

zones about all military camps in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Woodlawn Missionary Society, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the prohibition of the liquor business as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pomona, Cal., protesting against the waste of enormous quantities of food in the manufacture of beer and wine, and refusing to sign or indorse any compact to cut down the bread for our families while this enormous waste is countenanced by Congress and the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 19, 1917.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 18, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

NATION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, lest we forget, I rise to recall to our minds a resolution that was passed by the Continental Congress on the 27th day of February, 1777. Indeed, judging from the votes that were cast in this Chamber on the 7th day of this month, I fear it had slipped the minds of many of us.

It will come as a distinct surprise to some Congressmen that the question of food conservation, which we have hitherto prided ourselves upon as the very most recent invention, demanded attention in 1777. And it will certainly startle some to be reminded that in that connection the Congress went its limit, without presidential interference or correspondence with the Antislavery League, for bone-dry conservation of foodstuffs.

BONE-DRY IN 1777.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented.

That was passed 140 years ago. Nobody had ever seen a kerosene lamp, or a cookstove, or a steamboat, or a locomotive, or a postage stamp, or dreamed of a telephone, automobile, flying machine, or submarine. Those were slow and dreamy days, but Congress passed a more sensible and more effective conservation bill—within its limitations—in five minutes than this Senate, living in these days of enlightened progress, has been able to pass in five weeks. And incidentally, to the boundaries of its limitations, it passed a more statesmanlike bone-dry law than this Senate seems to be willing to enact.

But they had some distinct advantages—that was before the adoption of the Constitution and before the unconstitutional ghost was stalked at every legislative feast. And they had some disadvantages—unfortunately they could not enact any law binding upon anybody, and their resolution met in the legislatures the fate that great things often meet at the hands of small men.

BEER HAD NOT YET DISCOVERED AMERICA.

Some critic may urge that the measure was not bone-dry, since it did not mention brewing. At that date beer had not discovered America. The Government has no record of the beer industry prior to 1840—63 years after the adoption of this resolution—and then the per capita consumption was but 1.36 gallons, or less than one-twelfth the per capita consumption of last year.

CLEAR-VISIONED MEN.

This was the urgent and heartfelt appeal of earnest men for immediate action forbidding the transformation of their strength-giving grains into a poison which was certain to bring a flood of social and domestic disorders. They were without the modern knowledge of the physical effect of alcohol upon the human system and the physical economy. They were without the guidance of the experience of charitable, correctional, and penal institutions. They did not have the testimony of judges of every court, of peace officers of every grade, and of cities and States of every section all witnessing the destructive and corrosive civic and social effects of drink. And sir, it was before the advent of the saloon; it was before drunkenness was looked upon as a weakness; it was before the ministers of Christ either shunned it or looked upon it with marked disfavor; it was before the employer of labor discriminated against the drinker; it was before insurance companies frowned upon alcohol; it was before the church demanded total abstinence; it was before the school taught the effects of the poison; it was before there was a square inch of prohibition territory in the Anglo-Saxon world. That Congress was a world-renowned gathering that is remembered to-day with more veneration, respect, and love than many,

perhaps than any, of its successors. Are they remembered for their wisdom? For their time they were wise men, but wisdom accumulates with the years. There is not a man in this Chamber that does not know more of electricity than Franklin, who knew more of it than any other of his time. But, sir, they are not remembered for their learning. Are they remembered for their oratory? There were but few orators among them, and this Chamber holds the equal of their best. Are they remembered for their literary attainments? Their literary men, though great, were few.

MEN OF COURAGE.

There is one characteristic that elevates that Congress to an eminence of fame approached by no other; it is the sublime courage with which they faced the vexing problems of their day.

In face of death they dared to fling
Defiance to a tyrant king!

But that was the small beginning of their courage. They dared open-mindedly to face the revered traditions, customs, usages, and precedents of the awesome past and bend submissive knee to naught but truth. If in facing the pregnant issues of this hour this Senate will emulate them in that, its fame will be as glorious and endure as long.

THEY LABORED FOR THEIR FELLOW MEN.

One trait alone commends them to the lasting love of a forgetful world—they loved and labored for their fellow men. And this resolution I have read is but a single incident in proof of it. To distill grain took food from the hungry. Enough! Let it stop immediately. Let the laws be effectual. Again, from it extensive evils are likely to be derived. Enough! Let it be quickly prevented. In a single sentence of 46 words 3 of them denote speed and action and 2 indicate thoroughness; had the various legislatures heeded their appeal, this Nation would have escaped the "extensive evils that have been derived from the traffic" which our fathers of that Congress so clearly foresaw, and its illustrious glory, beauty, strength, and position would have reached heights of grandeur, service, and leadership now only shadowed in our fond, ambitious dreams. Doubtless cupidity on the one hand and cowardice on the other joined to balk this purpose of the gods and thwart the hope our patriotic fathers bore. For cupidity and cowardice ever join against the onward march of man—cupidity of those who get gain from the vices, misfortunes, and inequities which civilization seeks to cure, and the cowardice of those who fear to set the gauge of battle against entrenched wrong, and for a new-born struggling right. Sir, read that resolution again; it demands the conservation of the grain from every form of intoxicants that then consumed it. Dares this Senate pass its equal now?

THE ROLL CALL OF THE PAST.

Benjamin Franklin and Robert Morris then occupied the Pennsylvania seats. The Adamses and Howard Treat Payne were worthy representatives of the character as well as the culture of the old Bay State. Patrick Henry, Benjamin Harrison, and Peyton Randolph spoke for Old Dominion, while Stephen Hopkins, of Rhode Island, and John Jay and Philip Livingstone, of New York, clothed with solemn dignity and perfumed with moral worth the honor of the seats that they filled with such lofty purpose and distinguished patriotism. May we commend ourselves to the honor and love of posterity by courage as lofty and aspirations as holy as moved our illustrious predecessors.

THEY BLAZED THE TRAIL OF HUMAN PROGRESS.

They cut new highways for the better day to come. They asked no counsel of the murky past, but lifted their eyes to the dawn and strove on. We, their successors, now stand in the noontide of the day whose gray morning they helped to usher in by the light of their new concept of the purpose of government—to guarantee the "life, liberty, and happiness" of the people. And the liquor traffic stands repugnant to and destructive of life, the protection of which is the first sacred purpose of government; and of liberty, that sweet heritage so dear that brave men have ever counted it a duty and a joy to give their lives and fortunes to advance its cause; and happiness, without which both life and liberty rest as empty burdens upon the human soul. And, sir, Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry and their compatriots who adopted that marvelously patriotic resolution, every word of which is weighted with significance and force, saw, even in the dusk of that dawning, the wanton waste of needed food "and the extensive evils likely to be derived," and, though there were few abstainers in the group, had the courage that this pampered age seems hardly to possess to act with clear-eyed statesmanship and with purpose single to the Nation's good.

LIBERTY ENLIGHTENING THE WORLD.

Nor has the divinely planted zeal that this Nation shall light the world to liberty's shrine and free all peoples from the galling

chains of the maudlin god of wine ever left the bosoms of some of her most gifted and patriotic sons.

Abraham Lincoln, 65 years after the historic resolution which I have read was adopted in Congress, gave utterance to that lofty aspiration. He compared the political bondage suffered under King George III, which could trammel only the body or the outward shell of men, to the slavery of the soul inflicted by that "invisible spirit of wine" for which Shakespeare, viewing its hellish work, could find no proper name but "devil." I quote with reverence from the words of the martyred emancipator, who towers above most of his illustrious compatriots as the Matterhorn lifts its lofty head into the sun-lit blue above the shadowed foothills and the copse below. Before him lay in clear perspective the tyranny of monarchical oppression and the servitude of domestic slaves. Liberty was his passion, and he spoke in well-weighted words, with values thoughtfully compared:

A PROPHET'S VOICE.

Turn now to the temperance revolution. In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery uncommitted, a greater tyrant deposed; in it more of want supplied, more of disease healed, more sorrow assuaged. By it no orphans starving, no widows weeping; by it none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest; even the dram maker and dramseller will have gilded into other occupations and stand ready to join all others in the universal song of gladness. And what a noble ally this to the cause of political freedom; with such an aid its march can not fail to be on and on, till every son of earth shall drink in rich fruition the sorrow-quenching draughts of perfect liberty.

And when the victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those revolutions that shall have ended in victory! How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species!

This was delivered by Abraham Lincoln before the Washingtonians at Springfield, Ill., February 22, 1842.

Sir, we can not honor Lincoln nor our patriot fathers of the first Congress by prating their praise. If we would do them homage we must do bravely as they by fearless word and courageous deed have taught. When confronted, as we now are, by a national foe of such pernicious power as to lay threat to the citadel of our national liberty and honor and to menace and destroy the sacred purposes for which governments are instituted among men, we must act with a courage and patriotism worthy of such sires. I can not more appropriately close than with other words from Lincoln's lips:

WE SHALL NOT FAIL.

If ever I feel the soul within me elevate and expand to those dimensions not wholly unworthy of its Almighty Architect, it is when I contemplate the cause of my country, deserted by all the world beside, and I standing up boldly and alone and hurling defiance at her victorious oppressors. Here, without contemplating consequences, before high heaven, and in the face of the world, I swear eternal fidelity to the just cause, as I deem it, of the land of my life, my liberty, and my love.

And who that thinks with me will not fearlessly adopt the oath that I take?

Let none falter who thinks he is right, and we may succeed. But if, after all, we shall fail, be it so, we still shall have the proud consolation of saying to our consciences and to the departed shade of our country's freedom that the cause approved of our judgment, and adored of our hearts, in disaster, in chains, in torture, in death, we never faltered in defending. And we shall not fail—if we stand firm, we shall not fail.

This was delivered by Abraham Lincoln in the statehouse at Springfield, Ill., in December, 1839.

OVERTAKE THE PAST.

Senators, why not catch up with our ancestors? Why not enact into law the advice of the Congress of 1777 for food conservation, and attain for the Nation the vision of glory that charmed the prophetic eyes of Abraham Lincoln?

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate resolution 106. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] objected to its consideration because he thought it would lead to discussion. I understand now that he has withdrawn his objection, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It was read yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 106, submitted yesterday by Mr. Smoot, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to transmit to the Senate such information as may be in the hands of the Shipping Board to show what contracts have been let or are pending for the construction of ships under the authority of that board, the names of the contractors, the location and capacity of their yards, the price per ton to be paid to them, the nature and amount of any advances to be made to them from Government funds, together with any other information which will indicate the disposition of appropriations already made for the uses of the Shipping Board or which will assist the Senate in the consideration of requests from the said board for further appropriations.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] has just come in. Is the resolution before the Senate now?

Mr. SMOOT. I have just asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CENSUS FOR MILITARY DRAFT (S. DOC. NO. 64).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, information relative to the estimates of population based upon the results of the registration of June 5, 1917, furnished by the Bureau of the Census in accordance with the request of the Provost Marshal General of the War Department. It seems to be a public document, and the Chair will order it, with the accompanying paper, to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the Suffrage League of Fairfield County and of the National Woman's Party in the State of Connecticut praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of the Robert Emmett Literary Club, of Torrington, Conn., praying for the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Hartford Section of the Council of Jewish Women, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the morals of soldiers and to prohibit vice at Army posts, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Baltic, of organized labor of Danbury, of the Hartford Central Labor Union, and of the Norwich Central Labor Union, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the pending food-control bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILL INTRODUCED.

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 2656) to establish a staff war corps of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H. R. 4960, an act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

CONSERVATION OF FOOD AND FUEL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4961) to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I have three amendments to the pending bill, one of which I should like to have printed in the RECORD; and I ask that they may remain on the table.

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

In section 12, page 22, line 21, strike out the figures "\$1.75" and the word "one" and insert the figures "\$2" and the word "two," so that the line shall read "shall be \$2 per bushel for No. 2 northern"; also, in the same section and on the same page, at the commencement of line 22, insert the words "based on Chicago market," so that the proviso, commencing with line 18, will read as follows:

"Provided, however, That the minimum price of wheat from the passage of this act to the 1st day of January, 1919, shall be \$2 per bushel for No. 2 northern, based on Chicago market, and the board of food administration shall establish rules and regulations as to difference in price for the standard grades and as to places and conditions of delivery."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, at this point in the procedure, deems it appropriate to call attention to that part of the unanimous-consent agreement which reads:

That no amendment shall be proposed to the bill from and after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. of the calendar day of Friday, July 20, 1917, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is why I present the amendments now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But I do not think you have done so in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement. That is why I am making this statement. Ordinarily there can be only one amendment to a bill pending at one time. That amendment must be disposed of in some way before another can be offered to the bill. The presentation of an amendment to have it printed and lie on the table is not the presentation of an amendment to the bill at all. It is simply printed for the information of Senators, and must subsequently be offered by the Senator at some appropriate time when no other amendment is pending. But the Chair thinks that a fair interpretation of the unanimous-consent agreement is to waive this rule, and that prior to the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. of the calendar day of Friday, July 20, any Senator may present an amendment with a notice that he expects to have it a pending amendment to be voted upon under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, and that such action will entitle him to have a vote upon such amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the construction I gave the unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator asked to have the amendments lie on the table. The Chair understands that the Senator expects to have them voted on.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But some time before the bill is disposed of.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRONNA. I introduce the following amendment. I should like to have it read. I ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the proviso on page 22 of the amendment and insert:

The United States hereby guarantees and agrees to pay from the date this act becomes a law to the 30th day of June, 1919, for all wheat raised in the continental United States and tendered to it at any of the five principal interior primary markets, to be designated by the board, not less than \$2 per bushel for standard contract grades in such markets. The grades shall be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, as by law provided. The price for other grades to be based upon the said standard grades. The board shall make rules specifying the conditions of delivery and for the proper carrying out of the provisions of this paragraph.

The provisions of this act for the execution of the guaranty by the Government of minimum prices of wheat shall apply to the minimum prices covered by this paragraph.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRONNA. Just a moment. I think I made a mistake in asking to have the amendment printed and lie on the table. I mean to have the amendment pending to the bill so that it may be offered in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not want to have any misunderstanding. I desire to have my amendments pending. I do not want to be shut out from offering them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the amendments tendered by the Senator from Kansas and the amendment tendered by the Senator from North Dakota are to be voted upon some time by the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me, I desire to have three amendments, which I send to the desk, considered as pending. They have already been read, and I think it is not necessary to formally read them, but I should like to have them considered as pending.

While I have the floor I desire to have considered as pending the following two amendments.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That we may have an orderly procedure, may I suggest that the bill be taken up section by section, beginning with section 1, and that amendments to the sections as we reach them be disposed of? I think that procedure would be more orderly than if we would undertake to consider amendments to different sections throughout the bill. I hope that that order may be followed unless there is some objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not any power to say how amendments may be considered. When the Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, gets through with the committee amendments, the bill is open to amendments. The Chair can not fix the order.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I shall not insist on it. I was merely expressing the hope that that might be done. Then I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the construction of the unanimous-consent agreement by the Chair I offer the following amendment and ask that it may be considered as pending. It has already been read, and it is not necessary to read it again.

Mr. KELLOGG. Before taking the recess last evening I offered an amendment to be printed. I give notice that I desire to have the amendment voted upon.

Mr. POMERENE. I present the following amendment, which was ordered printed on yesterday. I ask that it be regarded as pending.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk the following amendment and ask that it be regarded as a pending amendment. I should like to have the proposed amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. Strike out section 9 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to section 1.

Mr. KENYON. I offer the following amendment to the amendment: Insert after the word "gasoline"—I do not know the line; the Secretary will ascertain that—the words "iron ore and its products, farm implements, and farm tools."

I shall not take any particular time to discuss the amendment to the amendment. It simply enlarges the definition of necessities so as to cover iron and steel and their products, also farm implements and farm tools. I think this is due to the farmers. I offer it merely on the theory that everything the farmer produces is subject to this act, and the act ought to be broadened to cover those things which he is compelled to buy. This is merely asking a square deal for the farmer. That he is entitled to; more he does not ask. No one need worry as to the farmer doing his part to help win this war. For the good of the Nation I beg of you to do nothing to discourage the farmers of the country and thus injure production. I have not covered binding twine, which, possibly, should be included. I realize that if this definition of necessities should be unduly enlarged it perhaps would make difficult the passage of the bill, but I do feel that iron and steel and farm implements ought to be included in the bill. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want to take just a few minutes of the time of the Senate to give Members of the Senate some information as to the increased cost of producing grain. During this year it will cost the farmers of the United States for binding twine alone more than \$33,000,000 above the normal cost. I now invite the attention of Senators from the South. I ask if they know that we are paying them for cotton in the use of canvases for our binders more than \$2,000,000? We buy from you more than that amount of cotton cloth for our binders. This season that price has increased to us more than five and a half million dollars; in other words, we are paying a premium to the cotton farmers of the South of more than three and a half million dollars merely for binder canvases. I am not saying that you are getting too much for your cotton, but I believe, when you understand the situation, that you will wish to be fair and to treat the farmers who produce grain the same as you would treat them if they lived in your own section of the country.

Let me tell you another thing with which the farmers of the United States have to contend, and I am sorry to say that the United States has been a party to this robbery. In ordinary times the cost of transportation of hemp or twine from Manila to New York is 30 cents a hundred, while to-day it is \$5.60. This indefensible freight rate has, I understand, been approved by the Shipping Board.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator give us this information: Can he state just how much that would add to the cost of a bushel of wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. I can only tell the Senator what it would add to the total cost to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What I desire to know is what it would add to the cost per bushel of wheat.

Mr. GRONNA. We use in a single year 250,000,000 pounds of binder twine; we use probably 50,000,000 pounds more for cordage; in round numbers, we use 300,000,000 pounds of all sorts of hemp. The principal part of that comes from Yucatan, and consists of sisal fiber, and the price has in the last year been increased from 6 cents to 19 cents per pound; but the people of Yucatan say, "We are basing our prices upon the prices of manila."

Yet the United States Government is a party to raising the price of binder twine to the American farmer in ocean freight rates from 30 cents a hundred to \$5.60.

Senators, these are facts which can not be contradicted. I think it is fair to presume that there are 20,000,000 women on the farms in the United States, and the farmers are not so cruel but that they want to give their wives at least one or two Mother Hubbards or wrappers during the year. We know that it takes about 10 yards of cotton to make a cheap calico dress. We used to buy cotton at 5 cents a yard, the material costing the women 50 cents, while to-day it is costing them \$1.20; in other words, these 20,000,000 women are paying to you people of the South

\$12,000,000 more for one dress for each woman in the United States beyond what they paid before the war.

Every man upon the farm has to have a few pairs of overalls, and he has to have at least one new pair for Sunday. Suppose we say that the farmer uses four pairs of overalls during the year. No one will contradict the statement that the price of the overalls to the farmer before the war was about, or on an average, 75 cents, and the overalls which he could buy for 75 cents at that time are to-day costing \$1.50.

There are at least 20,000,000 men living upon farms. Multiply that by 4, add 100 per cent, and see what the additional tribute the farmer on the grain-producing farms is paying to the cotton manufacturer of the South. I want to say to you it is unfair to take out of this bill all the products which necessarily must be consumed and used by the farmer.

I want to refer to the price of steel and I see before me the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who, I am sure, knows a great deal more about steel than do I; but I have been told by men who ought to know that a reasonable price for steel in normal times is a cent and a half a pound, or \$30 a ton. To-day the price of steel is from 4½ cents a pound to 5 cents a pound. I do not know how many million pounds of steel are being used by the farmers of the United States, but I know that there are millions of tons being used in the manufacture of their farm implements. Necessarily, if you compel them to pay this tremendous price for steel, the men who are manufacturing farming implements must add this increased cost to the cost of the machinery. We can not expect the manufacturers of farming implements in these times, when they are paying 4½ to 5 cents a pound for steel, to sell farming machinery as cheaply as they have done in normal times, when they were only paying \$30 a ton. So the farmer, the man who uses farm implements, self-binders, plows, harrows, thrashing machines, and everything else that is necessary to carry on farming operations, is the very man who ultimately pays the increased price.

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

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand the proposition is to fix a minimum price of \$2 a bushel for wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If we are going to fix a minimum price on these things, relatively that would be about 20 cents a pound, as I suppose, for cotton; and I should be very glad to make that arrangement with the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I should be very glad to vote for a minimum price of 20 cents a pound for cotton; I should have no objection to that at all. I do not believe that the cotton farmer is receiving any too much for his cotton, but I believe it is unfair to simply say that you are going to control the prices of our products and then let your own products be uncontrolled. That is my objection to this legislation. I have just offered an amendment which provides that the minimum price in all these various interior terminal markets shall not be less than \$2 a bushel for wheat to the farmer. Let me tell you that there is not a thing on earth that the farmer buys that has not increased in cost at least 100 per cent to him, and in the matter of steel the price has increased 400 or 500 per cent. I do not think it is fair that men who come from other sections of the country should try to eliminate their own products from this bill, and that they should say to the farmer who produces grain, "Your product must be controlled." We have no objection to letting you control our products; we want the Government to control our products in times of war, if necessary; but we also want the Government to control your products. We want to give the President of the United States the right to control the products of steel which are so important in the manufacture of farm machinery.

