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1920.

Caleb C. McNair to be postmaster at Gasport, N. Y., in place of C. C. McNair. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

T. Benson Smith to be postmaster at Freeport, N. Y., in place of T. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Fay P. Greene to be postmaster at Franklinville, N. Y., in place of F. P. Greene. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John J. Shea to be postmaster at Frankfort, N. Y., in place of J. J. Shea. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Charles F. Record to be postmaster at Forestville, N. Y., in place of C. F. Record. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Jerry B. Martin to be postmaster at Fonda, N. Y., in place of J. B. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired April 4, 1920.

Hans C. Hansen to be postmaster at Fishers Island, N. Y., in place of H. C. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

John F. Gilmartin to be postmaster at East Hampton, N. Y., in place of J. F. Gilmartin. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1920.

Asa G. Neff to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y., in place of A. G. Neff. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

John J. Finnerty to be postmaster at Croton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of J. J. Finnerty. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

George E. Barry to be postmaster at Clifton Springs, N. Y., in place of G. E. Barry. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Benjamin B. Tooker to be postmaster at Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of B. B. Tooker. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Darius E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Canton, N. Y., in place of D. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Walter C. Burton to be postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y., in place of W. C. Burton. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1920.

James W. Larkin to be postmaster at Brockport, N. Y., in place of J. W. Larkin. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Henry J. Griffin to be postmaster at Bombay, N. Y., in place of H. J. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Allen R. Nevinger to be postmaster at Bliss, N. Y., in place of A. R. Nevinger. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Elbert D. Parker to be postmaster at Arcade, N. Y., in place of E. D. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Maurice Tuttle, jr., to be postmaster at West Hampton Beach, N. Y., in place of Mabel B. Williams, resigned.

Lula V. White to be postmaster at Springwater, N. Y., in place of Clare B. Allen, resigned.

William M. Stuart to be postmaster at Canisteo, N. Y., in place of James L. Seely, jr., deceased.

Jessie I. Lester to be postmaster at Blasdell, N. Y., in place of Garra K. Lester, resigned.

Raymond Bissell to be postmaster at Buffalo, N. Y., in place of G. J. Meyer, deceased.

August P. Bolender to be postmaster at Collins, N. Y., in place of A. P. Bolender. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Edward Coady to be postmaster at Holley, N. Y., in place of Edward Coady. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

NORTH CAROLINA.

William R. Badgett to be postmaster at Pilot Mountain, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Sarah L. Whitson to be postmaster at Oteen, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Everette R. Crawford to be postmaster at Hayesville, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Martin L. Fogleman to be postmaster at Gibsonville, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

John F. Hunsucker to be postmaster at Conover, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Miley C. Glover to be postmaster at Bailey, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

George K. Snow to be postmaster at Mount Airy, N. C., in place of J. H. Carter, resigned.

Frank W. Miller to be postmaster at Waynesville, N. C., in place of F. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

James J. Farriss to be postmaster at High Point, N. C., in place of J. J. Farriss. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

A. Wayland Cooke to be postmaster at Greensboro, N. C., in place of A. W. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Millard F. Bond to be postmaster at Edenton, N. C., in place of M. F. Bond. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Frank R. Mease to be postmaster at Canton, N. C., in place of F. R. Mease. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

William C. Gillespie to be postmaster at Burnsville, N. C., in place of W. C. Gillespie. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

L. Estelle Jones to be postmaster at Bethel, N. C., in place of L. E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Luther F. Tillery to be postmaster at Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of O. A. Snipes, resigned.

James P. Parker to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, N. C., in place of J. P. Parker. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Emma B. Dean to be postmaster at Crary, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Clara J. Leet to be postmaster at Brocket, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

William J. Quigley to be postmaster at Bathgate, N. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

John C. Nippolt to be postmaster at Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Nippolt. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

Claude D. Rittenhouse to be postmaster at Wahpeton, N. Dak., in place of C. D. Rittenhouse. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Harriet M. Frank to be postmaster at Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of H. M. Frank. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Simon K. Kringlie to be postmaster at Portland, N. Dak., in place of S. K. Kringlie. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Wallace W. O'Hara to be postmaster at Neche, N. Dak., in place of W. W. O'Hara. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Perry Roath to be postmaster at Maddock, N. Dak., in place of P. Roath. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John E. Dick to be postmaster at McVie, N. Dak., in place of J. E. Dick. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

John B. Wagner to be postmaster at Lidgerwood, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Hans M. Haakenson to be postmaster at Hatton, N. Dak., in place of H. M. Haakenson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Fritz O. Hunger to be postmaster at Hankinson, N. Dak., in place of F. O. Hunger. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Reinhart Gilbertsen to be postmaster at Glenburn, N. Dak., in place of R. Gilbertsen. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Warren S. Town to be postmaster at Flaxton, N. Dak., in place of W. S. Town. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Minnie Clabaugh to be postmaster at Fairmount, N. Dak., in place of M. Clabaugh. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Hugo K. O. Schilling to be postmaster at Drake, N. Dak., in place of H. K. O. Schilling. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John O'Keefe to be postmaster at Cavalier, N. Dak., in place of John O'Keefe. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas W. Kinsey to be postmaster at Towner, N. Dak., in place of Henry A. Holmes, resigned.

Theodore S. Overby to be postmaster at Finley, N. Dak., in place of Alfred K. Cochrane, resigned.

Lorena W. McDonald to be postmaster at Medora, N. Dak., in place of L. S. Will, name changed by marriage.

OHIO.

Glenn B. Rodgers to be postmaster at Washington Court House, Ohio, in place of S. A. Murry, resigned.

Frederick B. Mowery to be postmaster at Kingston, Ohio, in place of F. B. Mowery. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1920.

James A. Angus to be postmaster at Genoa, Ohio, in place of J. A. Angus. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Justus D. Smoots to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Ohio, in place of J. D. Smoots. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Michael E. Miskall to be postmaster at East Liverpool, Ohio, in place of M. E. Miskall. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

John E. McFarland to be postmaster at Dresden, Ohio, in place of J. E. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

William E. Haas to be postmaster at Delaware, Ohio, in place of W. E. Haas. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1920.

Augustus S. Tuttle to be postmaster at Creston, Ohio, in place of A. S. Tuttle. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Peter J. Blank to be postmaster at Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of P. J. Blank. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Emmet H. Dixon to be postmaster at Byesville, Ohio, in place of E. H. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Thomas M. Duncan to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Ohio, in place of T. M. Duncan. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Gideon Locher to be postmaster at Bluffton, Ohio, in place of G. Locher. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Fred H. Hart to be postmaster at Beverly, Ohio, in place of F. H. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

James M. Phillips to be postmaster at Bethesda, Ohio, in place of J. M. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Oscar D. Ellenwood to be postmaster at Belpre, Ohio, in place of O. D. Ellenwood. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Lee R. Carman to be postmaster at Belmont, Ohio, in place of L. R. Carman. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Albert E. Kroske to be postmaster at Arlington, Ohio, in place of A. E. Kroske. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Harry E. Rice to be postmaster at Xenia, Ohio, in place of H. E. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1920.

Thomas N. Swearingen to be postmaster at Winchester, Ohio, in place of T. N. Swearingen. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

Theresa M. Beacham to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Ohio, in place of T. M. Beacham. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Charles H. Dale to be postmaster at Troy, Ohio, in place of C. H. Dale. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

James Connor to be postmaster at Toronto, Ohio, in place of J. Connor. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Henry H. McFadden to be postmaster at Steubenville, Ohio, in place of H. H. McFadden. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Claren T. Shively to be postmaster at Rogers, Ohio, in place of C. T. Shively. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

James B. Beard to be postmaster at Newton Falls, Ohio, in place of J. B. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John I. Norris to be postmaster at New Matamoras, Ohio, in place of J. I. Norris. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Daniel A. Muskoff to be postmaster at Navarre, Ohio, in place of D. A. Muskoff. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1920.

Franklin Harper to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ohio, in place of F. Harper. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Charles W. Hodges to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, Ohio, in place of C. W. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Karl H. Sherman to be postmaster at Minster, Ohio, in place of K. H. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Robert L. Hagerty to be postmaster at Mingo Junction, Ohio, in place of R. L. Hagerty. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Lewis G. Barton to be postmaster at Millersburg, Ohio, in place of L. G. Barton. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Frank G. Henry to be postmaster at Marietta, Ohio, in place of F. G. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Homer G. Hansel to be postmaster at Logan, Ohio, in place of H. G. Hansel. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

George M. Galbraith to be postmaster at Lexington, Ohio, in place of G. M. Galbraith. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Frank P. Allen to be postmaster at Akron, Ohio, in place of William H. Kroeger, declined.

George W. Lathrop to be postmaster at Toledo, Ohio, in place of George F. Parrish. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1919.

Ross S. DeMuth to be postmaster at Rossford, Ohio, in place of R. S. DeMuth. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1920.

OKLAHOMA.

Cora E. Morris to be postmaster at Manchester, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Alfred J. Stein to be postmaster at Alex, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Gaines D. Whitt to be postmaster at Quay, Okla., in place of E. L. Senft. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

Albert Cravens to be postmaster at Jenks, Okla., in place of C. S. Cravens, resigned.

Carl E. Williams to be postmaster at Tonkawa, Okla., in place of C. E. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

James M. Loper to be postmaster at Tishomingo, Okla., in place of J. M. Loper. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George H. Crittendon to be postmaster at Rush Springs, Okla., in place of G. H. Crittendon. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1920.

Ora E. McCague to be postmaster at Ralston, Okla., in place of O. E. McCague. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Hugh D. O'Neill to be postmaster at Marshall, Okla., in place of H. D. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Marian L. Robinson to be postmaster at Depew, Okla., in place of M. L. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Robert H. Carraway to be postmaster at Caddo, Okla., in place of R. H. Carraway. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Samuel D. Grandstaff to be postmaster at Butler, Okla., in place of S. D. Grandstaff. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

George H. Overbeck to be postmaster at Buffalo, Okla., in place of G. H. Overbeck. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Nettie C. Fluke to be postmaster at Boynton, Okla., in place of N. C. Fluke. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

John A. Miller to be postmaster at Beaver, Okla., in place of J. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

John A. Cox to be postmaster at Spiro, Okla., in place of Jefferson D. Ward, declined.

Allen E. Jennings to be postmaster at Perkins, Okla., in place of A. E. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Josiah L. Buckley to be postmaster at Texhoma, Okla., in place of J. L. Buckley. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Clarence O. Berry to be postmaster at Vinita, Okla., in place of C. O. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

OREGON.