I do not think that the steel manufacturers deserve any better treatment than the grain farmers of the West and of the United States generally. I observe that the profits of the Steel Trust during the last year were \$282,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he include binder twine in his amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I will be very glad to accept that suggestion, and include "binder twine." I ask that those words be inserted in the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment now and have it pending, so that I will not be cut off to-morrow. I offer the amendment and desire to have it treated as pending.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] will be adopted. If this bill is to apply to the necessities produced by the farmer, it should also apply to the necessities which the farmer must have. It is well known to members of the Senate that a foreign organization, backed by money furnished by bankers in this country, increased the price of binding twine last year to the farmers. The increase cost to the farmers of the United States on the amount used for binding twine was more than \$19,000,000 last year. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa is adopted, including the suggestion of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the foreign producers of binding twine who want to take advantage of our market can be controlled by the provisions of this bill.

It is also known to Senators that the price of farm machinery was greatly advanced last year. I am told this morning by the president of a leading farmers' organization in the State of Kansas that notice has been served on the farmers that they may expect an increase of 33½ per cent on farm machinery during the coming year. If that is so—and this gentleman is a reputable farmer of my State, and says that the notice has come direct—then the farm machinery which the farmers must buy should be included within the provisions of this bill. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, before the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] is voted upon, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, if I understand the purpose of this bill, it is to encourage production. The reason why I have advocated wheat being included and made the principal article subject to the provisions of this bill is because we need bread in this country, and because in 1915, when we made 1,025,000,000 bushels of wheat the average price to the farmer was 87 cents a bushel, while in 1916, with a crop of 525,000,000 bushels short, almost a half production, the price then went to \$3 a bushel. In order to make as secure as possible a maximum production of wheat it is necessary to guarantee the wheat farmer against the disastrous experience of 1915.

What we are attempting to do here, as I understand, is to increase the food supply of this country without regard to other articles which may have been affected by the extraordinary conditions of the war. We want to guarantee the food producers of this country against the disaster that always comes with overproduction. We are inviting them to increase their acreage in foodstuffs, and we are attempting now to fix a price below which the market will not go. We have said nothing about a maximum price. There is a maximum yield of steel because prices are high; there is a maximum yield of war munitions because prices are high; but when there was a maximum yield of wheat in 1915, the prices broke to where it hardly paid the farmer the cost of production. He is not called upon to sacrifice everything he has in the world; and out in the West wheat is the principal standard crop. We are trying to encourage the farmer to fill the elevators of this country, to supply America and our allies, and it is wisdom on our part in this emergency to depart from the ordinary rule and fix a minimum price, so that he will not be subject to the disaster of a break in price from overproduction.

Then why do we desire to lug in steel? Steel is not indicated as a national necessity along the line of sustaining life. The prices already guarantee a maximum yield of steel. The prices of all the articles which have soared are guaranteeing maximum production now. We ought to guarantee the farmer, who is going to furnish the food, a price which will take care of the expense incurred in the production plus a profit. That is the reason why I am lending my support to this bill and trying to confine it to the one idea of guaranteeing the producers of food supplies against the disaster that always follows a maximum crop.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief interruption?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. The market price of wheat to-day is \$2.80 a bushel. If you guarantee the wheat farmer \$2, are you not taking 80 cents away from him?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In answer to the query of the Senator, I will say that that \$2.80 is predicated upon the disastrous yield of last year. Now, the Senator would hardly think that \$2.80 would be a fair price for a maximum yield. I do not know anything about the cost of the production of wheat, but, taking the average price for the last 10 or 15 years from the Statistical Abstract, it did not average over \$1.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit me, I want to inform him that in the spring-wheat belt, especially in my State and Montana, wheat is practically a failure this year.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Well, Mr. President, that helps the argument that I am attempting to make. Whenever there is a failure in the crop, the law of supply and demand will take care of the price. We are trying to encourage the farmer this fall, winter, and spring to put in a maximum wheat acreage, so that a maximum yield of wheat may be made. We must guarantee him against the disaster of another billion and a quarter bushel wheat crop, because in 1915, when the war was a year old, we made the largest wheat production this country ever saw, and the price broke to 87 cents a bushel.

The year following, as I said a moment ago, the wheat crop dropped down to 600,000,000 bushels and the price soared. Now, if you want to encourage the production of foodstuffs you have got to guarantee the producers against the disaster that comes when there is a production above the ordinary. Just guarantee him a reasonable profit. If you were to fix the price at \$1.50 or \$2 a bushel, and the year 1918 witnessed a failure of the wheat crop, there is no law under God's heaven that could keep the price from soaring again; and if you should make a billion and a half bushels of wheat in 1918, outside of the Treasury of the United States guaranteeing that it shall not go below a certain price, it would break to 87 cents again and every man who produces a raw material knows that to be so.

The question has been asked here, Why do we desire to eliminate cotton and steel? If the Government wanted 20,000,000 bales of cotton, I, as a cotton producer, would say, "Well, in 1914 we made 16,000,000 bales of cotton and the price broke to a point where there was no market for it at all. Now, if you want 20,000,000 bales of cotton, you guarantee the cotton-growing States a reasonable profit and you will get your 20,000,000 bales." That is all we are doing in this bill, and, as the Senator from Georgia suggests, we would be satisfied with a much less price for a 20,000,000-bale crop than it is bringing now with an 11,000,000-bale crop. We must take into consideration the fact that there is a law greater than the power of Congress; there is the law of supply and demand and human necessity, and it is going to have its sanction despite anything we can do. Now, the thing for us to do is to encourage the production of wheat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss at all the question of fixing a minimum price on wheat. That is a separate proposition, and it comes later in the bill.

This first section to which the amendment is proposed is the defining clause as to what shall be included. It includes everything that is in the title of the bill as sent over from the House. It is confining the operation of the bill to foods, feeds, and fuels, including kerosene and gasoline.

Mr. President, if we begin to add other subjects, and put all the metals of the country in the control of the food administrator, and everything that can be remotely attached to farming interests, we open the bill to the same flood of additions that we put in at an earlier stage; and in my judgment it would jeopardize the passage of the bill, which I should greatly deplore.

It seems to me that those who have spoken overlook the fact that in section 5 of the amendments we provide specifically for a license by any person operating a factory which produces farm implements or machinery and any person engaged in producing, storing, or handling fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients. The control given by the license is much better and more restraining than the general control which would be implied in the first section. If we put on iron and steel, we open the door to everything and we should find ourselves in the same place that we were in before.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. REED. A large part of the fertilizer employed in this country, I understand, comes from outside of the United States. How can we, by license, control the price of that?

Mr. LODGE. We can license those who deal in fertilizers in this country.

Mr. REED. Yes; we might say to them, "You can not charge more than a certain amount," but we can not control the world price. We can simply shut out the fertilizer.

Mr. LODGE. No; and nothing you can do will control the world price.

Mr. REED. Certainly; that is true. But that brings us back to the question of how the farmer is going to be left if you take away his world market and then make him pay the world prices.

Mr. LODGE. We do not make him pay the world prices. He gets most of his fertilizer at home, and that is amply con-

trolled in section 5; but if we go to work and enlarge this again we endanger the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not desire to take any time in discussing this bill, but I do not wish to cast my vote with a misapprehension on anybody's part as to what my vote means. I want the record of the Senate to show that I do not believe in the Congress of the United States going into the business of fixing prices. Now, there are exceptions to the rule. The only exception that I am willing to agree to is when the Government of the United States itself disturbs the prices of great commodities in this country; then I think we are justified in protecting the people who produce those commodities against the disturbance that was created by the Government itself. I am willing to vote to fix prices under those conditions for the same reason that I would vote to pay a man for his property if the Government proposed to take his property away from him.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the Senator not to interrupt me. I only have 10 minutes.

The proposal is made in this bill to fix a minimum price for wheat; in other words, that the Government of the United States shall guarantee to the producers of wheat in this country that wheat shall not go below a stated figure. Now, Senators who come from wheat-growing sections discuss this bill as if this were an attack upon the wheat producers. If they feel that way about it and desire to strike the provision from the bill, I am willing to vote with them to strike it out, because I do not want it there if they do not want it there. But if they do want it in the bill, and want this \$2 minimum price fixed, I am willing to fix the price at \$2 and vote for it and put it in the bill, because I think the Government itself has brought about the disturbance that is affecting the wheat market. I am not willing, however, to vote for it under the condition that they have to be paid for the privilege of receiving a boon from the Government of the United States. If they do not want it in the bill, let us strike it out. If they do not want \$150,000,000 in this bill to purchase the surplus supply of wheat for this year, let us strike it out if it is not going to be of benefit to the wheat producers of this country.

I expect to vote for those provisions, but I am not voting for them on the idea that we are thereby shackling the hands of the wheat producer or enacting legislation that is hurtful to him. I am voting for them on the idea that we are doing something of benefit to the producer of wheat, because the Government of the United States has established or is about to establish an embargo against the shipment of wheat to foreign countries, thereby destroying the market for the American producer of wheat. If I am casting my vote under a misapprehension and the men who represent the great wheat belt on this floor think that this legislation is hurtful to them and not helpful to them, why, let us strike it out of the bill.

I do not know that there is anything in this bill affecting the price of wheat or destroying the price of wheat. If it is in the bill I do not know it. The thing that is affecting the price of wheat is the provision that we adopted in another bill authorizing the President of the United States to establish an embargo against the shipment of wheat out of this country, in order to protect our allies and control the distribution of wheat in the future; and I can readily see that if that is done it is temporarily going to result in a surplus production of wheat. There is nobody in this country to take care of it, and unless the Government goes out and buys it at a fixed price and a fair price and carries it over until the hour of distribution comes it will seriously injure the producer of wheat in the United States; and it is in that view that I am willing to vote for these provisions. But if Senators who represent the great wheat belts of this country think it is injurious to their people to pass this legislation, I feel that in all candor they should stand here and say that they want it to go out of the bill, and if they do they will have my vote to strike it out; but if they want it in the bill for the protection of their own people—a protection to which I think they are entitled—I do not think they ought to come here baring their arms to the swords of a battle that they have not fought.

A few years ago agriculture in the South was flat on its back because of conditions that grew out of this war. Members of Congress from the South—and I was not one of them—insisted that the Congress of the United States should take care of the situation by fixing a minimum price for cotton or by the Government taking care of the surplus crop until the conditions could pass by. Now, the only difference in the situation is this: When that condition happened it grew out of the condition of war; it grew out of the disturbed condition of shipping;

it grew out of an embargo placed by one of the nations of the world that is now our ally on other countries of Europe, but it was not chargeable directly to the Government of the United States—a very marked distinction, in fact, as to our responsibility, but not a marked distinction in effect. Yet when that condition was presented to the Congress of the United States gentlemen from the great Northwest were prepared to laugh out of the Congress of the United States the men who proposed that that situation should be taken care of by the Congress of the United States.

Now we have paid our price, we have borne our burden, and we are prepared to do it in the future; but when it comes to the question of casting my vote to help other sections of this country bear their burden by Government aid, I am not willing to do so when men from those sections of the country come here charging that we are not liberal, but that we are forcing an unwilling burden on the producers of those sections of the country, when, in fact, we are not doing so. I challenge Senators on that side of the Chamber, if they mean what they say about this provision of the bill being an attack on the wheat farmers of this country, to offer their amendment to strike it out of the bill; and if they do, so far as I am concerned, I will attempt to rally my colleagues from the Southern States to aid them. But if they want our help, if they think it is a protection to the farmer of the Northwest to keep these provisions in this bill, that it is a matter of justice to him, as I believe, because of the condition in which the Government of the United States has placed him, then do not put the blame on us, but accept our aid in the spirit in which we are willing to give it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have not been so much concerned in regard to who shall administer the food-control bill when it becomes a law, whether it be administered by one man or by a board of three men or by a board of five men; but I have been tremendously interested in the nature and extent of the powers proposed to be conferred by this bill, and especially as those powers relate to the farming industry.

Mr. President, there are two provisions in this bill to which I am opposed. I am opposed to the powers conferred upon the President by section 9 of the bill, as it is now; and I am opposed to the minimum price provided for in what is known as section 12 of the bill, and as I now view it, am opposed to conferring power upon the President to fix a minimum price. But, Mr. President, as long as section 9 and section 12 remain undisposed of, and may, when they come to a vote, be enacted by the Senate, I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa extending the list of necessities.

Mr. President, the two sections—section 9 and section 12—especially relate to farm products. Section 9 is as follows:

That the President is authorized from time to time, in order to guarantee reasonable prices to the producer and to the consumer, to purchase, to store, to provide storage facilities for, and to sell at reasonable prices—

What?—

fuel, wheat, flour, meal, beans, and potatoes.

According to the last amendment now proposed by the Senator from Oregon, with the exception of one in this list, all of these products are products produced on the farm.

How about section 12? It relates to a minimum price for wheat; and, as the amendment now stands, it provides for a minimum price of \$1.75 per bushel for wheat. If you are going to give the President the power to purchase at reasonable prices these staple products of the farm for the purpose of storing them and then doling them out to the consumers at reasonable prices as provided for in this bill, why should not the farmer be afforded the same opportunities to secure at reasonable prices the farm machinery and implements that he uses in producing these feed and food products?

Mr. President, it seems to me there is nothing more reasonable than the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, that these few articles be added to the list of necessities as articles which the President shall be empowered to buy at reasonable prices and sell at reasonable prices under the terms of this bill. They are intimately, they are inseparably, connected with the production of food and feeds which otherwise you attempt to regulate by the provisions of this bill, and it would be an injustice to say that the prices of the binders, thrashing machines, corn planters, or the cultivators may soar away beyond what they have been, and yet the President shall not have the power to purchase and dispose of to the farmer—that great part of the consuming public—these articles essential for the production of the food supply which we are so anxious to increase.

Mr. President, we are trying to do too much by this bill by enacting or seeking to enact sections 9 and 12. I refer here to an article from the Washington Post of some days ago:

"Given powers never dreamed of."

It seemed to me as I read this article that it was inspired. The first portion of it reads:

Whether the farmer protest causes delay or not, the farmer can not be charged with the overloading of the bill with all sorts of amendments increasing the powers of the President.

The farmers are not demanding a minimum price of \$1.75 a bushel nor \$2 a bushel nor any other minimum price. The farmers, I think, realize that fixing a minimum price may have its psychological effect, and the tendency will be in fixing a minimum price to depress the price of wheat to that minimum price in the market at a time when all the conditions would warrant a higher price. We may say of any given minimum price, it is enough and not enough—enough to-day, but not enough to-morrow or three or six months hence. So I think the farmer will be quite content to leave the matter of prices to conditions as they will be found to exist.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, that with the war continuing, and with the shortage of the last two years, with an extraordinary demand never equaled in the world, the farmer will be able to get a reasonable price for all the farm products, at least those staple products that he has to dispose of, and which are contemplated by this bill. And this is all he asks.

I call attention to a clipping from the Post of this morning and which reads:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 1917.]

FARMERS OPPOSE WHEAT AT \$1.75—RESOLUTIONS SAY SENATE FOOD AMENDMENTS ARE UNWORKABLE.

Representatives of 15 farmers' organizations, including the National Farmers' Union, conferred with members of the food administration yesterday and adopted resolutions protesting against the plan of Senate leaders to fix a price of \$1.75 a bushel for wheat in the food-control bill. Enactment of the measure as it passed the House was urged, the proposed Senate amendments being declared unworkable.

The price-fixing section as proposed, the resolutions declared, would permit "gambling, speculation, and exportation to proceed without restriction."

"We are strongly opposed to the fixing of the exact amount of a minimum price of wheat by law," they continued. "It is recognized that it is an expert question to be settled after such consideration as Congress can not possibly give it, and in a manner which will give the producer a full voice. The food administration should be vested with power to deal with this question."

Whether it is advisable to leave the fixing of price to the food administration or not, there is no question, I think, but that the farmers are opposed to the naming of a fixed price now and by Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand the pending question is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to the amendment. I read a few lines from the fifth chapter of Exodus:

And afterwards Moses and Aaron went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.

And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.

And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us; let us go, we pray thee, three days' journey into the desert, and sacrifice unto the Lord our God; lest He fall upon us with pestilence, or with the sword.

And the king of Egypt said unto them, Wherefore do ye. Moses and Aaron, let the people from their works? get you unto your burdens.

And Pharaoh said, Behold, the people of the land now are many, and ye make them rest from their burdens.

And Pharaoh commanded the same day the taskmasters of the people, and their officers, saying,

Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves.

And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, ye shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish aught thereof: for they be idle; therefore they cry, saying, let us go and sacrifice to our God.

Let there more work be laid upon the men, that they may labor therein; and let them not regard vain words.

And the taskmasters of the people went out, and their officers, and they spake to the people, saying, Thus saith Pharaoh, I will not give you straw.

Go ye, get you straw where ye can find it: yet not aught of your work shall be diminished.

So the people were scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw.

And the taskmasters hasted them, saying, Fulfill your works, your daily tasks, as when there was straw.

Mr. President, this bill is now being organized to put into effect this scriptural decree—the farmer is to be told to make brick without straw—to raise crops regardless of what he may himself have to pay for everything with which he is to produce crops.

It is conceded that upon the farmers of this country, their energy and their extraordinary efforts, depends in a very large measure the success of this world conflict. Their increased acreage and their renewed efforts are the surest guaranty of success. And yet we are proposing now, Mr. President, to regulate and control the market of the farmer and to leave open and uncontrolled and unregulated everything which the farmer buys and that enters into his daily life as a means by which he produces food. The one class of men who have no monopoly, who are not in a position to organize a monopoly, who are not in a posi-

tion to control prices, are to be regulated and controlled and the great monopolistic powers of the United States are to go unregulated and uncontrolled. In other words, the farmer is advised to go forth with his task and produce his crop, to extend his acreage. We will, however, take your market from you and give you such market as we see fit. In the meantime you shall share as best you may and do the best you can with those who have an uncontrolled market and a price-fixing power of their own. It was apparent from the beginning that that was precisely where this measure would land. It was clear to all who know the power of certain interests here that they would escape all regulation.

Let me call attention to the fact that before the war steel sold for \$30. It now sells for \$130, and all the different things which enter into the production on the part of the farmer from the steel has increased in price accordingly.

Coal has advanced from 100 to 200 and 250 per cent.

Wire has advanced 100 per cent.

Wagons have advanced 40 per cent.

Prepared feeds have advanced 100 per cent.

Tankage costs 100 per cent more now.

Fertilizers have advanced 600 per cent.

Binder twine has advanced from 8 cents to 18 cents.

Plow shovels that were bought for \$2.50 before the war now cost \$7.

Cultivators sold at \$28 before the war and now sell for from \$50 to \$55.

And so on, Mr. President, all the different things which the farmer must buy have thus increased in price.

As I now understand the proposition, it is to leave that entire industrial field uncontrolled and unregulated, while the one upon whom you depend to produce sufficient to feed the world and to feed the Army is to have his market taken away from him, in the first place, by the laws which you have passed and which you are to pass, and, in the second place, to dole out to him just such figure as you see fit.

Now, in my humble judgment that will not have the effect of bringing about the activity and the energy which the farmer is supposed to put forth from this time on; but it will have the very opposite effect.

There is no reason under the sun or among men why we should control the one class of people who can not combine, who can not monopolize, and leave the others uncontrolled. If you propose to encourage the farmer, at least arrange to protect him against exorbitant prices which are now being charged him by unconscionable and lawless combinations. If you would encourage and inspire him forward, give him a fair chance and equal treatment. He will do his full duty under just and equal laws and with fair and impartial treatment.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I have studied the bill with much care, and I have tried to find some basis for the argument presented that we are undertaking to control the price of wheat the farmer produces. That is not so. There is not a line or syllable in the bill that controls the price for farm products. All that is controlled is the profits that may be charged by the middleman and the storage charges and commissions that may be charged after the farm products get out of the hands of the farmer.

I have asked to have some part of the bill pointed out to me where prices which are paid to the farmer are controlled under the bill. No one has pointed out a place in the bill, and it is not in the bill. The bill merely seeks to take the product after it gets out of the hands of the farmer, and controls it and guards it until it gets into the hands of the retailer. It seeks to regulate the profit that may be charged by the middleman, the elevator man, and the commission man, but not to control the prices in the hands of the farmers.

I believe in Government control of all prices myself. I have believed in it for years, in times of peace as well as in times of war. I shall be glad if the price of steel and iron and every necessity in the country could be controlled, but this is a food and fuel control bill. If you start in by putting on steel and iron or farm implements or fertilizers, there is no logical place to stop, and we will get the bill in a shape where it can not be passed in the Senate.

I can not give any reason why food and fuel should be controlled, and why steel should not be. There is no reason, except the reason of expediency.

This amendment will be voted for by two classes of Senators. It will be voted for by those who wish to help the farmer more than the bill does as it stands, and by those who want to kill the bill altogether. The danger is that those two extremes, those who are most friendly to the farmer and those who are most hostile to him, may have votes enough to defeat those who want to do something practical and substantial in the bill.