Oscar Kendall to be postmaster at Richland, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Joseph Lyons to be postmaster at Reedsport, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Frank H. Loughton to be postmaster at Seaside, Oreg., in place of F. H. Loughton. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

James W. Dunn to be postmaster at St. Benedict, Oreg., in place of J. W. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

James A. Watkins to be postmaster at Philomath, Oreg., in place of J. A. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Walter L. Hembree to be postmaster at McMinnville, Oreg., in place of W. L. Hembree. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Homer S. Wood to be postmaster at Independence, Oreg., in place of H. S. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

William P. Quinlan to be postmaster at Grants Pass, Oreg., in place of W. P. Quinlan. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Robert P. Wirtz to be postmaster at Forest Grove, Oreg., in place of R. P. Wirtz. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Chester Noland to be postmaster at Creswell, Oreg., in place of Chester Noland. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Katherine B. Veatch to be postmaster at Cottage Grove, Oreg., in place of K. B. Veatch. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

John W. Leneve to be postmaster at Coquille, Oreg., in place of J. W. Leneve. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Warren A. Heylman to be postmaster at Estacada, Oreg., in place of W. A. Heylman. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Fitzhugh G. Lee to be postmaster at Junction City, Oreg., in place of F. G. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Anna M. Frank to be postmaster at New Salem, Pa., in place of A. N. Yaughter, resigned.

Dorothy M. Shidler to be postmaster at Marianna, Pa., in place of J. B. Wise, resigned.

Joseph M. Rutherford to be postmaster at Willow Grove, Pa., in place of J. M. Rutherford. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John F. Mann to be postmaster at Wilcox, Pa., in place of J. F. Mann. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1920.

George D. Arner to be postmaster at Weissport, Pa., in place of G. D. Arner. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Percival E. Faust to be postmaster at Weatherly, Pa., in place of P. E. Faust. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

John B. Henning to be postmaster at Tunkhannock, Pa., in place of J. B. Henning. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Michael J. McNulty to be postmaster at Troy, Pa., in place of M. J. McNulty. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Charles L. Gibbs to be postmaster at Titusville, Pa., in place of C. L. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Hiram L. Purdy to be postmaster at Sunbury, Pa., in place of H. L. Purdy. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John V. McFadden to be postmaster at Summithill, Pa., in place of J. V. McFadden. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

John H. Custer to be postmaster at Stoyestown, Pa., in place of J. H. Custer. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Walter M. Clevenstine to be postmaster at Spring City, Pa., in place of W. M. Clevenstine. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

James P. Owens to be postmaster at Scottdale, Pa., in place of J. P. Owens. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John M. Ebling to be postmaster at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., in place of J. M. Ebling. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Eulalie D. Lockard to be postmaster at St. Davids, Pa., in place of E. D. Lockard. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Preston L. Peters to be postmaster at Saegerstown, Pa., in place of P. L. Peters. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1920.

Menzo M. Burt to be postmaster at Roulette, Pa., in place of M. M. Burt. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Laura W. Weaver to be postmaster at Republic, Pa., in place of L. W. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1920.

Phaon E. Sheidy to be postmaster at Pine Grove, Pa., in place of P. E. Sheidy. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Edwin J. Wieder, jr., to be postmaster at Pennsburg, Pa., in place of E. J. Wieder, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

George N. Grumbein to be postmaster at Palmyra, Pa., in place of G. N. Grumbein. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Edward S. Laughlin to be postmaster at Oil City, Pa., in place of E. S. Laughlin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Andrew S. Knepp to be postmaster at North East, Pa., in place of A. S. Knepp. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Henry M. Good to be postmaster at New Castle, Pa., in place of H. M. Good. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

William J. Burke to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, Pa., in place of W. J. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Edward Weidenhamer to be postmaster at Milton, Pa., in place of Edward Weidenhamer. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Charles W. Rubendall to be postmaster at Millersburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Rubendall. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

Joseph E. Niemond to be postmaster at Mifflin, Pa., in place of J. E. Niemond. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John T. Shipley to be postmaster at Meyersdale, Pa., in place of J. T. Shipley. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1920.

Elias B. Leiby to be postmaster at Marysville, Pa., in place of E. B. Leiby. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

John D. May to be postmaster at Lapark, Pa., in place of J. D. May. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

J. Bentley Candy, jr., to be postmaster at Langhorne, Pa., in place of J. B. Candy, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Joseph C. Luman to be postmaster at Hyndman, Pa., in place of J. C. Luman. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

J. Landis Strickler to be postmaster at Hummelstown, Pa., in place of J. L. Strickler. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

William Critchfield to be postmaster at Herminie, Pa., in place of William Critchfield. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1920.

Francis E. Burke to be postmaster at Great Bend, Pa., in place of F. E. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Harby A. Koller to be postmaster at Glen Rock, Pa., in place of H. A. Koller. Incumbent's commission expired March 20, 1920.

Caroline E. W. Curry to be postmaster at Glen Olden, Pa., in place of C. E. W. Curry. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

Patrick B. Egan to be postmaster at Emporium, Pa., in place of P. B. Egan. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1920.

Milton A. Miller to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, Pa., in place of M. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

Mertie T. Gillies to be postmaster at Devon, Pa., in place of M. T. Gillies. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Harvey M. Bard to be postmaster at Denver, Pa., in place of H. M. Bard. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.
William L. Marshall to be postmaster at Dayton, Pa., in place of W. L. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Augustus T. Groff to be postmaster at Confluence, Pa., in place of A. T. Groff. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

George W. Yost to be postmaster at Collegeville, Pa., in place of G. W. Yost. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Thomas McCobb to be postmaster at Cochran, Pa., in place of Thomas McCobb. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1920.

Richard O. Heilman to be postmaster at Catasauqua, Pa., in place of R. O. Heilman. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

John A. McGinley to be postmaster at Bristol, Pa., in place of J. A. McGinley. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

John J. McCormick to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Pa., in place of J. J. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

Michael C. Bermingham to be postmaster at Blossburg, Pa., in place of M. C. Bermingham. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Charles W. Krissinger to be postmaster at Berlin, Pa., in place of C. W. Krissinger. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1920.

Francis B. Smeltzer to be postmaster at Avonmore, Pa., in place of F. B. Smeltzer. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Fred H. Smith to be postmaster at Athens, Pa., in place of F. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John C. Wiegel to be postmaster at Aliquippa, Pa., in place of J. C. Wiegel. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1920.

Nelson O. Smith to be postmaster at Blawnox (late Hoboken), Pa., in place of Herbert P. Mosca, resigned. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

Oliver F. Wolf to be postmaster at Telford, Pa., in place of O. F. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Clarence Reisinger to be postmaster at Sewickley, Pa., in place of C. Reisinger. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Howard Kemrer to be postmaster at Paradise, Pa., in place of H. Kemrer. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1920.

Thomas W. Lauver to be postmaster at Milroy, Pa., in place of T. W. Lauver. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Andrew J. Palm to be postmaster at Meadville, Pa., in place of A. J. Palm. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Joseph R. Thurston to be postmaster at Factoryville, Pa., in place of J. R. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

John A. Miller to be postmaster at Arnold, Pa., in place of J. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Willis C. Kemp to be postmaster at West Middlesex, Pa., in place of J. Ray, resigned.

Clive S. Burtch to be postmaster at Tioga, Pa., in place of W. H. Rose, deceased.

Samuel J. Myers to be postmaster at Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of A. J. Young, deceased.

Louis S. Bisky to be postmaster at Meshoppen, Pa., in place of A. R. Sherwood, removed.

PORTO RICO.

Carlos F. Torregrosa to be postmaster at Aguadilla, Porto Rico, in place of C. F. Torregrosa. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

RHODE ISLAND.

John McPike to be postmaster at Warren, R. I., in place of J. McPike. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Summer Mowry to be postmaster at Peace Dale, R. I., in place of S. Mowry. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Frank P. Lamb to be postmaster at Natick, R. I., in place of F. P. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Samuel W. Smith, jr., to be postmaster at Jamestown, R. I., in place of S. W. Smith, jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

Emory H. Desilets to be postmaster at Manville, R. I., in place of E. H. Desilets. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Ellen M. Williamson to be postmaster at Norway, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

John W. Willis to be postmaster at Lynchburg, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Clara A. Bonner to be postmaster at Due West, S. C., in place of F. P. Wilson, resigned.

Martha E. Nichols to be postmaster at York, S. C., in place of M. E. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Marie C. Harley to be postmaster at Williston, S. C., in place of M. C. Harley. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William B. Wright, jr., to be postmaster at Shelton, S. C., in place of W. B. Wright, jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Maxcy J. Spears to be postmaster at Lamar, S. C., in place of M. J. Spears. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

James A. Barrett to be postmaster at Clover, S. C., in place of J. A. Barrett. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Clinton G. Rowland to be postmaster at Central, S. C., in place of C. G. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

James M. Byrd to be postmaster at Branchville, S. C., in place of J. M. Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Manton B. McCutchen to be postmaster at Bishopville, S. C., in place of M. B. McCutchen. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Almon C. Turbeville to be postmaster at Lake City, S. C., in place of J. F. Rickenbaker, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

John W. Martin to be postmaster at Watertown, S. Dak., in place of J. W. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

James M. Rasmussen to be postmaster at Viborg, S. Dak., in place of J. M. Rasmussen. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

James R. Dunlap to be postmaster at Vermillion, S. Dak., in place of J. R. Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

James E. Burns to be postmaster at Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of J. E. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1920.

Joseph W. McMahon to be postmaster at Salem, S. Dak., in place of J. W. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Francis M. Crain to be postmaster at Redfield, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Crain. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

Frelen Riley to be postmaster at Parker, S. Dak., in place of F. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

Tazewell M. Simmons to be postmaster at Huron, S. Dak., in place of T. M. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Harry K. Sanborn to be postmaster at Hurley, S. Dak., in place of H. K. Sanborn. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

James S. Slaughter to be postmaster at Herrick, S. Dak., in place of J. S. Slaughter. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

John A. Stromme to be postmaster at Garretson, S. Dak., in place of J. A. Stromme. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

Frank E. Riley to be postmaster at Dupree, S. Dak., in place of F. E. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Edward McDonald to be postmaster at Deadwood, S. Dak., in place of E. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1920.

Guy A. Miller to be postmaster at Conde, S. Dak., in place of G. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

Dana N. Bonesteel to be postmaster at Artesian, S. Dak., in place of D. N. Bonesteel. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Leroy F. Lemert to be postmaster at Spencer, S. Dak., in place of L. F. Lemert. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Lydia Oldewurtel to be postmaster at Freeman, S. Dak., in place of L. Oldewurtel. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

Anna M. Damberger to be postmaster at Herreid, S. Dak., in place of J. W. Blair, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1919.

Raymond B. Breed to be postmaster at Brookings, S. Dak., in place of A. E. Swift, removed.

TENNESSEE.