I hope that section 5 of the bill, the licensing provision, will be amended so that it will include not only food and fuel, but the manufacture of farm implements and farm machinery, and will control those who manufacture and deal in fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients.

I also hope that section 12 may be amended so that there will be a guaranteed price for wheat No. 1 northern at the principal interior primary markets at \$2 a bushel from the passage of the act of January 1, 1919. I think that ought to be done because wheat occupies a peculiar position. Wheat is the one food product that they need more than any other in Europe, and it is the one which needs stimulation in its production.

So, Mr. President, I hope the friends of the bill, those who really want to get the bill passed, will limit the articles upon which it acts to real food and fuel.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to be pending so that it may be voted upon when the proper time comes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the pending question, I believe, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to section 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was mistaken.

The amendment of the Senator from Oregon adds to the commodities covered by the House bill petroleum and gasoline, thus covering foods, feed, fuel, petroleum, and gasoline.

Mr. President, individually I favor adding to those commodities aluminum, copper, iron, and steel, because they are basic commodities, which enter into almost all the industries and they are essential to the successful prosecution of the war, as they are largely used in munitions.

I trust that our action will be so shaped as to include these additional commodities. I regret that other commodities have been inserted in the bill by amendments on the floor in such a way as to imperil its passage, and I shall regret to see any attempt to enlarge the included commodities beyond those to which I have referred.

Mr. President, the reason why I urge that these commodities should be included is that they are under quasi monopolistic control. We all know that the control of copper, aluminum, iron, and steel is in great corporations, which practically, though not perhaps in a legal sense, monopolize these industries, and such an extraordinary demand has been imposed upon these products as to enable the producers to secure skyrocket prices, the height of which can hardly be measured.

The necessity for their use is so great, the operation of a great demand upon a limited supply is so great, as to enable producers to charge almost what they choose. If, therefore, there ever was a condition which would justify the intervention of governmental power it is this, for these things are absolutely necessary, and they are in quasi monopolistic control.

Mr. President, I was in hopes that these great industries which have been practically mobilized under the direction of the Government, through the organization of the Council of National Defense and the advisory commission, and have been able by reason of this sanction of the law to gather and confer together, which they have feared to do heretofore because of the restrictions of the Sherman antitrust law. I was in hopes, inasmuch as the terrors of the Sherman antitrust law had practically been removed by our action, in this condition of peril when they were summoned en masse to appear here and to mobilize their industries, and to act practically regarding them, that they would make such reasonable and just proposals to the Government as would insure the prosecution of the war with moderate cost and the highest efficiency, so far as their materials were concerned.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that these gentlemen, these captains of industry, men of great capacity, have failed to meet the issue of the hour. Some of them have partially met it. The aluminum industry, built up by the most arduous process, and securing a practical monopoly by the industry and the capacity of its promoters, able to command almost any price, offered the Government aluminum, the market price of which was something like 90 cents, at, I believe, 27 cents. That was a wise and just thing; and had it been accompanied also by a reasonable concession to the general public that industry would have deserved the gratitude of the country.

The copper industry also in dealing with the Government in reference to a limited amount—40,000,000 pounds, I believe—when the prevailing price was 30 cents a pound, offered it to the Government at 18 cents a pound. That was a commendable thing; but it would have been more commendable if this highly profitable price of 18 cents a pound, or perhaps a price somewhat in excess of that, had been extended to the general public.

The steel industry has made no compromise. It is the most powerful industry in the country and is most intelligently directed from the industrial point of view. It is directed by men of whom we have a right to expect more breadth of vision. They failed, for they offered no price. On the contrary, we understand that they expect to exact from the Government at least double the normal price and that they expect to exact from the public whatever price they can get.

Mr. President, it is said that we have only to deal with the Government's wants. I insist that a virile war can only be conducted by a virile nation; that not only must your Army be strong, but that your people must be strong; that your Army must not only be well fed and well equipped, but that your people also must be well fed and well equipped; and that it is folly to attempt, in the emergency of war, to make a distinction between the treatment that should be accorded to the Army and that accorded to the people at large. Big men ought to see that.

These men who are big enough to conduct the copper, the steel, and the aluminum industries of the country ought to be able to see this. Besides this, as economists they ought to realize the fact that they themselves are inaugurating a price level which will provoke a constantly increasing wage level, and that the end of the war will find us, as a result of the struggle between the wage earners on the one hand and the producers on the other, with a wage level raised to some correspondence with the price level. We will find at the end of this war a wage level far above that of any other country in the world; and just then, when competition will again come between nations for the commerce of the world, we shall find the United States at a disadvantage, a disadvantage which will involve a struggle between the wage earners and the producers and lock up the entire industries and energies of the country.

Mr. President, I should be glad to speak longer on this subject, but time will not permit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to occupy only a few moments in the discussion of this amendment. Like the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], I voted, when the original bill was pending before the Senate, to add to the provisions which the House bill contained a number of commodities or necessities which should be subject to governmental control; but it developed in the discussion of the bill that those who were opposed to the bill fundamentally, and those who opposed the limiting of control to the products of the farm, including fuel, were likely to defeat the very purpose of the bill as well as any legislation at all. In an attempt to reach a compromise in this matter Senators who entertained different views upon the whole subject undertook, by consultation, to reconcile these differences, so that the measure would carry out the purposes the administration originally had in view, viz, to control foods, feeds, and fuel.

I still think, Mr. President, that the time must come, and that in the near future, when all of these things—steel, iron and its products, and many other commodities—must be subjected to governmental control; but I have reached the conclusion that it is impossible to put any food-control measure through the Senate at this time, and possibly not through Congress at all, unless it is limited to the original purposes of the administration.

Mr. President, I think we all realize the necessity for food control in this emergency. The example of other countries has vindicated the position which this Government is taking in respect to the food situation. Therefore I think that something ought to be done promptly; we must discuss it from the patriotic standpoint rather than from the selfish and the purely local point of view. If it be conceded that there ought to be control of the food situation, we must not forget that the Liverpool market fixes the price of wheat always, and that the Liverpool market has practically been destroyed by a measure which all will admit was a perfectly proper war power exercised by the President. I refer to the embargo recently declared.

The embargo was proclaimed by the President on the 9th of July and includes in its provisions the following articles: Coal, coke, fuel oils, kerosene and gasoline, including bunkers; food grains, flour and meal therefrom; fodder and feeds, meat and fats, pig iron, steel billets, ship plates and structural shapes, scrap iron and scrap steels, ferromanganese, fertilizers, arms, ammunitions, and explosives.

I am inclined to believe that the effect of this embargo will be to reduce the price of some of the articles mentioned; but, whether it affects all of them or not, we do know that it is certain to reduce the price of wheat and foodstuffs generally. So that this bill, as was very ably stated by the Senator from Alabama, will in effect be for the protection of the farmer rather than to his injury. I venture to say that there is not a Senator but will admit that if the farmer could have been guaranteed a price of \$1.75 per bushel for wheat during the past 10 years, or if he is guaranteed a price of \$1.75 a bushel for the next 10 years, there will not be a single year when he will not make a profit from its production.

Now, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa may be voted down, and that the amendment proposed by me may be adopted. In that event some hope may be entertained that a measure for the control of food, feed, and fuel will be finally adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope we may be able to yield somewhat our individual views and give support to the substitute for section 1 offered by the Senator in charge of the bill.

Some of us would have been glad to have five commissioners; some preferred only one director.

The substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon meets the views of both, in a measure. It provides for three commissioners; it gives an opportunity for freedom from single control, and yet the number is sufficiently small to insure forceful action.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon strikes out all commodities named in section 1 except foods, feeds, and fuel. Mr. President, if we undertake to add to foods, feeds, and fuel all the other items named in the section as it now stands we will compass the entire industries of this country, and no ten men, no hundred men will be able to handle so gigantic a task. The bill would break down by the very length to which it would seek to reach.

The original purpose as disclosed to the public was to affect food and fuel, and yet from the first the bills presented went very much further, going even to the length of fixing for foodstuff maximum prices. I would have opposed the bills as first presented. The most objectionable features have been stricken out, and now the substitute of the Senator from Oregon strikes out all other commodities and leaves in simply foods, feeds, and fuel. I hope we will stand by that provision and support the substitute as it is written.

Why do foods and fuels stand entirely upon a different basis from other commodities? Take clothes, as an illustration: I am not obliged to have new clothes to-morrow or next month; I may wear old clothes and patch them, perchance; but I must have something to eat to-morrow; and in cold weather I must have coal with which to keep warm. They are necessities required day by day, distinguished entirely from the other numerous commodities proposed to be inserted in this bill. They are commodities to which the Government can attach its control with the justification of necessity not applicable to anything else.

Mr. President, we all understand that the burden is upon the United States largely to see to it that France, England, and Italy have food. The food problem lies at the very foundation of success. The moment it is known in Europe that submarines can not stop foods going to France, England, and Italy, and that foods will be raised to go there, then will the pressure against Prussianism and against pan-Germanism, even in Germany itself, grow with increased strength.

Of the foodstuffs, wheat stands preeminently important. Bread is the staff of life, and wheat is the only cereal from which an abundance of bread may be prepared to last days and even weeks after it is baked. It is bread that must sustain the troops at the front.

If the friends of the wheat grower desire no legislation with reference to minimum prices, I do not wish to force it on them. I favor the provision in the last print of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, somewhat enlarged and broadened, because I think it is only justice to the wheat grower. Why? The market of the wheat grower has had a terrible blow from the embargo placed upon the exportation of his wheat. His foreign market is cut off, and it is proposed—and properly so as a war necessity—that one agency shall buy for our Government and buy for England, France, and Italy, thereby eliminating all competition, thereby taking from the wheat grower a situation which otherwise would give him numerous competitors for his product. This is only excusable upon the ground of war necessity.

That is not all that the bill does. It lays its hand upon the stock exchange; it lays its hand upon the granaries; it lays

its hand upon the elevator companies. By the system of licensing authorized in section 5, the President is given authority to control all the profits made out of wheat from the time the wheat leaves the farmer until it reaches the retail merchant. All this opportunity for the sale of wheat and for the increase in the speculative price of wheat is taken away by this bill. I believe it is right; I believe a condition of war confronting us justifies our Government in enacting such legislation as a war measure; but, believing that, I also think it only fair to encourage wheat production next year and to see that the farmer does not bear the burden alone.

As his markets are taken from him for the general welfare, so the general public can afford, as this bill provides, to bear part of his losses, and to say to him, "The Government, having taken your markets from you or greatly curtailed them, says to you you shall not bear the burden alone, but your Government will see to it that you receive a price for your wheat commensurate with the value of your labor." It is going a great distance to do this, but we go a great distance when we take the markets so completely or so largely from the wheat grower. I believe that certainly this year, and unless the crop is largely increased next year, the demand for wheat will cause the price to go above the minimum which we may fix, even if we fix a liberal minimum, but we should not leave the wheat grower any uncertainty. The Government has and will curtail his markets and should guarantee him a fair price.

The Senator from North Dakota said that he could see no difference between wheat and cotton. I see a vast difference. We need, we must have, the wheat for food. We can do without, nationally, an immediate great supply of cotton. I wish to say to the Senator that if you would guarantee to the cotton grower next year a price for his cotton midway between the average price the three years before the war and the present price it might cost the National Government, in my judgment, \$500,000,000, for he would probably raise 20,000,000 bales. It is now selling for 27 cents. It sold for 13 cents before the war. You guarantee him 20 cents for his cotton, and he would probably raise 20,000,000 bales next year. The demand would not consume the supply, and the normal price might drop much below that figure.

I would not object to action by the Government placing regulations around cotton, coupled with a guarantee of such an increase in price to the producer. But this would involve a risk to the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars—a risk which the exigency of the situation, so far as cotton is concerned, does not require.

Let me urge Senators to yield somewhat their individual views and join an earnest effort to pass this bill in the wisest form upon which we may, by mutual yielding, agree. Our enemies understand well the importance of furnishing food-stuffs to England, France, and Italy, and to our troops. Let us show to our enemies how united we are, how determined we are to meet pan-Germanism, and the purpose which now seems to be controlling that Empire. Let us prepare to insure their inevitable defeat and thereby not only accomplish the result but help to accomplish it by producing the internal disintegration among our enemies which will come with a knowledge that defeat is certain.

Everything we do to win this war will help by its effect in Germany, as well as on the sea and in the trenches.

Let us, without dissent, determine to mobilize every resource of this country to crush the war party of Prussia. We will certainly triumph and we will help bring an earlier peace.

We must and will succeed. Let us hasten the day when success will crown our efforts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have been very much surprised to find Senators who represent agricultural States criticize this bill. I have examined the bill very carefully, to ascertain whether there is any justification for such criticism. Of course, when attempt is made to regulate prices in the selling market you have a very big undertaking on hand, but the Senators who should not complain of this bill are those who represent the agricultural States.

My home State is one which now produces in agricultural products four times as much as it does in minerals; and I suppose, while formerly known as a mineral State, as a producer of ores, it might now properly be classed as an agricultural State. It seems to me, Mr. President, when that one clause is written into this bill, stating that there shall be a certain fixed guaranty for the price of wheat, that is all the agricultural States should ask.

Mr. President, this bill is not intended to do away with the fundamental principle of supply and demand. The object is to

stimulate production, so that the price of wheat will not be \$3.25 a bushel, but will be maintained at a level that will be fairly remunerative to the farmer—in fact, liberally so—and that is the intent and purpose of the bill. The Agricultural Committee, composed of Senators who represent agricultural States, have the very deepest interest in the farmer and in the maintenance of fair prices for products which are raised upon the farm. For that reason the talk that has been indulged in, that everything else is getting high and it is not wise to legislate in any way with respect to the farmer, it seems to me is not wise, nor to the point.

The very argument that is advanced consists of contrasting prices of articles the farmer buys which Senators complain of as being exorbitant, and then insisting that those same outrageous prices form part of the basis for determining the minimum price of wheat. They then insist that the exorbitant prices of the articles be lowered. We are going to fix a minimum price, and that is all there is any certainty about with relation to the price to be fixed in this bill. That price as now guaranteed is \$1.75 per bushel, which will induce farmers to increase the wheat crop of next year. The object is to stimulate the production and let the law of supply and demand and not any requirement of Congress bring the price of wheat to a reasonable level, so that it will give the farmer a good price, a remunerative price, and yet not be such a price as to impair the financial condition of the Government in this great crisis.

Now, Mr. President, when it comes to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, another thought suggests itself. If we are going to include everything in this bill, it will mean the Government will undertake to operate the entire industrial processes of the country. We can not do that. This legislation is an experiment. It seems to me we ought to confine it to such a limited number of subjects as the Government can reasonably handle. When the Government goes beyond that point it embarks upon uncharted and dangerous waters. On that account, Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to limit this measure to the necessities of our war-time conditions; we ought to provide for food, feed, and fuel. These are absolute necessities in our conduct of the war.

It is true that steel does enter to some extent into all war operations, and I should be very glad, indeed, if I thought that the Government could exercise the power with effect so as to include steel, copper, and all other things that could have an influence to produce a lowering of these high prices. But this is an experiment. We do not know whether we will succeed or not. I can readily see that one part of this bill is very easy, and that is where you guarantee the minimum price. There is not any question but that there will be stimulation of wheat production by guaranteeing the price at \$1.75 a bushel. But when it comes to fixing the maximum price you will encounter the greatest difficulty. We had better confine the scope of the bill to those things that might be considered absolute necessities for the conduct of the war, in order to be sure that we can handle them successfully.

If, after trial, our experiment proves a success, it will be found that this body will be nearly unanimously in favor of extending control to other lines. It is unwise to attempt to put into this bill all of these industries without the machinery to administer the same.

But I am certain that if now you attempt to include all the other lines of production you are going to be faced with the query: "Well, why not guarantee other industries a minimum price?" Why should we not say that the price of lead shall be fixed at at least 8 cents a pound? Why should we not say that copper shall bring at least 20 cents a pound? If you do that you are going to find this war debt which we have contracted a very small and insignificant item, compared with the vast amount that it will be necessary to raise to enable the Government to place all these businesses under its control.

On that account, it seems to me, we ought to adhere to the bill as it was originally intended that it should be, and should confine our efforts in that direction; and when we do that I think we will meet with success. If we fail to do that, I am afraid we will fail in the passage of this bill; and even if we enact the bill with all of the provisions in it we will find that it will not be a success.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which I desire to have regarded as a pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator desires to bring it up at a later time?

Mr. STERLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, just a word on the subject of the pending amendment.

I realize the force of the argument that has been made that it is important to have some sort of control of the exorbitant prices now being charged the farmer for the implements that he must buy in order to raise his crop and for the supplies which he needs. Among those supplies, fertilizer is an important item. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] read a statement this morning to the effect that the price of fertilizer had increased 600 per cent. In a large portion of the country, perhaps in more than half of the country, perhaps more than two-thirds, fertilizer is essential to the production of crops. It is utterly impossible in those sections to produce crops without the use of commercial fertilizers or fertilizers in some form. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa does not include fertilizers. It is just as important, it seems to me—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator consent to being interrupted for a moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On page 8 of the bill the Senator will see that farm implements and fertilizers are each brought within the licensing control of the President, and in that way the farmer will be protected as to the prices of fertilizers.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that. I am much obliged to the Senator, however, for alluding to it. The same thing applies, I believe, to the other items mentioned in the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. They are required to be licensed, too. At any rate, that scarcely meets the situation, but I am not going to dwell upon that.

I should be glad if I could see my way clear to support the amendment of the Senator from Iowa upon the proposition that I believe these people who produce the Nation's food by the hardest kind of toil—the farmer who has to run all the chances of seasons and of enemies of his product, the pests and the insects and droughts and too much rain, and everything else, and who toils day in and day out for 365 days of the year, and usually more than 12 hours a day—is entitled to consideration. He is entitled to respect, and he is entitled to the incidental benefits that may grow out of wise legislation in this country. I propose to stand by that man here and elsewhere as far as I can. My own judgment is that this is not so much a problem of production; it is not so much a question of whether we are going to produce enough wheat or corn or meat, or whether we can do it; it is a question of economic distribution.

If we could institute some sort of agency in this country which could regulate this matter of distribution so that, for instance—as an insignificant illustration, perhaps, but to show the point I am trying to make—instead of the consumer paying 40 cents a pound for peanuts and the farmer getting 3½ cents a pound, if some sort of a plan could be arranged whereby the farmer could get 7 cents a pound for peanuts and the consumer could pay 7 or 8 cents a pound for them, or even 17 or 18, there would be some benefit to both the consumer and the producer.

That is just one illustration, but it is so all along the line. In the case of all the products the farmer is not getting, ordinarily, the benefit of these excessive prices. The man who produces these food products is not the man who is being benefited by these exorbitant prices in any way, or getting that profit out of his enterprise. It is to bridge this chasm between the man who produces these foodstuffs and the breakfast table that we ought to direct our chief energies, it seems to me. Some agency ought to be established whereby this tremendous loss or waste or unnecessary expenditure and tax upon the consumers of the country, amounting probably to \$6,000,000,000 every year, could be saved to the benefit of both the producer and the consumer.

It is estimated, I believe, that the farm products of the country amount annually in value on the farm to over \$9,000,000,000. Assuming that the farmers themselves consume one-third, or \$3,000,000,000, you have \$6,000,000,000 worth of farm products going to market for which the consumers of the country pay over \$13,000,000,000. Now, there is a tremendous amount of money, a tremendous burden upon the consumers, between the farm and the dinner table; and it is to reach that situation, in my judgment, that energies ought to be directed by those who are endeavoring to solve these problems.

I just want to have go in the RECORD, Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, an editorial published in the Florida Times-Union, entitled "Production of food," showing where food is produced in this country and some other facts upon that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PRODUCTION OF FOOD.

Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, a specialist of the Bureau of Education, has made a report of 50 years of educational effort among the negroes of the South. This was well-meant work, and if the investigation was thorough

and the results accurately stated the effect would be good. Of the report a story from Washington says:

"The report says three-fourths of the 8,500,000 negroes in the South live in rural communities, and that there are 3,000,000 negroes engaged in agricultural pursuits, cultivating fully 160,000,000 acres. As owners and renters of land, they are cultivating 41,500,000 acres. This acreage is twice that under cultivation either in Virginia or in New England, according to the report. Nevertheless, the South does not produce enough food to feed itself, drawing on the rest of the country annually for farm products recently estimated as worth \$750,000,000."

It is the last statement in this paragraph that attracts our attention. A specialist connected with the Bureau of Education should not have accepted with apparent credence an estimate that the South lacked three-quarters of a billion dollars of feeding herself. This statement sounds like some of Karl Vrooman's scare stuff. It is palpably absurd.

The Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture shows the following production of foodstuffs for 1916 expressed in value instead of in bulk:

| | South. | Balance of country. |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Corn..... | \$925,793,000 | \$1,369,987,000 |
| Wheat..... | 215,359,000 | 810,495,000 |
| Oats..... | 111,317,000 | 544,832,000 |
| Barley..... | 1,183,000 | 179,744,000 |
| Rye..... | 3,820,000 | 54,037,000 |
| Buckwheat..... | 1,674,000 | 11,690,000 |
| Rice..... | 33,642,000 | 2,545,000 |
| Irish potatoes..... | 82,610,000 | 334,453,000 |
| Sweet potatoes..... | 53,742,000 | 6,393,000 |
| Apples..... | 18,697,000 | 43,193,000 |
| Peaches..... | 20,428,000 | 21,683,000 |
| Total..... | 1,468,268,000 | 3,378,736,000 |

The butter, egg, and poultry product, which is common to all parts of the United States, is not given by States and we have no right to guess it is unevenly distributed. The value of vegetables is not given except as shown above. There is no reason to guess it is unevenly distributed except that early in the year the South has to supply the whole country. The value of sugar by States is not given, but the South produces its share. Nothing is said about pears and oranges or pineapples and grapefruit—the last two produced only in the South. Taking the average of these products there is no reason to think the South doesn't produce its part.

The food value of the cotton crop grown only in the South is fully \$200,000,000. Cotton seed go into many products eaten by men. Peanuts are now extensively raised in the South. The greater portion of the crop is not gathered at all, but is left in the ground for the hogs. A not inconsiderable part of it is used for human food. The value of this crop is probably \$100,000,000, and it is peculiar to the South. Sirup and molasses are almost exclusively southern products. Of these the South makes at least \$100,000,000 a year more than its share.

Add this \$400,000,000 to the \$1,468,268,000 worth of food produced by the South and we have \$1,868,268,000 worth of food produced by the South as compared with \$3,378,796,000 produced by the balance of the country, or \$5,247,064,000 for the entire country. As the South has only one-third of the population of the country its proportion would be \$1,749,021,000, which it exceeds by \$119,247,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there are two things going on now that are attracting the attention of the world—talk in the Senate and war in Europe. In connection with them and their comparative importance, I should like to have read an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday.

There being no objection, the Secretary read the editorial, as follows:

THE AVIATION FLEET.

The House set an example of patriotism in passing the \$640,000,000 aviation bill in record-breaking time. It will be a complete answer to criticism of delay in war matters if the Senate, dispensing with unnecessary committee hearings, should make a similar record and pass the bill even before straightening out the tangle over the food bill.

The leaders can easily determine whether there is to be any insistence upon debate on the aviation bill. If any Senators should insist upon their right to discuss this war measure at length, it would, of course, be impracticable to displace the food-control bill. To do so in such circumstances would be to play into the hands of those who want to confuse all legislative action and delay American victory.

If, however, the Senate generally is of the same mind as the House and feels with the American public that no useful purpose can be served by talk, the aviation bill can be given the right of way without embarrassing or delaying the food measure.

A recent dispatch from Germany indicates that no more Zeppelins are being constructed at Friedrichshafen. Thousands of workmen who hitherto have been employed in building the balloon type of airship are now building the plane type. The Germans act quickly. They have sneered at the American aviation program, but they are already at work to overmatch it.

Time is the essence of the problem. A fleet three months from now may bring the war to a successful end. Postponement even by a few days in beginning the work may give Germany the advantage which she will be prompt to seize.

The American program should be put under way at once.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is one word, I think, in the minds of all Americans and of all right-thinking people everywhere when an emergency arises to be met, which arouses more contempt than any other one word in the world, and that is the word "slacker." The slackers are not only composed of those who are resorting to lying and marrying and various other devices in order to avoid service, but it likewise applies to legislators who are forgetful of their duty, and who are taking up time needlessly and uselessly for the purpose of exploiting themselves or some local interest rather than paying due regard to a great—I started to say national, but international emergency.

I picked up a little piece of poetry the other day, which was written by Harold Begbie, and was published in the Boston Transcript, entitled "Fall in!" It ought to be entitled "An admonition to the slacker":

FALL IN!

[Harold Begbie in the Boston Transcript.]

What will you lack, sonny, what will you lack,
When the girls line up the street,
Shouting their love to the lads come back
From the foe they rushed to beat?
Will you send a strangled cheer to the sky
And grin till your cheeks are red?
But what will you lack when your mate goes by
With a girl who cuts you dead?

Where will you look, sonny, where will you look
When your children yet to be
Clamor to learn of the part you took
In the war that kept men free?
Will you say it was naught to you if France
Stood up to her foe or bunked?
But where will you look when they give the glance
That tells you they know you funked?

How will you fare, sonny, how will you fare,
In the far-off winter night,
When you sit by the fire in an old man's chair
And your neighbors talk of the fight?
Will you slink away, as it were from a blow,
Your old head shamed and bent?
Or say, "I was not with the first to go,
But I went, thank God, I went"?

Why do they call, sonny, why do they call,
For men who are brave and strong?
Is it naught to you if your country fall,
And right is shamed by wrong?
Is it football still and the picture show,
The bar, and the betting odds,
When your brothers stand to the tyrant's blow
And country's call is God's?

Can not the Senate take a little bit of encouragement to do something rather than talk quite so much from this utterance, and things like it, which are uppermost right now in the minds of the American people?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I probably would not have referred to the so-called "hold up" of the aviation bill but for the remarks of the Senator who has just addressed the Senate. Some of the newspapers, notably the one mentioned by the Senator, have, I think, been guilty of gross injustice to Members of this body, an injustice that the circumstances neither warranted nor palliated.

At about 11 o'clock yesterday morning the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] presented the aviation bill. With the main purpose of that bill no Senator on either side of this Chamber is in more ardent sympathy than I am, as I stated to the Senate at the time. But yet it has come to a pretty pass in the Senate if Senators can not present important amendments to any proposition that is offered, speak on them a reasonable time, and do no more than ask, what they are entitled to as a matter of constitutional right as long as this remains a free country, the judgment of this body on the merits of the proposition they have presented.

Both the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], who is absent, and myself on yesterday did that, and no more. I do not recall how long the Senator from Oklahoma spoke. I probably addressed the Senate something like 8 or 10 minutes and offered one amendment. I had no desire then, and I have none now, to delay the bill. I simply wished to perfect it. It was perfectly agreeable to me then, as it is now, to proceed with it then or at any other time.

I merely insisted then, as I shall insist whenever the bill comes before the Senate, on my right to present the amendment, and if that right is to be denied in this body, either by bulldozing newspapers or Members, or if it can not be exercised unless Members of this body who exercise it are to be criticized, abused, and misrepresented, then we are pretty nearly at the end of free constitutional government in this country.

I am not excited about this matter. I know that some of these newspapers, and some of the people who sympathize with them, are excited. I endeavor to make all reasonable allowance for that frame or state of mind. I am perfectly willing that the Senate shall vote whenever it pleases on the aviation bill, but whenever it does I expect to exercise my constitutional rights as a Member of this body, no matter who shall be displeased.

On yesterday I occupied about 8 minutes of the Senate's time—8 or 10 at the outside—in presenting an amendment, as I had a right to present it; and if I am to be abused or criticized for doing that, by the newspapers or by any Member of this body or anybody else in this country, we will be at the end of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of action in the Senate of the United States, and it will be useless for this body to continue to attempt to exercise its constitutional functions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. KENYON. On the amendment to the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GRONNA. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hale | McNary | Smith, Ga. |
| Beckham | Harding | Myers | Smith, S. C. |
| Borah | Hardwick | New | Smoot |
| Brandegee | Hitchcock | Norris | Sterling |
| Broussard | Hollis | Overman | Thompson |
| Calder | James | Owen | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | Johnson, Cal. | Page | Trammell |
| Culberson | Johnson, S. Dak. | Poindexter | Underwood |
| Cummins | Jones, Wash. | Pomerene | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | Kendrick | Reed | Warren |
| Dillingham | Kenyon | Saulsbury | Williams |
| Fletcher | King | Shaforth | Wolcott |
| Frelinghuysen | Lewis | Sheppard | |
| Gore | Lodge | Shields | |
| Gronna | McKellar | Smith, Ariz. | |

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HUGHES] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. MYERS. My colleague [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained on important business. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] is absent on public business. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from Iowa requests the yeas and nays on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. REED. Let the amendment to the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert, after the word "gasoline," where it appears in the proposed amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the words "iron ore and its products, farm implements, farm tools, and binding twine."

Mr. GRONNA. May I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he change the words "binding twine" to "hemp"? The Senator knows that there is no binding twine imported; that it is the raw material which is imported.

Mr. KENYON. I would have no objection if it would not complicate the matter.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator insert the word "hemp" before the words "binding twine"?

Mr. KENYON. I will insert the word "hemp," as it relates to binding twine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa modifies the amendment to the amendment. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Insert the word "hemp" before the words "binding twine," so as to read: farm tools, hemp, and binding twine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa requests the yeas and nays on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. On this question I am at liberty to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). The general pair I have with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] does not apply to matters contained in this bill. I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Kirby] and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] and his pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHAFROTH (when Mr. THOMAS's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on account of illness. I will state that he is paired with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I have already voted, but I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is not present, and not knowing how he would vote I withdraw my vote, having a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Goff] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and let my vote stand.

While I am on my feet I desire to state that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has been called from the Senate on official business, and he is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—28.

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------|------------|------------|
| Borah | Johnson, Cal. | McNary | Sherman |
| Cummins | Johnson, S. Dak. | Myers | Shields |
| Curtis | Jones, Wash. | Norris | Sterling |
| France | Kellogg | Owen | Sutherland |
| Gore | Kenyon | Poindexter | Thompson |
| Gronna | La Follette | Reed | Townsend |
| Hitchcock | McCumber | Sheppard | Trammell |

NAYS—43.

| | | | |
|---------------|----------|--------------|-----------|
| Ashurst | Hardwick | Newlands | Smoot |
| Beckham | Hollis | Overman | Swanson |
| Brandegee | James | Page | Tillman |
| Broussard | Kendrick | Pomerene | Underwood |
| Calder | King | Ransdell | Wadsworth |
| Chamberlain | Lewis | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Culberson | Lodge | Shafroth | Watson |
| Fletcher | McKellar | Simmons | Weeks |
| Frelinghuysen | McLean | Smith, Ariz. | Williams |
| Hale | Martin | Smith, Ga. | Wolcott |
| Harding | New | Smith, S. C. | |

NOT VOTING—25.

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|--------------|----------|
| Bankhead | Gerry | Nelson | Stone |
| Brady | Goff | Penrose | Thomas |
| Colt | Hughes | Phelan | Vardaman |
| Dillingham | Husting | Pittman | Walsh |
| Fall | Jones, N. Mex. | Robinson | |
| Fernald | Kirby | Smith, Md. | |
| Gallinger | Knox | Smith, Mich. | |

So Mr. KENYON's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. REED. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the language:

He is further authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three commissioners, at an annual salary of \$7,500 each, payable monthly, who shall constitute a board of food administration, and who shall perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct. One of said commissioners shall be a farmer actually engaged at the time of his appointment in the cultivation of the soil. The President shall designate the chairman of said board. Said commissioners shall hold office at the pleasure of the President during the continuance of the war.

And inserting in lieu thereof what I send to the desk. I ask to have read the proposed amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all of the amendment after the word "act" and the period, and insert:

A board of food and fuel administration is hereby established. Said board shall consist of five members. The Secretary of Agriculture shall be ex officio a member of said board, and shall act as chairman thereof. The other four members of said board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of said board shall be bona fide residents of the United States

and qualified electors thereof. At least one of said members shall be a practical farmer. At least two of said members shall be presidents of land-grant colleges under the act approved July 2, 1862, and commonly known as the Morrill Act. Said presidents shall be selected from colleges located in the principal wheat-producing States. Not more than three of said five members shall belong to the same political party: *Provided*, That the presidents of the two colleges designated shall be entitled to receive the difference between the salary received as such president and the \$10,000, with a reasonable allowance for traveling expenses, to be approved and paid by the board. When the five members herein authorized have been duly commissioned by the President they shall organize for business. A majority of the board shall constitute a quorum to transact business: *Provided, however*, That whenever the minimum price authorized in this act is fixed the two presidents of the land-grant colleges herein referred to shall be present.

That the president is authorized temporarily to transfer and assign to said board such duties now devolved upon other departments, bureaus, divisions, and commissions.

Mr. REED. I ask the acting chairman of the committee if he can not accept this amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not feel that I have any authority to accept the amendment. I will say to the Senator that I differ from the provisions which I have myself offered; I believe that the whole food control ought to be under one person, one food controller, one management; but in order to try to arrange a bill that we might agree upon, I have consented, so far as I am concerned, to the substitute that I have offered for the original section.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri is not in order. We are now considering a motion to strike out the first section and to insert. Under the practice of the Senate not more than one motion to strike out and insert can be in order at the same time. That is for this reason: Whenever a motion to strike out and insert is entertained, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted are privileged to be considered as separate questions and as subject to amendment. If the second motion to strike out and insert should be entertained, it is in effect a motion to strike out a certain part and to insert another part, just as the Chamberlain motion is to strike out a certain part of the bill and to insert another part. If a motion to strike out and insert can be superimposed one on another in that way, we should never come to any end, and we should have amendments offered in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth degrees.

We had this matter up the other day when we were considering the prohibition section; it was then debated, and it was then ruled by the occupant of the chair at that time—I have forgotten who it was—that a second motion to strike out and insert could not be superimposed on an original motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, either I greatly misunderstand the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from New Hampshire does. Of course, you can not superimpose a motion to strike out and insert on another motion to strike out and insert; that is quite true; but as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is simply a perfecting amendment to the substitute, which is open as a separate question. It is not a proposition to strike out and insert, but the Senator proposes to change certain words of the substitute. I can not see that he has not an absolute right to do so. There are two separate questions—the original text and the substitute. If the Senator moves to strike out and insert, I entirely agree he can not properly do that.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the motion can not be anything else, because the motion is to substitute for certain language in the bill certain other language. That is the original motion of the Senator from Oregon—to substitute certain language for certain other language that is now in section 1, to wit, the whole section. Now, the motion to substitute certain language for other language is a motion to strike out language not desired, and to insert language that is desired. The motion to substitute has invariably, under the practice of the Senate, been considered a motion to strike out and insert. That was so when we had the Federal-reserve act under consideration for determination. We then had exactly this situation presented. The original bill, the Owen substitute, and the Hitchcock amendment. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] offered the first section of his amendment for the first section of the original House bill. That was first entertained, and entertained just as the motion of the Senator from Oregon is entertained here. Now the Senator from Oregon moves to substitute one section for another by moving to strike out and insert.

Mr. LODGE. No doubt that is perfectly true.

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator from Missouri can move to substitute his amendment by moving to strike out and insert—

Mr. LODGE. That is not the point; nobody is denying that it is a motion to strike out a portion of the text of the first section and to insert something else. Under our Rule XVIII

every bill is subject to perfecting amendments. I may have misunderstood the Senator from Missouri, and if I have, I hope he will correct me; but I understood him to move to amend a portion of the offered substitute.

Mr. REED. By striking out certain words and inserting others.

Mr. LODGE. By striking out certain words in the offered substitute. To move to strike out and insert anything to perfect an amendment or to substitute has been held over and over again to be in order.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will pardon me, let me make this suggestion: Suppose that the rule is accepted as advocated by the Senator from New Hampshire, let us see where we would come out. Assume that this bill had certain numerals in it, as, for instance, \$10,000, and it was desired to change them to \$5,000. The only way in the world we could make an amendment would be to move to strike out "\$10,000" and to insert "\$5,000." The Senator from New Hampshire has set up a rule here that would make it impossible in any way to change the text of a proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] as yet has no status in the bill. The motion made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is not to strike anything out of the bill, but merely to change the language of the proposed amendment. His motion is much in the nature of a perfecting amendment. The present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that the Senate rules can not be so construed as to prevent the Senate from perfecting a pending amendment. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order raised by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to beg the attention of the Senate to this amendment. We have proceeded to a point where it must be agreed that there ought to be a commission to execute the powers contained in the bill. The question now is whether we shall have a commission of three or a commission of five, and also what shall be the qualifications of the members of that commission.

Ordinarily in the Senate, when it is proposed to confer powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture, it is taken for granted that that is a thing that ought to be done if it relates in any way to agriculture. It now seems to be almost settled, from the last vote, that this bill is to deal only with agricultural products and fuel. Under those circumstances, I can not see how we can justify ourselves to the country for refusing to place upon this board as one of its members the man who is at the head of the Agricultural Department of the United States, who has placed under him a very large corps of salaried assistants, who has those men already located in every county and almost in every village in the United States, who is possessed of a vast and potential working machinery, and who is not only himself supposed to be an expert but whose army of helpers are supposed to be experts. To throw aside this machinery, to ignore it, to set it at naught, and to refuse to employ it can not be justified by any sound argument, and will not be justified upon this floor.

In addition to that, my amendment proposes that there shall be named upon this commission the presidents of two agricultural colleges located in the great wheat belt of the United States. If that provision thus put into the amendment is carried out, we shall have two of the great experts connected with agricultural education upon the board, and who are consequently in touch with the agricultural conditions from those parts of the country that are to be especially affected by this bill.

The amendment then proposes that one member of the board shall be a practical farmer. The amendment further proposes that all of the members of the board shall be qualified electors of the United States who have lived in the United States for at least 12 months.

Mr. President, I want this bill that is to control the American market to be controlled by Americans, by men whose every interest is united to America and who have no interest elsewhere sufficient to control their judgment. I put into the Record a day or two ago the authorities showing that Mr. Hoover's entire manhood life has been spent outside of the United States; that his connection to-day is with a large number of English, Belgian, Chinese, and Russian companies; and that, so far as I was able to learn, he is connected with but one American company. I put it upon the conscience of this Senate whether, in administering our foods and our fuels, we ought to turn that matter over to a man whose every interest is with some other country than our own, who for many years has made only a few trips to the United States, and then, ac-

ording to one of his eulogists, has taken the fastest boat here and the fastest boat away.

We may ignore this if we please, but I say to the Senate and I say to the country that there are one or two distinguished Englishmen here now who are engaged in the task of endeavoring to secure for the English Government the same prices which our Government secures from its American producers. They are also engaged in the task of trying to secure the same prices for American food for the people of Europe that are charged to our people. I do not blame these agents of foreign Governments for endeavoring to accomplish that; but I do say that our own Government should see to it that our own markets and our own people are represented by those who have no interest save in America. If the Senate does not pause to listen now, I predict that the country will listen. I call your attention to the following article recently published in a newspaper:

EMBARGO HASTENS END, SAYS RHONDDA—BRITISH FOOD CONTROLLER DECLARES IT ALSO WILL HELP SOLVE ALLIES' FOOD PROBLEM.

LONDON, July 10.

Lord Rhondda, the food controller, in a statement to the Associated Press to-day on the embargo proclamation of President Wilson, said:

"The comprehensive and effective character of the President's latest action is typical of the way the United States has thrown itself heart and soul into the war. It seems to me that the additional pressure which thereby will be brought to bear upon our enemies should go far toward bringing this struggle to an earlier termination, especially in view of the fact that in applying an embargo on provisions the President will have the advantages of Mr. Hoover's unequalled knowledge of conditions in the neutral countries.

"The embargo, by diverting supplies from neutral destinations, also should help to solve the food problem of the European allies. But while our difficulties as regards supply are appreciably eased by this embargo, we can not really effectively deal with the vital and pressing question of price until Congress passes the food bill. So long as there is no control over the principal market, so long obviously must the prices of the allies' staple food remain variable, and, as a rule, dangerously high.

I put that in, in answer to those who state they do not have to pay high prices in England. I continue reading:

I hope soon to announce measures for the control of our own home-grown crops. This should help to equalize distribution and reduce prices. But it will, of course, be infinitesimal as compared with the world-wide effect of the present food discussion in Congress, the result of which we await with natural anxiety.

You may be assured that England will give the control of her food prices to a great Englishman, who will get the best prices he can for England. I want to put the control of American foods and food prices in a board of American citizens who have no alliances abroad, and I call your attention to the fact that, reading between the lines, we all must know that it is not in the terms of this food bill Lord Rhondda finds his solace and content and hope; it is in the administrator of the bill, for there is nothing in the terms of the bill to give him such hope.

Mr. HOLLIS and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized, having first risen.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is very frankly aimed at Mr. Hoover. It is no secret to the Senate, nor to the country, that the junior Senator from Missouri is very bitterly opposed to Mr. Hoover, and we are to have a chance on this amendment to vote whether we want Mr. Hoover kicked out of a very important position, or whether we do not. If the Senate sympathize with the views so often and so forcibly expressed by the Senator from Missouri on the floor of the Senate for the last fortnight, I assume that they will vote his amendment into the bill and thereby vote Mr. Hoover out.

I do not know Mr. Hoover; I have never met him; I have seen him only twice, and that was twice on the same day, when he was mercilessly cross-examined by the Senator from Missouri, very much as he would have been examined if he had been on trial for some crime in a police court.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HOLLIS. I do not yield. I have not the time to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield.

Mr. REED. I simply want to challenge that statement, and say that it is absolutely untrue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator—

Mr. REED. And the record will show it is untrue.

Mr. HOLLIS. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. REED. It will.

Mr. HOLLIS. It has been published; the Senator has referred to it many times; he has attacked Mr. Hoover mercilessly on many occasions, and I say the record shows that he attacked

him mercilessly on that occasion, as if he had been up before a police court for stealing chickens in Kansas City. I repeat that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. I refuse to be interrupted.