Leander N. Alley to be postmaster at Oakdale, Tenn., in place of L. N. Alley. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

James C. Walker to be postmaster at Monterey, Tenn., in place of J. C. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Dossie O. Thompson to be postmaster at McEwen, Tenn., in place of D. O. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Mary B. Buford to be postmaster at Lynnville, Tenn., in place of M. O. Buford. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1920.

Hugh H. Gouchenour to be postmaster at Greenville, Tenn., in place of H. H. Gouchenour. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

Charles C. Berry to be postmaster at Dyer, Tenn., in place of C. C. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

John I. Cox to be postmaster at Bristol, Tenn., in place of J. I. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Charles M. Reed to be postmaster at Athens, Tenn., in place of C. M. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

John M. Jones to be postmaster at Newport, Tenn., in place of J. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1920.

James S. Pritchett to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Tenn., in place of J. S. Pritchett. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Shadrach E. Byler to be postmaster at Collinwood, Tenn., in place of S. E. Byler. Office became presidential April 1, 1919.

S. R. Robinson to be postmaster at Tazewell, Tenn., in place of F. F. Overton. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

TEXAS.

Charles P. Zapalac to be postmaster at West, Tex., in place of C. P. Zapalac. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Virgil T. Williams to be postmaster at Thornton, Tex., in place of V. T. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James W. Longley to be postmaster at San Saba, Tex., in place of J. W. Longley. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Herschel C. Connally to be postmaster at Rosebud, Tex., in place of H. C. Connally. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

Mary M. Ferrel to be postmaster at Roby, Tex., in place of M. M. Ferrel. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Abundio Contreras to be postmaster at Riogrande, Tex., in place of A. Contreras. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

Osceola G. Wilson to be postmaster at Nixon, Tex., in place of O. G. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

Claud W. Warren to be postmaster at Matador, Tex., in place of Claud W. Warren. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Mary R. Manning to be postmaster at Madisonville, Tex., in place of Ross Manning. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

Charles J. January, jr., to be postmaster at McAllen, Tex., in place of C. J. January, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Percy L. Walker to be postmaster at Luling, Tex., in place of P. L. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Wilson B. Russell to be postmaster at Liberty Hill, Tex., in place of W. B. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Willis D. Holman to be postmaster at Hutto, Tex., in place of W. D. Holman. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James H. Richey to be postmaster at Hedley, Tex., in place of J. H. Richey. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Walter N. Ramsay to be postmaster at Eldorado, Tex., in place of W. N. Ramsay. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Henry C. Bailey to be postmaster at Detroit, Tex., in place of H. C. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Howell L. Piner to be postmaster at Denison, Tex., in place of H. L. Piner. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

Rudolph Flach, jr., to be postmaster at Comfort, Tex., in place of R. Flach, jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Hugh M. Bryan to be postmaster at Burton, Tex., in place of H. M. Bryan. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William L. Hayley to be postmaster at Bronte, Tex., in place of W. L. Hayley. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Edgar A. Stripling to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Tex., in place of W. J. Moore, resigned.

Harvey E. Williams to be postmaster at Desdemona, Tex., in place of H. E. Williams. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Aaron H. Russell to be postmaster at Willis, Tex., in place of Clinton Bybee, deceased.

Wiley H. Lowrey to be postmaster at Weimar, Tex., in place of R. H. McCormick, deceased.

Roy C. Lattimore to be postmaster at Roxton, Tex., in place of M. C. Bradshaw, resigned.

Joseph W. Holland to be postmaster at New Waverly, Tex., in place of W. H. Allen, deceased. Office became presidential July 1, 1918.

George F. Nelson to be postmaster at Mount Calm, Tex., in place of T. R. Warr, resigned.

Otto J. Lang to be postmaster at Lufkin, Tex., in place of W. E. Boykin, resigned.

Theodore W. Lueders to be postmaster at Lagrange, Tex., in place of L. V. Vanek, resigned.

William R. Dickens to be postmaster at Eden, Tex., in place of C. H. Latham, resigned.

Albert B. Seale to be postmaster at Beaumont, Tex., in place of J. Dies, resigned.

UTAH.

William A. Jones to be postmaster at Spanish Fork, Utah, in place of W. A. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1920.

Leonard C. Sargent to be postmaster at Panguitch, Utah, in place of L. C. Sargent. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George A. Allen to be postmaster at Nephi, Utah, in place of G. A. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Richard T. Fry to be postmaster at Morgan, Utah, in place of R. T. Fry. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Robert D. Halladay to be postmaster at Grantsville, Utah. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Jedediah M. Blair to be postmaster at Logan, Utah, in place of J. M. Blair. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1920.

Heber J. Sheffield, jr., to be postmaster at Kaysville, Utah, in place of H. J. Sheffield, jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1920.

William S. Anderson to be postmaster at Moroni, Utah, in place of Urvin Gee, declined.

James A. Faust to be postmaster at Delta, Utah, in place of J. A. Faust, deceased.

Anthony W. Thomson to be postmaster at Ephraim, Utah, in place of L. M. Olson, deceased.

VERMONT.

John H. Donnelly to be postmaster at Vergennes, Vt., in place of J. H. Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1920.

Andrew B. Anderson to be postmaster at Swanton, Vt., in place of A. B. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Asa C. Oakes to be postmaster at Stowe, Vt., in place of A. C. Oakes. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1920.

Frank H. Tyler to be postmaster at South Londonderry, Vt., in place of F. H. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1920.

John L. Welsh to be postmaster at Proctor, Vt., in place of J. L. Welsh. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Daniel R. Stetson to be postmaster at Newport, Vt., in place of D. R. Stetson. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Calvin L. Gates to be postmaster at Morrisville, Vt., in place of C. L. Gates. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

James B. Kimball to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, Vt., in place of J. B. Kimball. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Herbert O. Bixby to be postmaster at Chelsea, Vt., in place of H. O. Bixby. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1920.

Michael J. Moran to be postmaster at Brattleboro, Vt., in place of M. J. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John Noble to be postmaster at Bethel, Vt., in place of John Noble. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Martha G. Kibby to be postmaster at Randolph Center, Vt., in place of M. G. Kibby. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1920.

VIRGINIA.

John L. Henley to be postmaster at Tappahannock, Va., in place of J. L. Henley. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

William A. Coates to be postmaster at South Washington, Va., in place of W. A. Coates. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

Samuel R. Gault to be postmaster at Scottsville, Va., in place of S. R. Gault. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Robert L. Dudley to be postmaster at Rural Retreat, Va., in place of R. L. Dudley. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Henry L. Munt to be postmaster at City Point, Va., in place of H. L. Munt. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1920.

Sidney Sheltman to be postmaster at Christiansburg, Va., in place of Sidney Sheltman. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1920.

A. Sidney Francis to be postmaster at Boykins, Va., in place of A. S. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Ruth C. Mankin to be postmaster at Falls Church, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Eugene C. Hurt to be postmaster at Clover, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1919.

William G. Stevenson to be postmaster at Accomac, Va., in place of W. G. Stevenson. Incumbent's commission expired January 4, 1919.

Nannie B. Campbell to be postmaster at Amherst, Va., in place of N. B. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1920.

Everett S. Kendrick to be postmaster at Bristol, Va., in place of E. S. Kendrick. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1919.

WASHINGTON.

William L. Adams to be postmaster at Zillah, Wash., in place of W. L. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Joseph H. Gill to be postmaster at Washtucna, Wash., in place of J. H. Gill. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Thomas E. Brittain to be postmaster at Tonasket, Wash., in place of T. E. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Wilson Howe to be postmaster at Tenino, Wash., in place of Wilson Howe. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Conrad M. Vaupel to be postmaster at Tekoa, Wash., in place of C. M. Vaupel. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Uriel K. Lail to be postmaster at Sunnyside, Wash., in place of U. K. Lail. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Eli P. Marsolais to be postmaster at Sultan, Wash., in place of E. P. Marsolais. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

George B. Ragsdale to be postmaster at Sedro Woolley, Wash., in place of G. B. Ragsdale. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Antoine Faucher to be postmaster at Ritzville, Wash., in place of Antoine Faucher. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

John T. Harris to be postmaster at Ridgefield, Wash., in place of J. T. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Harvey L. Tibbals to be postmaster at Port Townsend, Wash., in place of H. L. Tibbals. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Herbert J. Nunan to be postmaster at Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of H. J. Nunan. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Joseph M. McGifford to be postmaster at Lacrosse, Wash., in place of J. M. McGifford. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Elliott B. Johnson to be postmaster at Granger, Wash., in place of E. B. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Eugene J. Edson to be postmaster at Coulee City, Wash., in place of E. J. Edson. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Joseph F. Lavigne to be postmaster at Chewelah, Wash., in place of J. F. Lavigne. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1920.

Frederick W. Reuter to be postmaster at Cheney, Wash., in place of F. W. Reuter. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1920.

Guy A. B. Dovell to be postmaster at Buckley, Wash., in place of G. A. B. Dovell. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

George H. Watrous to be postmaster at Bellingham, Wash., in place of G. H. Watrous. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1920.

Arthur H. Graves to be postmaster at Asotin, Wash., in place of A. H. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Frederick E. Tuttle to be postmaster at Twisp, Wash., in place of E. H. C. Ramm, resigned.

Thomas A. Graham to be postmaster at Goldendale, Wash., in place of Talleyrand Bratton, resigned.

Thomas H. McCleary to be postmaster at Centralia, Wash., in place of T. H. McCleary. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

Edward J. Tramill to be postmaster at Oakesdale, Wash., in place of E. J. Tramill. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1920.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Stanhope M. Scott to be postmaster at Terra Alta, W. Va., in place of S. M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

Edgar J. Loy to be postmaster at Romney, W. Va., in place of E. J. Loy. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

John L. Evans to be postmaster at Summersville, W. Va., in place of J. L. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Thomas W. Goeke to be postmaster at Piedmont, W. Va., in place of T. W. Goeke. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1920.

Joseph A. Wooddell to be postmaster at Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of J. A. Wooddell. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Willard Williams to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va., in place of Willard Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Ida J. Garrison to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va., in place of I. J. Garrison. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1920.

George A. Porter to be postmaster at Kenova, W. Va., in place of G. A. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1920.

Joseph H. Long to be postmaster at Huntington, W. Va., in place of J. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired May 15, 1920.

Clarence L. Perkins to be postmaster at Gassaway, W. Va., in place of C. L. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Maurice R. Walker to be postmaster at Bramwell, W. Va., in place of M. R. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1920.

James H. Bailey to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W. Va., in place of W. E. McDowell, resigned.

Malichi J. Meadows to be postmaster at Beckley, W. Va., in place of M. J. Meadows. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Earle Reger to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of C. Lively, resigned.

John E. Peck to be postmaster at Logan, W. Va., in place of L. E. Browning, removed.

WISCONSIN.