Mr. REED. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOLLIS. All the Senators have heard the Senator from Missouri; they have listened to the Senator from Missouri going on day after day. I have not interrupted him, and I refuse to be interrupted now.

Another reason why I object to this amendment is that five members on a commission of this sort would make it unwieldy. It should be smaller. There should not be more than three. I do not know of any other variance between the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and the one offered by the Senator from Oregon, but I believe, and I hope, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon may be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri rises to a question of personal privilege. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. I say that the statement just made by the Senator that I mistreated Mr. Hoover in any respect in examining him and that I made any attack upon him in examining him is absolutely and unqualifiedly false.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. And that the printed record—

Mr. HOLLIS. I think I ought to call the Senator to order. This is no place to indulge in words of that kind—

Mr. REED. The printed record will show—

Mr. HOLLIS. Or in fisticuffs or in altercations of any sort. The record will speak for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. REED. The question of personal privilege is just what I have said, that the statement made by the Senator is untrue, and that the record—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator is subject to being called to order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not a question of personal privilege. It is not a question of personal privilege to arise for the purpose of calling another Senator a liar on the floor of this body.

Mr. REED. I have not employed any such language. It remained for the Senator from Mississippi to employ it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator said "totally untrue and absolutely false." That amounts to what I said.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not see any distinction. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri was stating his question of personal privilege. The Chair warns the Senator from Missouri to use different language than he has been using.

Mr. REED. I am endeavoring to state it. The Senator has asserted that I mistreated Mr. Hoover when examining him; that I treated him as a chicken thief, and he employed similar expressions. I say, as a question of personal privilege, that that statement is a reflection upon me. Now, I say, in reply to the statement, that the record is printed; every word that I said to Mr. Hoover appears in the record, every word that he said in reply appears in the record, and no candid man can read it and find in it the slightest justification for the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire. That is what I say as a matter of personal privilege, and I say to the Senator—I say to the Senate, not to the Senator from New Hampshire—that I invite every man who is fair and decent and honest to read my questions to Mr. Hoover and to read his answers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi. Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, notwithstanding what the Senator from Missouri has just said, it is plain, palpable, and obvious to every Member of the Senate who has been listening to him for some days—many days—that he has been engaged in the business of prosecuting Mr. Hoover.

Now, Mr. President, the object of the Senator from Missouri, if I understand it, is to prevent the President from appointing a man of his choice to this place, or else, if the President does appoint a man of his choice, to so handicap the man that he may be helpless.

Mr. President, if I had my way about this bill I would appoint one man to take charge of this matter and I would name him in the bill, and I would name Hoover. I would name him

especially because of the absolutely uncalled for, unprovoked, and unjustified attacks that have been made upon him.

The Senator from Missouri says we may "rest assured that England will appoint a great Englishman" for this sort of position. If America appoints Hoover, she will appoint a great American for this position, one of the greatest in this country. The Bible was not false when it said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." This particular prophet has been honored everywhere except right here. He is a virile American of both the self-made and college-made type. He is a man all over, every fiber of him—intellectual, physical, and moral. He is not a volunteer for any Government "job." He was called upon to perform a public duty; he answered the call; and he has been persecuted upon this floor as if he were a criminal, or a suspect at any rate. The line of argument pursued concerning him has been such as to arraign him as un-American and possibly dishonest. I repeat, Mr. President, that if I had my way I would name him in this bill, and I would name him for the purpose of answering these attacks, unprovoked, uncalled for, unjustified in every possible sense.

The Senator from New Hampshire says he does not know Mr. Hoover. I do. Mr. Hoover is head and shoulders above the average man. His Americanism can not be challenged. He is as loyal as man can be. Thomas Jefferson once said of old John Adams, "He is as honest as the God who made him." I will not say that about Hoover; I think it was a little sacrilegious to have been said about John Adams, even by Mr. Jefferson, but Mr. Hoover is as honest as God makes men. He has not merited a particle of the abuse which has been showered upon his head merely because he has answered a call to duty by the President of the United States.

The more men there are upon this commission the less efficiently it is going to work. This is a war commission to meet a war emergency, and it ought to be a one-man power, and that man held to strict responsibility, and that man ought to be the choice of the President of the United States, who is the Chief Magistrate of this country.

The Senator says he wants a man who has no interest save for America. I do not. We have got a number of allies in this fight, and it is a great fight. It includes nearly the whole world, and I should dislike to see America appoint a man to run any part of this job who had no eye and no ear save for America. I want a man who has been identified to some extent with poor, stricken Belgium; a man whose heart is overflowing with sympathy and mercy and benevolence, and whose deeds will overflow with beneficence for her. I do not want any mere selfish Chauvinist in this position.

If there is a position in the world that does demand widespread sympathy for all the world, and especially for our allies, it is this position. I would not like the little provincial president of a State agricultural college to handle a great international question like this. In nine cases out of ten he would be incompetent for the job. I regard the utterance of the desire to have a man who is an American, "nothing but an American," and solely American in his sympathies, as shameful.

Mr. President, I repeat, I wish I had the opportunity to vote to put the name of Hoover in this bill. "A prophet," as I have said, "is not without honor save in his own country." Hoover was not without honor in Belgium; he has not been without honor in France—lovely, amiable, sweet France, suffering as never people suffered before, fighting as people never fought before, our ally in this great war for the liberty of the entire world. I am glad, if it be true, that Hoover permits his Americanism not entirely to monopolize him; but that he has sympathy for the French and the Belgians and the other peoples, and will to some extent adapt his conduct to their needs and necessities. I say I am glad if that be true, as is charged.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I beg to offer a suggestion to the Senate respecting this provision in the bill. The suggestion is merely an expression of my feeling as to what will be the final effect of the operations of the particular method prescribed in the proposed substituted measure.

Mr. President, I do not rise to enter into the controversy as to the fitness or unfitness of any particular gentleman for the position designated. The measure provides that whoever may be named shall be named by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I tendered such an amendment myself while in executive session here, it being my theory then, as it is my opinion now, that no one should be appointed to administer great trusts over the people and upon them without the people's representatives having in some wise a supervision of them. If the Secretary of War himself, the Secretary of State himself, and the Secretaries of the Cabinet, generally, can not enter upon their duties, as responsible as they are, without being submitted

to this body for confirmation, surely no other officer having only contemporaneous powers should be permitted to exercise them without the same constitutional supervision as is applied to the members of the Cabinet.

To that extent, therefore, I approve the section, in that it calls for the confirmation of the appointee, whoever he is, by the people's representatives, the Senate. But, Mr. President, I can not approve, as I view the situation, this board as substituting the place of the one who should be the head of the food-control agency. When the time comes to name that officer he should be a man who has the ability to create a board or a bureau. He himself should be the head; the members of the bureau should be his subordinates, subject to his employment and to his dismissal. He should have authority, full and complete.

Mr. President, if we name a board constituted of a large number, I warn you now, sir, we will have another repetition of that inexcusable situation which confronts America touching the Shipping Board and the Shipping Corporation. If the matter of the construction of ships had been placed in a single responsible head, which person had been subject to the confirmation of this body, there would have been no such exhibition as that to-day of a contest for epaulets between commanding heads of contesting agencies for the gratification of their ambition, while the opportunities of America are being wasted and her need is passing by without being served at a critical hour. America observes that at a time when there should be the ringing of the hammer, the buzz of the saw, and the employment of hundreds of thousands of men in building ships in order that our men may be quickly transported and our food soon conveyed, we have instead a conflict between boards and members of boards as to which shall dominate, who shall be captain, which shall be general, who shall have the power before the country and be recognized as king of the enterprise. Surely we will not duplicate that sort of thing, I trust, in this essential and serious matter of distribution of the foods and the control of them.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I would be opposed to a war board of many of equal authority, lest in a conflict between them we come to confusion; as I will oppose the war board proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] because of the reasons which I now urge; because I would oppose a board to run the State Department or a board to run the War Department or a board to run the Department of Justice, I respectfully urge that what should be done is simply that there should be one responsible head, whose qualifications should be submitted to the Senate in the person himself and should there be canvassed and investigated, and, if found competent, in the single authority should be vested the full and complete power, for, sir, all else will be distraction.

The Holy Scripture admonishes us that in the multitude of counselors there is security; but we are likewise informed that in the number of captains there is confusion.

Sir, with the exhibition we have had in this Government up to this time, I am unable to give my approval to a section that, to my thinking, will complicate the situation with too many who will contest between themselves for power. I favor one substantial head, appointed by the President, and submitted to this body for confirmation.

Because of these views, sir, I can not give my favor to the section, and I am unable to give my indorsement to a measure that calls for many instead of one.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, it is to have a commission of five. It is true, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has just said, that as to matters which in times of peace ought to be considered very carefully, numbers of counselors are generally better in deliberating as to the wisest course to follow; and in peace times I have not any doubt that a commission of some kind would probably be better than a one-man power. But, Mr. President, I do not subscribe to the view that there is going to be any usurpation of power by one man. I have heard a good deal of discussion upon the subject and the fear expressed that usurpation of power might result; and, of course, if these were normal times there is no question that a bill of this kind would produce a condition which would be serious. But, Mr. President, these are not normal times; they are war times; and as quick as we realize that we must know that we must have a concentration of power in order to get effective work. You might as well say that we could have a commission of five to determine and direct what an army should do on the field of battle. That is probably an extreme illustration, but no one would suggest any such thing as that. It is true that sometimes conferences are had, but the one man that has the power to direct is the man that must be supreme in his con-

trol. This is an executive function to be performed. We do not have three Secretaries of War nor three Secretaries of the Navy nor three Presidents. If we did, we would have less efficient government.

I have no fear as to usurpation of power, since we have in this bill a limitation of all of these powers to the duration of the war. That is the safeguard. If we did not have that in this bill, there would not be a Senator who would vote for it, because there would be danger of power being usurped after the war. But when we consider that in times of war concentration of power is absolutely necessary, and we take into consideration the fact that under divided authority this power becomes weak and ineffective and contentions occur that impair the efficiency of the very object we wish to attain, it seems to me we ought not to consider such division of responsibility.

I am opposed to the amendment providing for five members. I would rather have a commission of three, or a board of three, than a board of five; but I would rather have one man to direct this whole administration of affairs than to have a commission of three. I should not want to do that in time of peace, but I think it is eminently proper that we should do it in time of war.

If there is one thing that history has demonstrated it is that democracies can not conduct war until they give autocratic power. There is no way of conducting a war successfully without vesting the power in a centralized form, practically in one man; and every time a republic engages in war you find that legislation of that kind always takes place. If it is not done there will be dissensions, there will be differences of opinion, you will have in your ranks dissenters, and the inevitable result is that you will not wage a successful war.

I have no doubt that the action of one man in supreme authority will be direct, it will be specific, it will be to the point. There is here a great problem to be solved and much valuable time will be lost if we have a commission or a board. The inevitable result, to my mind, will be a detrimental effect on the administration of this measure.

The illustration which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] has just given demonstrates to my mind that it would be far better to have this shipbuilding program in the hands of either Mr. Denman or Gen. Goethals. Either one of them would do the work better and would produce better results, and the very fact that they jangle, and that they dispute, and that they are continually seeking to have their particular scheme adopted demonstrates to my mind that in division there is want of proper administrative power.

Mr. President, these are the principles that it seems to me ought to control this body. We ought to have, in my judgment, one man, and I am convinced that we will get better administration in that way. No one here is trying to do an injury. Some have talked as if the President might crush industry or might do something that is detrimental to the people. Why, the interest of the President and the interest of Mr. Hoover are identical with the general interest of the Nation. It can not be that any man holding a high or responsible position intends to do anything but what is good for the general public, and for that reason we have no danger of any action by either Mr. Hoover or the President that will work injury to the Nation at large. In this bill it is expected that if any commandeering takes place it will be done upon an equitable basis, and that no injury will be done to the persons that have to yield up the things that are required by the President. On that account I can not conceive why we should expect or why we should want anything but this concentration of power either in the President or somebody that he shall designate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator if it is his understanding that the war powers in Great Britain have been vested in one man or in a war council consisting of several members?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I do not know what has been the action in Great Britain. Perhaps they have the system of a commission. I do not know. I think a commission is a very desirable thing to advise with, but there ought to be one man to determine these matters, and you will find that all the successful campaigns were made under either one-man power or, if it was not a direct power, it was an implied power in the person.

Why, take the German Government to-day: The will of the Emperor is supreme in all of the central powers. Why is it that they have made such an effective resistance to such great powers as the entente allies? It is because one man directs them. The other central nations are willing that the control should

be turned over to him. They no doubt consult with him; they no doubt advise him, and perhaps their advice may be taken by him; but the effective operation of their work is in the concentration of that power in the German Emperor himself.

I have not any doubt that Napoleon's wars were successful because the will of Napoleon was supreme, because whatever he said, if he did not have the constitutional power to do it, it was the will of the legislative power, or the will of the cabinet, or the will of those intrusted with the power to let him handle it, and his word was just as good as if he had been vested with the power itself. These are matters which are necessary in war. They are intolerable in peace. There is no excuse for them in peace. For that reason, if we are going to fight this war to a successful issue, we must have an exercise of those powers that have proved to be successful in other wars. When we find that this is generally conceded to be the one proper step, I do not think we need fear usurpation of power in determining what our action should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment:

Add, after the word "soil," the words: "The members of said board shall, at the time of their appointment, be qualified electors of the United States."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from Missouri looks to me. I do not know whether he expects me—

Mr. REED. I thought perhaps the Senator would accept the proposition that a man could not serve on this American board unless he was a qualified elector.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, and so far as I am able, I am willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I should like to hear the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the word "soil," in the proposed amendment of the Senator from Oregon, it is proposed to insert the words:

The members of said board shall, at the time of their appointment, be qualified electors of the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it ought rather to be "citizens of the United States." I remember hearing a very distinguished admiral, a man who had been in command of a fleet at Santiago, say that he had not been an elector, but that he had fought for his country all his life. He had not had a residence, even, because he was at sea. I can conceive of a case where a man might not be an elector—that is, he might not have the right to vote—and yet he would be a citizen of the United States. If it is limited to citizenship, I have no objection to it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, it does seem to me that using the word "elector" might put us in a situation that would not be pleasant. Suppose a man failed to be in his town at the last election, and failed to vote, he is not a qualified elector. Consequently, it might catch any number of people in the United States; but if the word "citizen" is used, I can see no objection to it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Missouri that it ought to be "a qualified elector in the State in which he resides," or "in the State of his residence," because there is no such thing as a qualified elector of the United States, suffrage being a local matter, regulated by State law.

Mr. REED rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri on the assumption that he desires the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rose to answer the interrogatory or suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not want my time to be running while I am looking for this.

Mr. GORE. The Senator can answer in my time, if that is satisfactory to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will permit it on this occasion, without counting the time in which the Senator is looking for a reference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the definition given by Bouvier of an elector, which I call to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, is as follows:

One who has the right to make choice of public officers; one who has a right to vote.

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

Mr. REED. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator believe that because a man failed to vote at a civic election he should be denied the right to hold this office?

Mr. GORE. I do not think the qualifications of a voter depend on the actual fact that he voted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me that the use of the word "elector" means that he is qualified to cast a vote at each election.

Mr. GORE. Oh, no. It does mean that he must be qualified to cast a vote, but he need not necessarily have cast a vote.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The word "citizen," it seems to me, would be a much better word. Suppose, for instance, that Mr. Hoover was in Belgium at this time in the interest of the Government or in the interest of the Red Cross, doing the very kind of work which it is expected he will do under this bill. Because he may not have been here at the time of the election in November last, is it possible that anybody would think he ought to be deprived of the power of appointment, solely and purely because he was in that foreign country doing good?

Mr. GORE. Why, Mr. President, I will say, if the Senator is addressing that to me as a question, that nobody would reach such a conclusion as that, nor would that be the effect of this amendment. For my own part, I was in Phoenix, Ariz., when the election occurred last November. That in no sense disqualifies me as an elector in the State of Oklahoma. The exercise of the right to vote, and being qualified to exercise the right, are two entirely different questions.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The Senator recognizes the fact, does he not, that in order to be an elector you have to be registered?

Mr. GORE. In some States that is true. In some States it is not true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, that may be, but in most of the States I think in order to be a qualified elector you have to be registered, and if you miss the election one time in my State your name goes off the roll, and the result is you have to re-register before you become an elector again.

Mr. GORE. My suggestion is that there is really no such thing as a qualified voter or elector of the United States. I think the word "inhabitant," perhaps, would be a better word. The expression was used, though, by the Senator from Missouri, and, of course, I am not responsible for the phrase.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, answering the Senator, there can be no question about the proposition that the word "elector," as employed here, would simply mean one who possesses the qualifications of an elector; it would mean a person living within the United States who has the right to go to the polls and vote. It would not turn at all upon the question of whether he happened to be registered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator why, in this particular case, he uses language which has never been used in any statute of this kind before? Why not use the words "citizen of the United States"? Nobody can object to that.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator accept "citizen and inhabitant of the United States for 12 months"?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senator has very frankly stated what his purpose is here. His purpose is, as he has frankly stated, to take it out of the power of the President to appoint Mr. Hoover. Now, I do not see why the Senator should insist for that purpose upon having something inserted in the law that would carry out that purpose. I do not know that it would, but he is varying the language that all the statutes use when he uses the words "elector of the United States."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am utterly amazed that the Senator from Oregon should have asked my learned friend, the Senator from Missouri, why he resorts to this technical, subtle, ingenious amendment. The Senator ought to know that this great lawyer, the Senator from Missouri, is using this amendment as an ingenious and subtle way of excluding Mr. Hoover. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] does not want Mr. Hoover, under any circumstances, to be appointed, and the Senator from Oregon wasted the Senate's time when he asked that question, because we all knew what it meant—a dirk in the belt ready to be thrust at Mr. Hoover in some way, any way, to prevent Hoover from being appointed on this board.

Now, there is no such thing as a national voter or national elector? There may be such a thing as a national citizen, but there is no "national voter," and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], great constitutional lawyer that he is, is willing now to transcend the bounds of the Constitution, which he has

invoked so many times in this debate, in order to do what? To do a disservice to his country.

Mr. KENYON and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am not willing to vote for an amendment to exclude Mr. Hoover from this board. At the same time I think a man who serves on this board ought to be a citizen of the United States, and I believe Mr. Hoover is. Everybody knows that Mr. Hoover was absent from this country for a number of years while engaged in some wonderfully splendid humanitarian work. That ought not to count against him.

I ask the Senator from Oregon if he will not accept an amendment providing that the members of this board shall be citizens of the United States, and I ask the Senator from Missouri if he is not willing to accept that amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, I thought I had expressed a willingness to have the words "citizen of the United States" inserted in the bill. I think they ought to be there. If I did not make myself clearly understood, I say now that I am perfectly willing to have the language inserted that is usually placed in statutes of this kind; that is, that these men shall be citizens of the United States.

Mr. KENYON. I did not understand that the Senator had made that clear. That is fair and right, and I hope the Senator from Missouri will accept that amendment.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I shall object to the motion made by the Senator from Missouri for this reason: Every qualification that is added to the text offered by the Senator from Oregon is a limit tying the hands of the Executive just so much. Now, the President of the United States may be safely trusted to appoint proper persons to these places. I do not know whether Mr. Hoover is even a citizen or not; but if the President of the United States, on looking up the matter, finds that he is not a citizen, but still wants to appoint him on this board, I believe he should have the right to do it. Then, when the matter comes before the Senate for confirmation, if the majority of the Senators think that the men who have been nominated by the President should not hold the offices, they will fall of confirmation.

The country is behind the President of the United States on this matter of food control, as it is behind him on all other matters. The country is impatient of delay. The country is impatient of the technical questions that have been raised. The country will be impatient that this attack is made in this side way on Mr. Hoover, in the hope that a majority of the Senators will not dare to vote against a proposition of this kind. Now, I am not afraid to vote against it. I hope a majority of the Senators are not afraid to vote against it. The President will see whether Mr. Hoover is a citizen of the United States. Whether he is a citizen of the United States or not, the President will then decide whether he wants to put him on the board, and then the Senate will have a right to pass upon his qualifications when the matter comes to the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to remind the Senator from Missouri that he has spoken once.

Mr. REED. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that I distinctly said I was answering in the time of the Senator from Oklahoma and I sat down without saying what I wanted to say. I hope the Chair did not misunderstand my position. I have tried to make it very plain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes upon reflection that the Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the burning blast that comes from the sterile Arizona and the frigid wave that blows from New Hampshire, I venture to say there is nothing subtle and there is nothing concealed in this amendment. I openly proclaim my desire to have the Senate of the United States say what the qualifications shall be of the men who are to compose this board that is to have power to dictate the prices of all that the people consume in the shape of food and fuel, and to dictate the prices that shall be paid to the 45,000,000 people engaged in agricultural pursuits. It seemed to me that it was a very modest request that the men appointed should be "qualified electors of the United States." The term as thus employed means nothing more than that a man shall not be selected unless he is possessed of that character of citizenship which entitles him to vote. It does not mean that he technically shall have registered but he must be a man who is entitled to register. It does not mean that he shall have voted at the last election or that he must vote at the next election, but it means that he must be a man who possesses qualifications that will enable him to vote at the next election.