Jens Davidson to be postmaster at Westby, Wis., in place of J. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William Shenkenberg to be postmaster at Waterford, Wis., in place of W. Shenkenberg. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Elmer A. Peterson to be postmaster at Walworth, Wis., in place of E. A. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Frederick Y. King to be postmaster at Tigerton, Wis., in place of F. Y. King. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

William Wagner to be postmaster at Thorp, Wis., in place of W. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Charles J. Knilians to be postmaster at Sharon, Wis., in place of C. J. Knilians. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William H. Dunn to be postmaster at Rice Lake, Wis., in place of W. H. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Joseph Le Fevre to be postmaster at Pulaski, Wis., in place of J. Le Fevre. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1920.

Julius E. Hennig to be postmaster at Princeton, Wis., in place of J. E. Hennig. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

William W. Sanders to be postmaster at Osceola, Wis., in place of W. W. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John B. Kerrigan to be postmaster at Norwalk, Wis., in place of J. B. Kerrigan. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Charles H. Farley to be postmaster at New Lisbon, Wis., in place of C. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1920.

Alois Goebel to be postmaster at Mount Horeb, Wis., in place of A. Goebel. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Ira B. Pierce to be postmaster at Monticello, Wis., in place of I. B. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

James O'Hara to be postmaster at Mazomanie, Wis., in place of J. O'Hara. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

George I. Richmond to be postmaster at Lodi, Wis., in place of G. I. Richmond. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Henry R. Schumann to be postmaster at Kohler, Wis., in place of H. R. Schumann. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Joseph Marx to be postmaster at Hilbert, Wis., in place of J. Marx. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Henry H. Gleason to be postmaster at Glenwood City, Wis., in place of H. H. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Henry E. Steinbring to be postmaster at Fall Creek, Wis., in place of H. E. Steinbring. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1920.

Thomas D. Smith to be postmaster at Fairchild, Wis., in place of T. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Clare L. Shearer to be postmaster at Eagle, Wis., in place of C. L. Shearer. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Henry Pattison to be postmaster at Durand, Wis., in place of H. Pattison. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Herman Kronschnabl to be postmaster at Dorchester, Wis., in place of H. Kronschnabl. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Charles M. Tallman to be postmaster at Delavan, Wis., in place of C. M. Tallman. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

William C. McMahon to be postmaster at Cumberland, Wis., in place of W. C. McMahon. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Patrick J. Love to be postmaster at Coleman, Wis., in place of P. J. Love. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Carrie Kautsky to be postmaster at Colby, Wis., in place of Carrie Kautsky. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Ray C. Stewart to be postmaster at Clinton, Wis., in place of R. C. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Carl Whitaker to be postmaster at Chetek, Wis., in place of Carl Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John Cremer to be postmaster at Cashton, Wis., in place of John Cremer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Fred C. Schliesman to be postmaster at Cambria, Wis., in place of F. C. Schliesman. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Henry E. Zimmermann to be postmaster at Burlington, Wis., in place of H. E. Zimmermann. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Peter T. Moore to be postmaster at Brodhead, Wis., in place of P. T. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

John H. Levis to be postmaster at Black River Falls, Wis., in place of J. H. Levis. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Charles W. Steele to be postmaster at Beloit, Wis., in place of C. W. Steele. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Frank E. Poll to be postmaster at Almond, Wis., in place of F. E. Poll. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1920.

Olaf R. Skaar to be postmaster at La Crosse, Wis., in place of O. R. Skaar. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1918.

John A. Zimpelmann to be postmaster at Eagle River, Wis., in place of J. A. Zimpelmann. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Alfred H. Fischer to be postmaster at Ripon, Wis., in place of C. H. Ellsworth, deceased.

Arthur J. Dopp to be postmaster at Waukesha, Wis., in place of A. J. Dopp. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Hubert A. Wagener to be postmaster at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., in place of H. A. Wagener. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

William D. Schultz to be postmaster at Stanley, Wis., in place of W. D. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1920.

Henry Knapstein to be postmaster at New London, Wis., in place of H. Knapstein. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1920.

Joseph L. O'Neil to be postmaster at Gays Mills, Wis., in place of J. L. O'Neil. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1920.

Lawrence Clancey to be postmaster at East Troy, Wis., in place of L. Clancey. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1920.

Russell D. Stouffer to be postmaster at Shell Lake, Wis., in place of E. V. Aberg, deceased.

Raynold G. Lidbom to be postmaster at Grantsburg, Wis., in place of E. I. Bunker. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

WYOMING.

James L. Masters to be postmaster at Torrington, Wyo., in place of J. L. Masters. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1920.

Finis E. Godfrey to be postmaster at Lander, Wyo., in place of F. E. Godfrey. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1920.

Alfred F. Stott to be postmaster at Douglas, Wyo., in place of A. F. Stott. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1920.

Conrad S. Vaterlaus to be postmaster at Cowley, Wyo. Office became presidential July 1, 1919.

Effie R. Spragg to be postmaster at Manville, Wyo., in place of E. R. Spragg. Office became presidential July 1, 1919.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1920.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

J. Warren Davis to be United States circuit judge, third judicial circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph L. Bodine to be United States district judge, district of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

James E. Carroll to be United States attorney, eastern district of Missouri.

Elmer H. Geran to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

James L. Hughes to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Philadelphia, Pa.

BUREAU OF MINES.

Frederick G. Cottrell to be Director of the Bureau of Mines.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE.

Charles Eldred Herring to be first assistant director.

Oliver Paul Hopkins to be second assistant director.

CONSULAR SERVICE.