If that be treason or heresy, if that be wickedness, then let my friends and enemies alike regard it as suits them best. I say that Congress does still have some duties to perform, and that one of these duties is to see that those placed in positions of great power over citizens of the United States shall themselves be citizens of the United States. I reply further that I will answer to my own constituency, and am not alarmed though I am warned by a man who has probably never been in my State that the people are impatient. And I will answer to them as I answer now in due sobriety and not out of the dregs of intoxication.

I am reminded this morning of the fact that history repeats itself. I read:

His personal influence—

That is, Jefferson's—

prevailed in everything. Members of Congress knew very well how sorely the bill would pinch, but they never dreamed of disobeying. "All our surplus produce will rot on our hands!" cried a Member of the House. "God knows what all this means! I can not understand it. I see effects, but I can trace them to no cause. * * * Darkness and mystery overshadow this House and the whole Nation. We know nothing; we are permitted to know nothing. We sit here as mere automata; we legislate without knowing; nay, sir, without wishing to know why or wherefore." The embargo was to be tried because Mr. Jefferson believed in its efficacy. The closing year of his Presidency was darkened and distressed by its effects.

So wrote Woodrow Wilson, the historian, of Mr. Jefferson, the President, and the Congress of that time. So will the future historian write of Woodrow Wilson, the President, and the Congress of this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to offer an amendment to that, and I ask the Secretary to read it as I have indicated it there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. In the proposed amendment of the Senator from Oregon strike out, in line 18, after the word "appoint," the words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three commissioners"; in line 21, strike out the word "each," and, in the same line, strike out the words "who shall constitute a board"; in line 22, strike out the word "administration" and insert the word "administrator," and, after the word "administration," strike out the words "and who shall" and insert the word "to"; in lines 24 and 25 of the proposed amendment as printed in the committee print strike out the words "One of said commissioners shall be a farmer actually engaged at the time of his appointment in the cultivation of the soil. The President shall designate the chairman of said board"; and in line 3, page 3 of the printed amendment, strike out the word "commissioners" and insert the words "food administrator," so that it will read:

He is further authorized and directed to appoint Herbert C. Hoover, at an annual salary of \$7,500, payable monthly, food administrator to perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct. Said food administrator shall hold office at the pleasure of the President during the continuance of the war.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, this controversy seems to very largely revolve around Mr. Hoover, and it seems to me that the Senate should declare definitely whether or not it wants Mr. Hoover to act as food commissioner. It seems to be generally understood that the President wants to appoint Mr. Hoover commissioner. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that if we are going to have a commission we ought to have, for the purposes of this act, a commission composed of one person, a person who can act decidedly, definitely, and promptly in these matters.

I know but very little about Mr. Hoover, except what I have heard. I have met him twice. I will say that I was very favorably impressed with him. I believe that he is about as competent a man as we could get to discharge the responsibilities that we intend to repose in some commission by the terms of this act, and if we have to have some one to do these things, I would as soon see Mr. Hoover appointed to do them as anybody I know of.

Mr. SHAFROTH and Mr. VARDAMAN addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that his amendment, in my judgment, is ex-

cellent, except in naming a man. Mr. Hoover may die even before this bill becomes operative or he may die at any time during the war, and consequently it ought to read "an administrator to be appointed by the President." It seems to me, when you name one man you are doing that which might make the bill totally inoperative. I agree with the Senator that there ought to be a one-man power in exercising the powers that are vested under the bill, and I agree heartily with every syllable of his amendment except putting in the name of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to yield first to the Senator from Mississippi who rose.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator from Washington will permit me to say to the Senator from Colorado that if by any mischance or misfortune Mr. Hoover should shuffle off this mortal coil the American people would be helpless and hopeless. They would be sorrowing as those without hope.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I rose to make the same inquiry which is suggested by the Senator from Colorado. It seems to me that it is needless to put in the name of Mr. Hoover. Everybody knows that the President would appoint him to perform the functions of this office. As the Senator from Colorado has suggested, suppose he should die or decline to accept the place, what would become of the country? Can we afford to take any chances on it?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I beg to call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that under the Constitution we would be infringing upon the functions of the President if we undertook to name the officer in this act. The Senate has no function to perform in respect to the appointment of officers. The Constitution provides that the President shall nominate and, by and with the consent of the Senate, appoint officers created by law. So it would be futile, as far as the President is concerned, to name Herbert C. Hoover in this act. He could appoint John Jones in spite of the fact that the act contained such a provision.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is right, and, in view of the fact that the Constitution would prevent us from naming Mr. Hoover, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I now wish, if it is in order, to present the amendment which I presented yesterday and have it acted upon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think this question has been disposed of.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. I simply desire to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if the Constitution obtains in time of war?

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand there is no amendment before the Senate at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not wish to speak on that, and I shall not seek the floor until it has been disposed of.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and I insisted on the floor of the Senate the other day upon it. I believe that one man on this commission would be better than three.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana took the floor this morning, when the amendment of the Senator from Oregon was the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I did not speak upon this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Upon this pending amendment. The Chair has no way of telling what a Senator is going to talk upon. The amendment to the amendment has been withdrawn.

Mr. MYERS. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment, which has been pending all day, is the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to insert as section 1 what has been read.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state it again.

The SECRETARY. Strike out section 1 and insert the following:

That, by reason of the existence of a state of war, it is essential to the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, and for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, to assure an adequate supply and equitable distribution, and to facilitate the

movement, of foods, feeds, and fuel, including kerosene and gasoline, hereafter in this act called necessities; to prevent, locally or generally, scarcity, monopolization, hoarding, injurious speculation, or manipulations, affecting such supply, distribution, and movement; and to establish and maintain governmental control of such necessities during the war. The President is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem advisable to carry out the provisions of this act. He is further authorized and directed to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three commissioners, at an annual salary of \$7,500 each, payable monthly, who shall constitute a board of food administration, and who shall perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct. One of said commissioners shall be a farmer actually engaged at the time of his appointment in the cultivation of the soil. The President shall designate the chairman of said board. Said commissioners shall hold office at the pleasure of the President during the continuance of the war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to renew the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, leaving out the name of Mr. Hoover.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all of the proposed amendment after the word "appoint" and insert:

A food administrator at an annual salary of \$7,500, payable monthly, to perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct. Said food administrator shall hold office at the pleasure of the President during the continuance of the war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I believe that the administration of this bill will be greatly aided and assisted by having one administrator. I believe a commission even of three will not produce any result as expeditiously as the one administrator charged with the responsibility of the performance of this duty.

I have said that I believe three would be preferable to five commissioners, but I believe that one in time of war is the proper number to have, and I am confident if you incorporate the amendment I have offered into the bill it will greatly improve the measure.

The fear of usurpation, it seems to me, is visionary. One-man power in war is necessary. Division of counsel produces delay. The inevitable result when you have commissions is that disagreements occur between the commissioners and that evidently would work to the inefficiency of the service.

For these reasons, Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to take the bill as it was originally introduced in that respect.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is that very thing going on in the Shipping Board.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As the Senator from Mississippi has just said, we are having that very thing occurring in the Shipping Board.

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator think that the advice and counsel of a practical, intelligent farmer on the board would be productive of friction? Does not the Senator think that really it would be very helpful in the solution of the various problems which will come up for the consideration of the board? I think the advice and counsel of a sensible, patriotic, honest farmer would be helpful in discharging the duties of any office. Of all the vocations of man none is so calculated to develop all the latent qualities of mind and body and soul as that of the well-to-do farmer.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have not any doubt that advice of the farmer would be good and no doubt it would be taken, but to say that he shall have a voice in voting as to whether his policy shall be pursued will simply produce wrangling. I have not any doubt that Gen. Goethals and Mr. Denman are both excellent men, but they have radically different ideas concerning what is necessary to be done. It is a clear illustration of the saying that divided responsibility produces confusion and delay, and if there is one thing that is fatal in war it is hesitation. On that account it seems to me it is wise to have one executive officer.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would just like to ask the Senator if he does not think, in view of the fact that the farming interests are to be vitally affected, it would go largely to reassure the great mass of the producers of this country to know that there was a member of the board who was to pass upon the matters under consideration here, at least officially, who was one of their own class?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I do not think it will produce harmony. I believe it will produce dissension. I know that farmers are human.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Just like the representatives of the agricultural States here; they will want something in the bill that

may be extreme, just like some of the Senators would like to have \$2.80 named in the bill as a minimum price for wheat. But when you have one person who feels he must represent all classes and who is not connected with any industry, his judgment is likely to be better. Under any circumstances it produces discord, it produces delay, it produces an inefficiency of administration. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator talks as other Senators have talked about dissension in the Shipping Board. Does not the Senator know that the Shipping Board is an absolute unit; that there is not any dispute between them; that the dispute is between a general manager appointed by the Shipping Board and the board itself?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know what the dispute is in the Shipping Board, but I do know there are two elements, as it were, one represented by Gen. Goethals and the other represented by the chairman of the board. I know that when you have two people to pass upon measures you can not always have concord; men's minds are so constructed that they do not believe alike, though both are honest. When you have one man then you have one mind to control. Though that mind may not be as good as three, it will produce better effect in the end, because it will produce effectiveness.

Mr. President, I believe that as we are in war we ought to have an administration by one man, just like we have one general upon the field of battle. If you were going to have three men or five men to direct the Army you would have disputes as to what is the best course to pursue. We never provide for three governors or three sheriffs. We should never provide for more than one executive officer, especially in times of war. If you have farmers and men representing other industries upon this board you are going to have the farmers' side magnified by the farmer, you are going to have the coal industry's side magnified by the coal magnate, you are going to have some other industry's side magnified as to that member's industry. Under those circumstances either one of them charged with the duty of representing all would be better than to have all three, because the very disputes that will occur will cause delay in the determination of matters.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator puts himself in antagonism to the whole scheme of the management of national affairs in time of war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not see that I am in antagonism with it.

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the Senator think, in view of the fact that the farmer is the goat of this legislation, you would supplement it and make it perfect to exclude him from the board?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I do not think so. I do not think the farmer is made the goat; I think the farmer is made the beneficiary. I think when you fix the minimum price at \$1.75 a bushel for wheat he has a cinch. That is what I think, and it can not but produce great results in the way of stimulating that industry.

The inevitable result will be that supply and demand will control the price of wheat. In my judgment, when you attempt to regulate the maximum price, which this bill does not do, but even if it should attempt to do it, you will find great difficulty. You can not easily overcome the law of supply and demand that is recognized throughout the world as to controlling prices. You can modify it to some extent. But I am in favor of this bill even if it were to include fixing maximum prices, because I believe where exorbitant profits are extorted by certain industries the representatives thereof will yield to some extent in fear if nothing else of some punishment that might be inflicted upon them.

Mr. President, it does seem to me we should put this executive office in the hands of one man, such as the President has selected, but even if some one else should be selected it is better in time of war that we should have an administrator without a board.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am very much inclined to agree with the Senator from Colorado. I think even if we should have a commission of five we would, in fact, have but one member of the board. The others would draw their salaries, but there would be but one real executor. The only effect of a commission is to provide more salaries, more expense, and less efficiency. But the reason why I hesitate to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is because it does not seem to me exactly respectful toward our leaders. They have agreed upon this bill and have arranged what should go in and what should stay out, and among the other compromises was this, that some farmer should be appointed. That, of course, was

to placate the farmer for having taken largely everything out of the bill except what the farmer produces. I do not think it is exactly square to our leaders on the Republican side, some of whom are present, some of whom are absent. I see one or two of the leaders who framed the bill on the other side. Some of them are absent.

I think before this is finally determined the Senator from Colorado ought to consult with the leaders who framed the bill. We ought to deal fairly with one another. We ought to deal honestly. How can the Senator from Colorado display such want of obedience to things after they have been fixed for us. These leaders of ours with great unselfishness, these sacrificing and noble leaders, representing great manufacturing States, great iron and steel and cotton States, have sacrificed their time, put forth their efforts and so framed the bill that it affects the producer alone. Could anything be more magnanimous than that? Shall we display our ungratefulness by rejecting their labors and their unselfish skill? I hesitate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Are the leaders the Senator refers to members of the Agricultural Committee, or have they charge of the bill?

Mr. BORAH. No; they are the leaders of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. When did they have a meeting to consider this measure?

Mr. BORAH. Now, the Senator is getting into details. [Laughter.] It hardly seems proper in war times to reveal these secrets.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like very much to know who are the members of this self-constituted committee of leaders, if the Senator can give me the names.

Mr. BORAH. Men are not elected leaders; they are born leaders. [Laughter.] This bill has been framed by them. We ought not to attempt or assume for a moment to change it. I hope the Senator from Colorado can assure the Senator from Idaho that he has consulted with the leaders as to the privilege of offering this amendment. Do not lead us into dangerous paths, into a political cul de sac.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that I do not know who are the persons referred to by the Senator from Idaho. I do believe that it is a good amendment to be made. I have not been informed that any particular number of men said we will frame a measure and put it through the Senate. They have their individual views, but the views of each Senator must be consulted. I would not consider myself bound by them if they had made the agreement, but it is like everything else in the way of a compromise. Men who have deep interest in this bill no doubt have conferred, and they have come to an agreement as to the differences among themselves, and they no doubt feel that it is best to put the measure in this shape. I feel that we ought to have an opportunity to determine the matter for ourselves on this particular amendment at least.

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt they feel just as the Senator says they feel. I have seen evidences of that this morning by their votes. For some two or three weeks we spent time here putting different things in the bill which ought to be regulated and controlled. I heard some of the most intense and powerful arguments I have ever heard for putting this and that in the bill, but there came a change in the spirit of the dream, and the bill was reframed and reorganized. As we had framed the bill the things which the farmer must buy—farm implements, binder twine, fertilizers, and such things—were included, included after long debate. Now our leaders get together and, with a spirit of unselfishness seldom witnessed in legislative halls, take out of the bill everything in their States and leave in the products of the farm. I hesitate to record a disapproval of such magnanimous leadership.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the man who will fill this position will have as great responsibility as any Cabinet officer. In my opinion the Secretary of War will have no greater duty, no greater responsibility than the man who fills this position. It will be equal in importance and responsibility to that of any Cabinet officer. In fact, he will be a Cabinet officer in all but the name during the continuance of the war.

Suppose during the war we had three Secretaries of War, three Secretaries of the Navy, three Secretaries of Commerce, and three men filling positions at the head of each other executive department. Does anyone believe that the war would be prosecuted as speedily, effectively, decisively as it will be with one man at the head of each one of those departments?

I can not see but that there will be just as great responsibility resting upon the man who will fill this position as will

rest upon any Cabinet officer most intimately connected with the war. It is of just as great importance and responsibility to provide food and supplies at home and for the Army as it is to raise an army and put it into the field to fight. An army in the field without food is of no more benefit than an army in the field without munitions would be. Food is just as essential to success in war as munitions, and the supply must come from the people who are working at home to support the troops in the field.

As I said the other day, I do not believe there is any doubt that one man, a man of action, decision, experience, skill, knowledge, executive ability, in this position would act more effectively, efficiently, promptly, and decisively than three men, for it is certain there would be more wrangling and delay with three than with one.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Before the Senator takes his seat, if he will permit me, I wish to ask him, since he has illustrated the point he is making by using the Secretary of War, have we not a Council of National Defense, consisting of more than one person, which we have to advise the Secretary of War?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; to advise the Secretary of War, and the food commissioner or administrator may have advisors.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Secretary of War is the chairman of the Council of National Defense.

Mr. MYERS. I do not so understand; but, anyway, we have only one head of the War Department, the Secretary of War. We should have one man at the head of the food administration, and he should be Mr. Hoover. He may have numerous assistants and advisors, but there should be one head and his word should be decisive.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. We have the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, we have the different commissions that have been appointed in the wisdom of this body. We have distributed them so as to avoid one-man power, and we did it in the Council of National Defense.

While I am on my feet I wish to call attention to the fact that in the Council of National Defense every industry represented is represented by a personal interest.

Here we come to the conservation of food, and I heartily agree with the proposition incorporated in this amendment that there shall be a commission of three, one of whom shall be a representative of the class that produces those things which are to be administered; that that class shall be officially represented, just as the steel people are represented as to the steel supplies of this Government, just as the textile producers are represented on the board by those who are interested in textile work.

I am surprised that men in a democratic Government in this hour of our travail shall say that democracy is not competent to take care of and provide for its own perpetuation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, before the Senator from South Carolina takes his seat I desire to ask him a question. He has referred to the fact that we have an Interstate Commerce Commission and a Federal Trade Commission. Does not the Senator recognize that those commissions were framed for peace times? Does he not recognize that deliberation and judgment and time are necessary to solve the problems with which they deal?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Those commissions are operating in times of war, and their composition has not been changed. They operate during the war as officials, as they have done in times of peace.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but they operate as to matters which require discussion and judgment and hearing. You have got to give a hearing in such cases. The commission sits as a court, and you can not have such a form of administration to be effective in time of war.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the fact that, even in our Council of National Defense, when the question arose as to the purchases of coal, I think it was, for the benefit of the people of America we had more than one commissioner. One man would not do. A price of \$3.50 a ton for coal was asked, and it was refused because there had been contracts made for about half that price. That was one instance where having more than one man on a board saved the American people quite a nice sum of money. I took occasion to congratulate the man who stood by his guns and got the coal at a reasonable price. I believe that if we have more than one man on this board the people of America will be better satisfied, for it will be a nearer approach to democracy.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I had risen for the purpose of offering an amendment when the Senator from Colorado rose to offer his amendment. I am in favor of the amendment not only for the reasons which have already been given, and which I shall not repeat, but for the further reason

that if this amendment is adopted the act, when it is passed, will be put into effect very promptly; but if we provide for a commission of three there is no telling when that commission will be organized. Judging from the past it will be quite a while. After the Federal reserve act was passed it was nearly a year before the board provided for therein was appointed. After the shipping law was passed it was several months before the Shipping Board was appointed. So if we provide for a commission of three in this bill, there is no telling when this act will be put into effect. It seems to be generally accepted that the President has the man selected whom he wants to administer this act. So if we provide for a commission with just one administrator the act will be put into effect promptly. That is what we want.

It has been urged that it is very important to have this act passed promptly. So we have said; and so, when we are going to vote on it, I think we ought not to put anything into it which is likely to delay putting it into effect.

The controversy between the Shipping Board and the management, and so forth, has been referred to in this debate, and I want to refer to a matter with reference to that. I think it is very unfortunate that we have this conflict; but the real injury that has come to the country has come not by reason of the controversy between Mr. Denman and Gen. Goethals, but the injury has come because of the failure on the part of the President to do promptly the things which we authorized him to do.

Over a month ago we authorized the President as follows:

The President is hereby authorized and empowered, within the limits of the amounts herein authorized, to purchase, requisition, or take over the possession of for use or operation by the United States any ship now constructed or in the process of construction or hereafter constructed or any portion thereof or charter of such ship.

We gave that power to the President. The President could have exercised it, but he has not done so. We saw by the papers this morning or yesterday that ships under construction for foreign countries in our shipyards have not been commandeered. Why not? The President has the power to do it. I learned from reliable information a few days ago that within two or three weeks four large 8,000-ton steel ships, which were being constructed in the yards at Seattle, had been allowed to pass into the hands of a foreign country; and I saw in the papers two or three days ago that two 8,000-ton steel ships at Seattle had been allowed to pass under the Japanese flag. Mr. President, those ships ought to be under the American flag. They ought to have been put there under the authority given to the President over a month ago.

I am satisfied that the President has made up his mind as to whom he wants to appoint to carry out this act. I doubt if he has in mind a commission of three; he has not been considering that. So I am in favor of giving him the power to appoint one man, in the hope that he will do it the very next day after this act is passed and is put into effect.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Washington that I do not think the President deserves criticism for failing to do what the Senator has called attention to. If those ships are going to be used by the allies, I think it is a matter of prudence to permit some other nation to own and use them and thereby let some other nation than our own run the risk of having them sunk at sea. I do not see any ground for complaint or cause of censure of the President's failure to take them over. On the contrary, I think the President's conduct in the matter is highly commendable. These ships are going to serve the same purpose that they would serve if they were taken over by the United States, and the Government that takes them over will assume the risk of having them sunk. So I do not think the criticism of the President of the United States by the able and patriotic Senator from Washington is deserved in this instance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think there should be a commission of three to direct the handling and control of the commodities of this country, as provided in this amendment. The difference of time required by the President to appoint one man or three men to enforce the provisions of this bill will not delay the operation of the bill a day. Before the bill reaches the President it will have to go to conference, when it passes the Senate, and the conference report will have to be agreed to. Between now and until the bill reaches the President he will make up his mind whom he intends to appoint. I do not believe it will be 24 hours after he signs the bill before he sends the nominations of three persons to fill the positions provided for in this bill to the Senate of the United States for confirmation.

Mr. President, the labors involved in administering this bill will be so great that no one man can carry them into operation quickly. I have no doubt that the President will appoint Mr. Hoover as the chairman of the proposed commission. The bill authorizes him to appoint the chairman. I want to say that

Mr. Hoover will need all the assistance that he can possibly get. There will have to be an organization from one end of the country to the other, in every State, in every city, and in every little hamlet. I might say, Mr. President, that I think part of that organization is already effected; that I believe many of the men selected are in the different States to carry on the work as soon as the bill becomes a law. In fact, Mr. President, I think some work is being done now by a number of people in different States of the Union, and it can not help but be an advantage to Mr. Hoover to allow the President to select two persons who are qualified to assist him in carrying out the provisions of this bill.

I believe, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] said, that the board ought to have on it one farmer, who knows all about the details of the raising of wheat, its cost, and mode of handling, to assist in every way in looking out for the interests of the farmers of this country.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the author of the amendment and to the Senator from Oregon that we ought not to attempt to determine the question presented by the amendment at this time. Whether the power should be administered by one man or by a body of men must depend upon the power which we grant. There are some things that are eminently fit to be entrusted to a single person; there are other things which are just as manifestly proper to be committed to more than one person.

If the power of the original bill is to continue, the man who would propose to give that power to one person is either uncomprehending of the character of the task or he is indifferent to the welfare of his country—one or the other. To say that we should give the power to one man to fix the price of every commodity known to the industry of America is so alarming that it ought not to be considered for a single moment. To say that one man should determine the distribution of a single commodity is quite a different thing, but this bill as it is now would commit to the administrator the duty of fixing the price of everything that is known to American life; and to me even a suggestion that we should give a power of that kind to one man is abhorrent, and the people of this country will never tolerate it.

I suggest these things because we have lately carried on an investigation before a committee of which I am a member with regard to coal. I consider coal as more important than food in the present situation. If it is proposed to give one man the authority to fix the price of all the coal in this country, I would not only oppose it so long as I had a voice with which to oppose it, but, if it were adopted, it would require me to vote against the bill. I can not think of it with any kind of complacency. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senator from Oregon that we ought to pass through this bill and determine, first, what powers we are intending to grant and then select the tribunal with reference to the power rather than with reference to any preconceived notions we may have about administration.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator take into consideration the fact that whether we have a commission or whether we have one man to administer this bill it is all subject to the power of the President of the United States? There is, therefore, a safeguard whether it is placed in the hands of a commission or in the hands of an individual.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would be no more willing, Mr. President, to give the administration of these questions to the President of the United States than I would to Mr. Hoover. There are powers here that ought not to be conferred upon any man, for no man is capable of executing these powers.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator think, then, that there are powers in this bill that ought not to be given to any three men?

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, there are some powers that I think ought not to be conferred upon anybody; but there are a great many powers that I am entirely willing to see conferred upon a body of men, indeed powers which I shall insist upon being conferred upon a body of men when the time comes for the offering of amendments upon the floor. But that is not the question. We have not yet determined the character of the bill itself, the quality of the powers or the extent of the powers. Is it not reasonable to defer the decision with regard to the commission until we know what the President is to do through a single person or through a commission? If called upon to

vote at this time, I shall vote in favor of the commission, although I desire to suggest to the Senators who composed the amendment that it keeps the promise to the ear and may break it to the hope.

The President is not required to assign to this commission a single duty. He can select other agencies for the administration of the entire bill. I rather look upon the introduction of the commission as simply a tub to the whale, simply a sop to those who have been insisting upon divided authority, for there is not attached to the commission a single duty, a single authority, by virtue of the law itself. The language of the proposed amendment is that the commission "shall perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct." If he does not care to direct the commission to carry out the purposes of the act or to administer any part of it, he need not do so; and he may select another and entirely different agency for that purpose. I think, if we are to have a commission, it ought to be attached to the authority we here convey in some more direct and inseparable manner than is provided in the amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I was entertained by the argument of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], as I usually am by his arguments, especially with that part of it wherein he appealed for three commissioners, and stated that there ought to be at least one farmer on the commission. Now, as I understand, the bill comprehends both food and fuel and is limited to them. The Senator from South Carolina suggests that a farmer be placed on the commission because the bill includes food. I wonder if he would apply the same argument and say that we should also make a member of the commission a coal operator or some one interested in fuel. I am inclined to think he would not.

However much we may object to arbitrary power, which necessity seems to compel, it hardly seems possible to me that anyone who favors an administration of these subjects in the most effective manner can argue that that effectiveness will not be greater through one man than through a commission, and certainly if we were to compose that commission of interested parties we could not possibly hope to accomplish the object desired. The advice and knowledge of practical farmers and of coal operators should be obtained before any drastic action is taken either by one man or by a commission. Personally I am disturbed by doubts as to the wisdom of this proposed legislation, but if we must legislate, as I know we will, I want the most efficient law possible, and already too much time has been occupied in its discussion.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, there is more than one way to destroy a man's influence and break him down. Since the days of the ancient Greeks one of the favorite methods has been to heap honors upon a man and praise his virtues. Aristides was finally weakened and his influence destroyed by his enemies when they adopted the method of always referring to him as "Aristides the Just."

I myself feel that Mr. Hoover has been injured from the outset of the work that he has undertaken by too much praise. I have no doubt that some of the objection to Mr. Hoover that has been shown on the floor of the Senate has come from the fact that he has been placed by unwise friends in too exalted an atmosphere. It will be a protection to Mr. Hoover to be one of a commission of three. If he is the food administrator, he will be called the "food dictator." If he is one of three commissioners, no one can properly call him the "dictator," because the others can outvote him. I think it would be a protection to him, and I hope his friends will vote for a commission consisting of three.

There is an excellent reason why there should be a commission of three at least, and that is so that different-interests may be fairly represented on the board. I understand that Mr. Hoover is himself a mining engineer of distinction. He will know something about coal. There is no doubt that the farmers should be represented, so that they will have more confidence in the board than they would otherwise have, not that they will be able to influence the board for the benefit of the farmer, but they will have a direct means of knowing what is going on, so that nothing will be concealed from them; and I myself think, since the bill deals mainly with food, that the third member of this commission should be a woman, for woman has more to do with the actual preparation of food and with the consumer than has anyone else. So I hope that the compromise that has been offered by the Senator from Oregon will receive the sanction of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.
Mr. HARDING. I should like to have the amendment to the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the words "he is further authorized and directed to appoint," in line 18, page 2, of the amendment, and insert:

a food administrator at an annual salary of \$7,500, payable monthly, to perform such duties in carrying out the purposes of this act as the President shall direct. Said food administrator shall hold office at the pleasure of the President during the continuance of the war.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. The junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] has a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. We have arranged that the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New Mexico may stand paired, allowing the Senator from Wyoming and myself to vote. This announcement may stand for the day. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], I vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I inquire if the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] and vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], but I am at liberty to vote on all matters connected with this bill. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I am advised that, if present, the Senator would vote "nay" on this question, and I therefore permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. I will permit this statement to stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—10.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Borah | King. | Pomerene | Williams. |
| Johnson, Cal. | McNary | Shaftroth | |
| Jones, Wash. | Myers | Townsend | |

NAYS—63.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hale | McKellar | Smith, Ga. |
| Bankhead | Harding | Martin | Smith, Md. |
| Brandegee | Hardwick | Nelson | Smith, S. C. |
| Broussard | Hitchcock | New | Smoot |
| Calder | Hollis | Norris | Sterling |
| Chamberlain | Husting | Overman | Sutherland |
| Colt | James | Page | Swanson |
| Culberson | Johnson, S. Dak. | Penrose | Thompson |
| Cummins | Jones, N. Mex. | Pittman | Tillman |
| Curtis | Kellogg | Poindexter | Trammell |
| Dillingham | Kendrick | Ransdell | Underwood |
| Fletcher | Kenyon | Reed | Vardaman |
| France | Knox | Sheppard | Wadsworth |
| Frelinghuysen | La Follette | Sherman | Watson |
| Gore | Lodge | Shields | Wolcott |
| Gronna | McCumber | Smith, Ariz. | |

NOT VOTING—23.

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------|--------|
| Beckham | Goff | Owen | Stone |
| Brady | Hughes | Phehan | Thomas |
| Fall | Kirby | Robinson | Walsh |
| Fernald | Lewis | Saulsbury | Warren |
| Gallinger | McLean | Simmons | Weeks |
| Gerry | Newlands | Smith, Mich. | |

So Mr. SHAFTHROTH'S amendment to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "gasoline" it is proposed to insert "iron, steel, copper, and aluminum."

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I believe that the original bill, as amended, included too many products. I believe that the amendment now offered by the Senator from Oregon as a substitute does not include enough, and I think it should include iron, steel, aluminum, and copper.

When I had the floor before I presented the fact that these industries of copper, iron, steel, and aluminum were practical monopolies—not, perhaps, monopolies in the legal sense, but practical monopolies in the sense that these large industries were conducted by a very few great corporations that practically controlled the industry, and whose voice in the industry was omnipotent. I called attention to the fact that these products were essential to the successful prosecution of the war; that they all entered into the make-up of munitions of war. I also pointed out the fact that they are basic materials, related to almost every other form of production, and without which few forms of production can be successfully conducted. I also pointed out the fact that, though these great industries had been mobilized at Washington under the sanction of the law which provides for the Council of National Defense and the advisory commission, and although they are represented by the great chiefs of industry who ought to have breadth of vision, they have failed to realize their opportunity in making a reasonable price for the Government and a reasonable price for the public, and that in pursuing these skyrocket prices they were raising the price level so high that an effort would be made to raise the wage level throughout the country in order to correspond with it, and that that would mean continual unrest, contention, and strife—civil war—whilst we are engaged in the supreme contention abroad.

I contend, Mr. President, that in view of these facts it is essential that the heavy hand of the Government should be laid upon these industries; that if there are industries which in time of stress can be called public necessities and which require public regulation, these are the industries. I have called attention to the fact that the control of these industries is in a few hands, that there need not be a confusion of counsels, that they have the ability to survey the situation and the power to meet it, and that they have failed of their opportunity.

Mr. President, they are even more culpable than the coal producers of the country; for we know that the production of bituminous coal is in the hands of myriad men, unable to have a common mind upon any subject, whereas these men are so thoroughly bound together and so few in number that it is easy for them to reach a conclusion. The coal industry lost its opportunity, in my judgment; for whilst ostensibly it lowered the price from \$5.50 to \$3 a ton, the operators ignored the fact that that was doubling the price of less than \$1.50 a ton a year ago; and so they failed to meet their opportunity, though they met it in better form than the chiefs of these other industries.

Mr. President, I do not wish to load down this bill, but I do insist that if there are necessities, these are necessities; that if there is need of Government intervention anywhere, it is necessary here; that not only the wants of the Government and of the public require it, but the safety of our country at the conclusion of the war. If, as the result of skyrocket prices to which we surrender these industries now, wage levels are raised throughout the country, we will find at the end of the war that we will have a wage level far beyond that of any other competing country, and that in the world's markets our products, produced by higher-paid labor, can not meet the products of other countries, and that upon our own soil the products of cheaper labor from abroad will displace the products of our own country.

Any economist ought to view this condition with apprehension and alarm, and particularly the intelligent men who control these great industries, and who ought to have sufficient breadth of vision and sufficient knowledge of economic laws to realize that this is no time to impose either upon the Government or upon the country exaggerated prices for the products which they control; and that a wise statesmanship, not only in the interest of the country, but in the interest of the commodities themselves, demands that there should be an immediate naming of a fair and reasonable price for their commodities, both to the Government and to the public.

Mr. President, I think it essential that the prices to the public should be the same as they are to the Government. It is just as necessary, as I stated this morning, that we should have a strong Nation as it is that we should have a strong Army. We must have our people well fed and well clothed and well equipped if we wish to sustain a well-fed and well-clothed and

well-equipped Army, and monopoly should not be allowed to impress its power either upon the public or upon the Government itself.

Mr. President, the captains of industry in this country have it in their power to so adjust their prices as to avoid the application of the governmental forces which are now being summoned to regulate them. They deplore the tendency to State socialism, but if State socialism comes it will be because they have failed to meet the issue of the hour by a wise and statesmanlike maintenance of reasonable price levels. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment, Mr. President.

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

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before regarding my pair and vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—27.

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|
| Borah | Husting | McNary | Shields |
| Cummins | Johnson, Cal. | Nelson | Sterling |
| Curtis | Jones, Wash. | Newlands | Thompson |
| France | Kellogg | Norris | Townsend |
| Gore | Kenyon | Reed | Trammell |
| Gronna | La Follette | Sheppard | Vardaman |
| Hitchcock | McCumber | Sherman | |

NAYS—50.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hardwick | Myers | Smith, S. C. |
| Bankhead | Hollis | New | Smoot |
| Brandege | James | Overman | Stone |
| Broussard | Johnson, S. Dak. | Page | Swanson |
| Calder | Jones, N. Mex. | Penrose | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | Kerdrick | Poindexter | Underwood |
| Colt | King | Pomerene | Wadsworth |
| Culberson | Knox | Ransdell | Warren |
| Dillingham | Lewis | Shafroth | Watson |
| Fletcher | Lodge | Simmons | Williams |
| Frelinghuysen | McKellar | Smith, Ariz. | Wolcott |
| Hale | McLean | Smith, Ga. | |
| Harding | Martin | Smith, Md. | |

NOT VOTING—19.

| | | | |
|-----------|--------|--------------|------------|
| Beckham | Gerry | Phelan | Sutherland |
| Brady | Goff | Pittman | Thomas |
| Fall | Hughes | Robinson | Walsh |
| Fernald | Kirby | Saulsbury | Weeks |
| Gallinger | Owen | Smith, Mich. | |

So Mr. NEWLANDS's amendment to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 6, after the words "kerosene and gasoline," it is proposed to insert the following:

And, upon a finding by the President that a necessity exists therefor, such other things of whatever kind, nature, or description as the President from time to time shall include by proclamation.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I fully appreciate that the situation as to food, fuel, and feed is the most acute, and yet there is no question in my mind that before long many other things will have to be, and some now ought to be, included which will appear just as immediately necessary as these things designated in the bill.

I do not know whether we are going to have a recess of Congress or not; but we may have a recess, and emergencies may arise when it will be entirely essential—yes, indispensable—that this law shall apply to other commodities besides the things mentioned in the bill. I went into this matter yesterday at some length, and I do not propose to repeat what I said then; but I want to say that for the reasons there stated, and for the reasons I now state, it seems to me that this amendment ought to be adopted, so that at least during the recess and until another bill can be enacted in place of it designating other commodities that shall be put within the control of the Government in the same manner and to the same effect as these others we shall have some power in the hands of the President whereby we can regulate things that we may need to have regulated

before Congress meets again, or, after it does meet, before we must put in five or six weeks in discussing another bill.

This does not touch anything that is in this substitute already, but it leaves the things not mentioned in the bill entirely in the hands of the President when the need is presented.

I hope that the amendment may be adopted, and I ask for the yeas and nays upon it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, although much might be said in support of the same. Because of the extortionate prices alleged to have been charged by middlemen and speculators in foodstuffs, a demand was made upon Congress to enact a food-control bill. The view seemed to be that prices could be fixed by a commission created by Congress that would reduce the prices of food products to the consumer. The contention is now made that it is improper to control the products of the farm, unless the Government shall regulate the commodities which the farmer requires, and it is suggested that steel and farm implements, as well as a great variety of commodities, shall be subjected to governmental control and regulation.

I have never been an advocate of the theory of price fixing upon the part of the Government. It has proven unsatisfactory and futile whenever practiced and is reminiscent of outworn forms of legislation. The law of supply and demand and legitimate and proper competition have been the accepted formula in the economic world for more than 100 years. It is possible that great concentration of capital and the development of monopoly, not only in production but in transportation, may in part nullify the beneficent law of competition and lead to governmental regulation, which in the end will terminate in State socialism. I believe this bill, if enacted into law, will prove a disappointment and will fail to realize the expectations of its proponents. I was interested in the contention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who called attention to the exorbitant and extortionate prices being charged by the steel companies, the coal, aluminum, and other organizations producing things which are necessities in our civilization. He called attention to their failure to respond to the needs of the people and to measure up to the standards of patriotic duty. I did not vote for the Senator's amendment, although there is much to be said in favor of the proposition that if you control the products of the farm by governmental legislation there should be regulation of other commodities required by the farmer as well as by the public generally. But I am so averse to governmental regulation and the intrusion of the Government of its power into private enterprises that I felt constrained to vote against the motion. It may be, before this war is over, that the Government will be compelled to lay its heavy hand upon many activities and control the business of many corporations and individuals. However, I think I speak the sentiments of some Senators when I say that the corporations referred to by the Senator from Nevada and which were included within his amendment and those referred to in the committee's original amended bill need not conclude that their extortionate prices and their unjustifiable profiteering will be condoned or approved. They will be remembered when the revenue bill comes up for consideration. And, speaking for myself, if not for others, there will be a disposition to require them to put into the Treasury of the United States the gigantic sums which they have wrongfully extorted from the people. It is to be regretted that, in this war period, there should be a purpose upon the part of so many to exact from the Government, our allies, and our people prices that are not only abnormally high but such as can be properly denominated extortionate.

This bill is in the nature of a compromise, as I understand it, and, while I do not approve of many of its provisions and am not satisfied with its general plan, I shall support it in the end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. HUSTING. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ASHURST, and he answered in the negative.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll call has begun, and a response has been made.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same transfer of my pair as before, and I vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the former vote of the transfer of my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr.

HUGHES] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SHAFROTH (when Mr. THOMAS's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on account of illness.

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained on important business.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—15.

| | | | |
|---------|------------------|-------------|----------|
| Borah | Johnson, Cal. | Kenyon | Nelson |
| Cummins | Johnson, S. Dak. | La Follette | Pittman |
| Gronna | Jones, Wash. | McCumber | Thompson |
| Husting | Kellogg | McNary | |

NAYS—58.

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Harding | New | Smith, Md. |
| Bankhead | Hardwick | Norris | Smith, S. C. |
| Brandegge | Hitchcock | Overman | Smoot |
| Broussard | Hollis | Owen | Sterling |
| Calder | James | Page | Stone |
| Chamberlain | Jones, N. Mex. | Penrose | Swanson |
| Colt | Kendrick | Pointexter | Townsend |
| Culberson | King | Pomerene | Trammell |
| Curtis | Knox | Ransdell | Wadsworth |
| Dillingham | Lewis | Shafroth | Warren |
| Fletcher | Lodge | Sheppard | Watson |
| France | McKellar | Sherman | Williams |
| Frelinghuysen | McLean | Simmons | Wolcott |
| Gore | Martin | Smith, Ariz. | |
| Hale | Myers | Smith, Ga. | |

NOT VOTING—23.

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------|
| Beckham | Goff | Robinson | Tillman |
| Brady | Hughes | Saulsbury | Underwood |
| Fall | Kirby | Shields | Vardaman |
| Fernald | Newlands | Smith, Mich. | Walsh |
| Gallinger | Phelan | Sutherland | Weeks |
| Gerry | Reed | Thomas | |

So Mr. HUSTING's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I move as an amendment to insert after the word "gasoline" the words "fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients."

Mr. President, this amendment is not of extreme interest to the agriculturists in my part of the country, our soil is still young and very fertile; but it is of great importance to the older soil of the South. I hope it will be adopted. I do not think it is wise to undertake to regulate the products of the soil without taking care of those things which enter into the soil and cause its productiveness. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the negative). I wish to ask if the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. HARDING. I withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is detained on important business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—27.

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------|------------|
| Borah | Husting | Nelson | Shields |
| Cummins | Johnson, Cal. | New | Sutherland |
| Curtis | Jones, Wash. | Norris | Townsend |
| France | Kellogg | Owen | Trammell |
| Gore | La Follette | Reed | Vardaman |
| Gronna | McCumber | Sheppard | Watson |
| Hitchcock | McNary | Sherman | |

NAYS—50.

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hollis | Myers | Smith, Md. |
| Bankhead | James | Newlands | Smith, S. C. |
| Beckham | Johnson, S. Dak. | Overman | Smoot |
| Brandegge | Jones, N. Mex. | Page | Sterling |
| Broussard | Kendrick | Penrose | Swanson |
| Calder | Kenyon | Pittman | Thompson |
| Chamberlain | King | Pointexter | Wadsworth |
| Colt | Knox | Pomerene | Warren |
| Culberson | Lewis | Ransdell | Weeks |
| Dillingham | Lodge | Shafroth | Williams |
| Fletcher | McKellar | Simmons | Wolcott |
| Hale | McLean | Smith, Ariz. | |
| Hardwick | Martin | Smith, Ga. | |

NOT VOTING—19.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------|--------------|-----------|
| Brady | Gerry | Phelan | Thomas |
| Fall | Goff | Robinson | Tillman |
| Fernald | Harding | Saulsbury | Underwood |
| Frelinghuysen | Hughes | Smith, Mich. | Walsh |
| Gallinger | Kirby | Stone | |

So Mr. BORAH's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we have now reached the point I presume where we are going to vote on the substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to section 1 of the bill. For several days the Senate gave attention to section 1 of the bill. It is quite an important section. As it came from the House it referred to foods, feeds, and fuel, and articles required for their production. The Senate Committee on Agriculture, after a great deal of deliberation added several things to the articles enumerated by the House. The Senate again after two or three days' debate and consideration of the section added several more provisions. All these were added after unlimited debate, after full consideration, and, I think, without exception upon a roll call of the Senate, at least many of them were put on by a yea-and-nay vote, until when the Senate got through with the section the Senate had added petroleum and its products, steel and iron and their products, copper and its products; hemp, jute, sisal, and their products; lead, timber, lumber, farm implements and machinery, and fertilizers. These things were added, as will be disclosed by an examination of the Record giving the debates, on the theory that if we were going to control the products of the farm we ought to give to the same authority in the same law the control of the things that the farmer has to buy.