Alphonse Gaulin to be consul general of class 2.

William J. Pike to be consul of class 3.

Cecil M. P. Cross to be consul of class 7.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles W. McCune to be collector of customs.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Leo W. Tucker to be assistant surgeon.

Edward B. Faget to be assistant surgeon.

Harry J. Warner to be surgeon.

Robert Olesen to be surgeon.

COAST GUARD.

James H. Brown to be senior captain.
Harry G. Hamlet to be senior captain.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Omah Coulter, Omaha.

LOUISIANA.

Lillian P. Witherow, Lake Providence.

MISSISSIPPI.

Mellon E. Daniel, Dlo.
Jerry T. Talbert, Grenada.
Zilpha L. Killam, Hickory.
Pearl Young, Noxapater.
Edwin L. Sibley, Philipp.
William A. Davis, Wiggins.

OHIO.

John W. Kramer, Maumee.

VIRGINIA.

George E. Harrison, Lawrenceville.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate June 2, 1920.

POSTMASTER.

NEBRASKA.

Edward F. Lusienksi, Platte Center.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 2, 1920.

POSTMASTERS.

Edwin C. Johnson, Craig, Colo., sent to the Senate January 19, 1920.

Dewey E. Wilcox to be postmaster at Richfield, in the State of Idaho.

Ronald H. Gordon-Ross, Hudson, Ohio, sent to the Senate January 19, 1920.

Robert L. Wheeler, Delta, Pa., sent to the Senate April 29, 1920.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 2, 1920.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou Infinite, Invisible Spirit, whom we call God, to whom the humblest and most forlorn soul may look up and call Thee Father, receive consolation, hope, and courage.

In its sublime research, philosophy
May measure out the ocean deep—may count
The sands of the sun's rays—but, God! for Thee
There is no weight nor measure:—none can mount
Up to Thy mysteries; reason's brightest spark,
Though kindled by Thy light, in vain would try
To trace Thy counsels, infinite and dark;
And thought is lost ere thought can soar so high,
Even like past moments in eternity.

We come in our weakness, praying for strength; in our perplexities, praying for light; that we may use the faculties Thou hast bestowed upon us to the betterment of mankind, satisfy our longings, and receive Thine approbation. In Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND AT CRISTOBAL, CANAL ZONE.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill H. R. 6222, which is now lying on the Speaker's table, be now taken from the table and the Senate amendment concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls from the Speaker's table and moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A 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 Stat., ch. 390, p. 565).

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. As the bill originally passed the House, I remember it was for the correction of title in the Masonic lodge in Panama. Is that the purpose of it?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does not this Senate amendment change the purpose?

Mr. DENISON. In answer to the question I will state that after the bill passed the House an opinion was rendered by Judge Feuille, attorney for the Canal government, who said that he had serious doubts whether or not the first provision of the bill, as a matter of law, would accomplish the purpose. And he asked that the bill be amended as it is amended. I suggested the amendment to the Senate committee, and they made the amendment as suggested.

Mr. DUPRE. It is still intended to convey the land to the lodge?

Mr. DENISON. The purpose of the amendment is to better accomplish what was sought to be accomplished.

Mr. GARD. I have not seen the amendment to read it, but just heard it read, and I think from the reading of it that the amendment provides for the sale to some one other than the lodge by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. DENISON. No; it simply authorizes the Panama Railroad Co. to make conveyance to any person. Of course, they contracted to sell the property to the Masonic lodge, and the only reason they did not do it was because of this flaw in the title.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The situation, then, as I understand it, is that the House bill simply removes the prohibition against the disposition of the property?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And the attorney thought that the removal of the prohibition would not of itself authorize the sale of the property?

Mr. DENISON. That is it.

Mr. MONDELL. And the amendment goes to the removal of the prohibition as well as authorizing the sale?

Mr. GARD. But under the original title it authorized the sale.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the amendment was made at the suggestion of the attorney for the Canal government. It has the approval of the Panama Railroad Co., I suppose, and of all parties concerned.

Mr. GARD. It has not gone back to the committee for its consideration?

Mr. DENISON. I consulted with the chairman of the committee in regard to the matter, and from my understanding with the chairman I suggested the amendment myself which was made by the Senate, and I think it will meet the approval of the committee.

Mr. GARD. But it has not been considered by the House committee since the Senate amendment was made?

Mr. DENISON. No; but it is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. WINGO. Unfortunately for me, my attention was diverted. What was the provision in the House bill?

Mr. DENISON. The provision of the House bill was that this tract of land upon which the Masonic Temple had been built be taken out from under the operation of the Executive order of the President in 1912 expropriating all land and land under water in the Canal Zone.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, your House bill removed the inhibition which prohibited the sale or transfer of this property to this lodge?

Mr. DENISON. That is the effect of the bill as it is now.

Mr. WINGO. What is the Senate amendment to which the gentleman asks us to agree?

Mr. DENISON. The Senate amendment simply authorizes the Panama Railroad Co. to go ahead and make conveyance, as the title was in the Panama Railroad Co. before the order of expropriation.

Mr. WINGO. I gathered from the question of the gentleman from Ohio that the Senate amendment authorized the conveyance to anyone instead of those people who had put the building there?

Mr. DENISON. Well, we did not know to what particular persons they wanted to make conveyance nor what words they wished to use, so we made the grant of authority general.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is satisfied that the Senate amendment will permit the carrying out of this intention of the company to convey this title to the lodge which has now been built on it, and that it is satisfactory to them?