I call your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that if a minimum price is fixed in accordance with this or any other law on any of the products of the farm one of the considerations that ought to be and undoubtedly will be taken into account in fixing that price will be the cost of the things that the farmer has to buy. It was therefore the theory of the Senate, it was the deliberate judgment of the Senate, it was the conclusion of the Senate that those things the farmer had to buy in order to produce should be included with his products in the regulation.

But, Mr. President, for two days, perhaps three days, we have noticed in the papers that all this was going to be changed because it was announced in the morning paper day after day that the leaders of the Senate had made up their minds to overrule the Senate on these things, that the leaders were in consultation and they had prepared a bill in fact and in due time they were going to put it across. I only noticed that in the Washington Post, and having no corroborative evidence, of course I did not believe it, but later on when I came to the Senate I saw the program being carried out just as it had been announced; and I now find the Senate, after unlimited debate having fixed certain things in the bill, on a limited debate with a cloture undoing what they did and obeying the mandate of the wise men and cutting out from control all the things the farmer has to buy.

I am amazed at Senators arguing in favor of this proposition when they say, one after another, as several of them have done, "I am in favor of having these things controlled, but we do not control them in this bill. I am in favor of controlling these things and having them controlled by law, but I am going to vote to take them out of control in this bill." Some Senators argue, and perhaps have made themselves believe, that the bill is going to be defeated if that is not done. I want to say to you, Mr. President, that the bill will lose more supporters by confining the bill to a control of what the farmer produces and not including in the same bill and in the same law the things that he has to buy than it will by any other feature of the bill. As a matter of economy, for the minimum price which I presume will be fixed on one or more of the products of the farm we ought to control the things that those who produce those articles have to buy. We ought to regulate them. We ought not to submit the farmer to control with his product and compel him to pay what may be asked for what he has to produce. Mark you, Mr. President, if we do, the men who fix the minimum price will have to fix it higher, and it will mean a great deal of possible expenditure of public funds, in my judgment, if that course is pursued.

First, it seems to me to be a matter of common justice that if we are going to control the output of the farm we ought in the same way, by the same machinery, under the same law, by the same power, control the things that the farmer has to buy, to see that he is not fleeced in that direction; and then as a matter of economy we ought all to be interested in having a minimum price that will be fair, that will not be too high, because under the regulations of this bill that will probably become the real price. If we do not take any control of the prod-

ucts that the farmer must buy, knowing that he is going to pay, as has already been shown to-day, from 100 to 600 per cent advance for those things, we must know that that means an increased minimum price. If we want to stimulate production, because the object of fixing a minimum price is to stimulate production.

The world is short of food and we all concede that we want to increase the yield particularly of wheat, perhaps in time other things, and if we fix a minimum price with a view of stimulating production it must be so high that it will be profitable. That profit is affected by what it costs to produce the crop. It is affected by what the farmer pays for his farm machinery. That you have taken out from regulation. It is affected by what the farmer in some localities—not in mine, but in a great many localities—has to pay for fertilizers. That has increased 600 per cent in cost. That is now excluded by this proposed amendment of the leaders, and so on through everything that the farmer has to buy.

But, Mr. President, if we fix a minimum price that is remunerative—and none other will be any good—if we fix a minimum price that is profitable—and none other will accomplish any increase of production—we must take all these things into consideration. It is not necessary to say, as has been said by one Senator, that when we come to the revenue bill we shall increase the taxes on the steel men and on the fertilizer men, for that will not affect the minimum price which we will have to fix for the farmer to regulate the production of food in this country.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. President, since we come to this test between the substitute, that takes all the things that the farmer has to buy out of the bill, and the bill as we once fixed it after deliberate and candid consideration and judgment, that Senators ought to hesitate before they vote now in accordance with the demands of these leaders who have, wisely or unwisely, as the case may be, taken all these things out from the control of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska will pardon the Chair. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question, and he can answer it in my time. It has been suggested to me, by, I suppose, some of the leaders, that this matter is largely taken care of in another amendment which these leaders have prepared, and which I suppose they expect to submit, but which they have not referred to apparently in this debate. That is found on page 7. It proposes to strike out all of section 5 and to insert in lieu thereof a provision with reference to licensing all kinds of business. Under this they provide that "the President is hereby authorized to give a license," and so forth, "to any person operating an elevator."

Mr. NORRIS. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. JONES of Washington. From page 8 of the committee print, which embodies all of the amendments which our leaders have prepared.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not a committee print.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; it is a committee print. That is what it is called.

Mr. NORRIS. Those amendments are not reported by the committee. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; but they have got the committee to have them printed.

Mr. NORRIS. They had to use some committee stationery, then, to print them?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have had access evidently to the committee room, although I understand they are not members of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Some of them probably are members of the committee. It would not do to say that there are no leaders on the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, well, I thought the place of the committee itself had been taken by these Senators.

Mr. NORRIS. That is probably true; but I suppose that in some way they got some of the committee stationery, printed the proposed amendments on that stationery, and headed it "Committee Print."

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 8 they provide for a license, and in line 17 it reads:

Fourth. Any person operating a factory which produces farm implements or machinery which enter into interstate or foreign commerce.

Then—

Sixth. Any person engaged in producing, selling, or handling fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients—

Without taking time to read further we find that "whenever the President shall find that any storage charge, commission, profit, or practice of any licensee is unjust or unreasonable or

discriminatory and unfair or wasteful," he "shall order such licensee, within a reasonable time fixed in the order," to make it just and reasonable; and if the licensee shall refuse to do so, he can take away their license. In other words, I understand that this provides for a regulation of all the charges for farm implements; for instance, for fertilizer, and so forth, and that by this provision the farmer is protected. Has the Senator from Nebraska examined that?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator, in the first place, that it is limited, as the Senator has noted, to articles of interstate commerce, which has nothing to do with the price.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If they can regulate the profit, it seems to me that necessarily would regulate the price.

Mr. NORRIS. The profit of a factory?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Where does the Senator get that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The print says on page 9:

Whenever the President shall find that any storage charge, commission, profit, or practice—

Mr. NORRIS. Well, certainly a storage charge or a regulation of a storage charge on farming implements, for instance, would not accomplish anything.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that; but the word "profit," as I understand, is what they claim will give the President power to regulate the charges which shall be made to the farmer, because they can regulate the profits made in factories.

I notice this peculiar phraseology in connection with coal:

Fifth. Any person operating a coal mine producing coal, and any person dealing in coal, which enters into interstate or foreign commerce—

That would catch the retailer as well as the man who operates the mine; but with reference to farming implements, it only touches the person operating the factory and does not go to any person dealing in farming implements.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator from Washington desire my judgment on that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I do.

Mr. NORRIS. A factory manufacturing, for instance, farm implements could sell them at a profit to a subsidiary corporation of not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent, and they could dispose of them then to a dealer from that corporation at a profit of 2,000 per cent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Suppose we should insert in this language here—

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say further, while I am on the question, that if this section to which the Senator refers would regulate and prevent exorbitant prices being paid by the farmer, then why not regulate them all in that way? Why not exclude everything and put it into this section, if that is going to regulate prices? I am not talking against that provision or of the proposed amendment. There is something similar in the bill, and I think that is an important thing and ought to be in it, but it certainly will not save the farmer from the payment of exorbitant prices.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Suppose we should insert in line 18, after the word "machinery," the words "and any person dealing in farm implements or machinery"?

Mr. NORRIS. On what page does the Senator suggest that amendment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. On page 8, in line 18, so that it would provide a regulation not only of the person operating the factory but of the person dealing in farm implements—for instance, the retailer. Does not the Senator think that that would help it considerably?

Mr. NORRIS. It might, although my opinion is merely given offhand, just having the matter called to my attention. I have not given it any consideration.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, it has occurred to me, after listening to the remarks of my distinguished neighbor from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who has referred so frequently to the leaders, and at the same time listening interestedly, as I have, to those who do not assume that quality, that perhaps it would be well for a "neutral" to speak. I can not quite describe the impression that has been made upon my mind by listening to the debate on this bill. I have been wondering what one who is disinterested would say of the discussion in the United States Senate—whether we were debating warfare between selfish interests in the United States or whether we were debating means of furthering the defense of our common country.

I come from a neutral State, Mr. President. Ohio is both industrial and agricultural. I am not sure but that we are the third or fourth corn State in the Union. We raise half as much wheat as North Dakota; we rate about the third in quantity of oats produced in any State in the Union, and unless the

weather man interferes very much with our harvest, we are going to make the most splendid contribution of wheat this year that the State has ever made to the bread supply of the Nation.

So I am a "neutral," Mr. President, as between the agriculturist, on the one hand, and the industrial brother on the other; and, oddly enough, I know a little something about farming. I have followed the cradle, Senators, with the rake, when wheat sold for 40 cents a bushel. That was in the day when farming was something of a contest for subsistence. In this latter day farming has become an occupation for profit; and I happen to know that, under normal conditions, dollar wheat makes it a very profitable occupation—perhaps not to the farmer who farms the farmers, but it is to the farmer who farms a farm; and I make bold, Mr. President, to say now that the regulation of the price of wheat will indirectly operate to regulate the price of all farm products, and that is exactly what this bill is aimed to do or it ought not to be a pending proposal before this body.

It is not a discrimination, Mr. President, against the American farmer. I said a moment ago I represent an agricultural State. I have not received 20 protests from farmers against the passage of this proposed regulatory measure. The Ohio farmer who is promised \$1.75 for his wheat will be reasonably content. If the Congress desires to put a higher price on wheat and maintain the relative cost of bread for the American industrial worker, it must of necessity provide for a higher compensation for that workman.

Of course, Mr. President, I should like to have it understood in the beginning that I am not much in sympathy with any feature of this bill, certainly not with the principles involved. I accept it as a matter of necessity in a time of war. I think it is the entering wedge to the establishment of the socialized state; and I have opposed pending amendments suggesting the inclusion of iron and steel and their products and numerous other necessities that the American farmer must buy, because I think the regulation of the price of the great necessity, flour, is the most that we need to do in this trying hour, and it is the least step toward the socialized state.

I know how Senators feel; I have listened with a great deal of interest, and with mixed impressions, to discussions in regard to the suspension of constitutional powers. Well, Mr. President, that suspension, if it were not unseemly to say it, began last year in this body when the United States Congress undertook to fix a wage rate in this country. I refer to the passage of the Adamson law. When we established that principle and the United States Supreme Court gave its assent, we laid the first stone in the structure of the socialized State; and it is important to say at this hour that while we are making the world safe for democracy we are going through the processes of revolution or evolution that are very likely to leave the world a socialized democracy.

You need not be surprised thereat. In this tumult of the world, in this contest between popular government and autocracy, in the great revolution in Russia and the hoped-for revolution in Germany, there has come the inevitable contest between the toiling mass and those who have heretofore dominated society. It need not be surprising, therefore, to find slumbering beneath the surface in these United States the unmistakable processes of revolution. I am not seeking to paint a pessimistic picture, but I have the strong conviction, Mr. President, that in this year of 1917 we have much more to do than to preserve the American Republic. We have the greater task of preserving the inherited institutions of the fathers. If this body had adopted any one of the pending amendments in whose behalf arguments have been made on this floor, we would have driven not one but many a wedge into the overturning of the institutions we boast to-day.

Yet, Mr. President, I recognize the necessity that grows out of the exigencies of this world tumult. The toiling masses of America can not live under our standards of living at the present high cost of the necessities of life. If you could regulate the habits of men by statutory enactment, if Congress could prescribe a little self-sacrifice and still more of thrift, then the entire problem would solve itself. No Congress, no political party, no leadership can set aside the abiding laws of economics. You can not abolish the requirements of the law of supply and demand; you can only temporize and avoid its effects. If I could have my way I would say to the people of the United States, "If there are things that seem to you too high, do not buy," and we would soon solve the problem. That is one of the reasons why I very readily assented to the opposition to putting in all these different products, iron and steel and other enumerated necessities.

Why, Mr. President, we are the most extravagant Nation on the face of the earth. I listened a little while ago, with much respect and great interest, to the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

NEWLANDS] talking about the extreme necessity of a well-fed and well-cared-for people. Well, in a sense that is a very agreeable thing to say, but if I could fix a condition to strengthen the fiber of the citizenship of the United States of America I would prescribe some self-denial; and I want to put the prediction in my remarks now that the nation which comes to the fore in the great reorganization and reconstruction of the social fabric and the industrial world after peace comes again will be the nation which has taught itself some self-denial, some economy, and thrift in its every-day affairs.

The greatest difficulty with the United States of America—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will pardon the Chair. The Senator's time—

Mr. HARDING. I want to say this, Mr. President: The greatest difficulty with the United States of America is that we have lived according to extravagant standards; we boasted them. It was a peculiarly American development. Nobody has been willing to preach that we ought to modify somewhat our style of living. If I could have my way, Mr. President, I would go back to the good old simple days of the fathers, and if we could do that we would solve, naturally and effectively, the problem that this Congress is now trying to solve inside of 60 days, with the law that we have already enacted providing against the export of foodstuffs from this country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, one of the results of the adoption of the substitute will be to take cotton out of the bill. I voted to include cotton in the bill on a former occasion because I believed that it was so fundamental a necessity that it was entitled to the protection and the privileges of the bill, and that the possibility of the recurrence of a disaster to cotton like that of 1914 ought to be prevented. It has become evident, however, that the bill can not be passed, or that its passage will be seriously imperiled, with the retention of cotton in the measure, and I shall support the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The question is on the substitute proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.
The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], but I am at liberty to vote on this measure. Therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 60, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—60.

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Ashurst | Hardwick | Myers | Smith, Ga. |
| Bankhead | Hollis | New | Smith, Md. |
| Beckham | James | Newlands | Smith, S. C. |
| Brandegee | Johnson, S. Dak. | Overman | Smoot |
| Broussard | Jones, N. Mex. | Page | Sterling |
| Calder | Kendrick | Penrose | Stone |
| Chamberlain | Kenyon | Pittman | Swanson |
| Colt | King | Pol Dexter | Thompson |
| Curtis | Knox | Pomerene | Trammell |
| Dillingham | Lewis | Ransdell | Vardaman |
| Fletcher | Lodge | Saulsbury | Wadsworth |
| Frelinghuysen | McCumber | Shafroth | Warren |
| Gore | McKellar | Sheppard | Watson |
| Hale | McLean | Simmons | Weeks |
| Harding | Martin | Smith, Ariz. | Williams |

NAYS—16.

| | | | |
|---------|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Borah | Hitchcock | La Follette | Reed |
| Cummins | Husting | McNary | Sherman |
| France | Jones, Wash. | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Gronna | Kellogg | Norris | Townsend |

NOT VOTING—20.

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| Brady | Gerry | Owen | Thomas |
| Culberson | Goff | Phelan | Tillman |
| Fall | Hughes | Robinson | Underwood |
| Fernald | Johnson, Cal. | Shields | Walsh |
| Gallinger | Kirby | Smith, Mich. | Wolcott |

So Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to offer the amendment to section 5, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of section 5, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Sec. 5. That the President is authorized, whenever in his judgment the national security and defense will be thereby subserved, to require the following persons to take out licenses in such form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to wit: First, any person operating an elevator or other storage facility used for the storing of wheat which constitutes a part of interstate or foreign commerce; second, any person operating a cold-storage establishment for the storage of meat, poultry, or dairy products constituting a part of interstate or foreign commerce; third, any person operating a packing house producing meat or meat products which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; fourth, any person operating a factory which produces farm implements or machinery which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; fifth, any person operating a coal mine producing coal, and any person dealing in coal, which enters into interstate or foreign commerce; sixth, any person engaged in producing, storing, or handling fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; seventh, any person, not a retailer as defined in this section, who shall engage in handling any of the foregoing enumerated products. Whenever the President shall give notice that the foregoing persons, or any of them, shall be required to take out a license as herein provided, it shall be unlawful for any person to engage in any such business without having obtained said license, and conforming to the rules and regulations prescribed in connection therewith. Whenever the President shall have given said notice it shall be unlawful for any carrier to receive for transportation any of the foregoing enumerated products from any person who shall not have obtained the license herein authorized and provided for. Whenever the President shall find that any storage charge, commission, profit, or practice of any licensee is unjust, or unreasonable, or discriminatory and unfair, or wasteful, and shall order such licensee, within a reasonable time fixed in the order to discontinue the same, unless such order, which shall recite the facts found, is revoked or suspended, such licensee shall, within the time prescribed in the order, discontinue such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice. The President, may, in lieu of any such unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, find what is a just, reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and fair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, and in any proceeding brought in any court such order of the President shall be prima facie evidence. Any person who, without a license issued pursuant to this section, knowingly engages in or carries on any business for which a license is required under this section, or willfully fails or refuses to discontinue any unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and unfair storage charge, commission, profit, or practice, in accordance with the requirement of an order issued under this section, or any regulation prescribed under this section, or the officer or agent of any carrier who shall knowingly receive for transportation any such product from any person so required to take out such license but who shall have failed or refused to do so, or whose license shall have been revoked, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any farmer, gardener, cooperative association of farmers or gardeners (including live-stock farmers), or other person with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him, nor to any retailer with respect to the retail business actually conducted by him, nor shall anything in this section be construed to authorize the fixing or imposition of a duty or tax upon any article imported into or exported from the United States or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this act a retailer shall be deemed to be a person, copartnership, firm, corporation, or association not engaging in the wholesale business whose gross sales do not exceed \$100,000 per annum.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if the Senators followed the amendment which has just been read and compared it with the section as it now stands in the bill as reported from the committee, they will find this essential difference:

Section 5 now provides that from time to time, "whenever the President shall find it essential to license the importation, exportation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities constituting a part of commerce with foreign countries, or among the several States, including the several Territories and the District of Columbia, in order to carry into effect any of the purposes of this act, and shall by proclamation so announce, no person shall, after a date fixed in the proclamation, engage in business" unless he has a license for that purpose issued under the act. Now, in this proposed amendment that portion of section 5 has been stricken out and in lieu of it is inserted the following:

The President is authorized, whenever in his judgment the national security and defense will be thereby subserved, to require the following persons to take out licenses in such form and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to wit: First, any person operating an elevator or other storage facility used for the storing of wheat which constitutes a part of interstate or foreign commerce; second, any person operating a cold-storage establishment for the storage of meat, poultry, or dairy products constituting a part of interstate or foreign commerce; third, any person operating a packing house producing meat or meat products which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; fourth, any person operating a factory which produces farm implements or machinery which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; fifth, any person operating a coal mine producing coal, and any person dealing in coal, which enters into interstate or foreign commerce; sixth, any person engaged in producing, storing, or handling fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients which enter into interstate or foreign commerce; seventh, any person, not a retailer as defined in this section, who shall engage in handling any of the foregoing enumerated products. Whenever the President shall give notice that the foregoing persons, or any of them, shall be required to take out a license as herein provided, it

shall be unlawful for any person to engage in any such business without having obtained said license and conforming to the rules and regulations prescribed in connection therewith. Whenever the President shall have given said notice it shall be unlawful for any carrier to receive for transportation any of the foregoing enumerated products from any person who shall not have obtained the license herein authorized and provided for.

In other words, the original bill covered all necessities. The amendment, as submitted, limits the licensing feature.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Why have you omitted from the storing provision corn and oats and limited it simply to wheat? I refer to line 9 of page 8 of this substitute bill. The licensing only relates to elevators storing wheat, not to those that store corn or oats. Why have you omitted those?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know that there was any particular purpose in it. Wheat is the principal food commodity, and therefore wheat was specifically included.

Mr. NELSON. Is not corn a food commodity, too?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it is.

Mr. NELSON. Why should not corn be included?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, it might have been included, Mr. President. It can be amended if the Senator thinks it ought to be.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest that the Senator amend it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest that the Senator offer an amendment. I have limited it to wheat in the portion of the bill to which the Senator refers.

Mr. NELSON. I am not one of the leaders, so it would be useless for me to offer it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Neither am I, I will say to the Senator. I am simply a worker in the ranks trying, as best I can, in a national crisis to reach a fair solution of a most difficult and puzzling question. I thought it best to confine it to wheat, as did many Senators with whom I have conferred. If the Senate wants to change it or modify it in any way, of course the Senate has the power to do it. I simply offer that as a substitute for section 5 of the bill as it stands; and I have no doubt that the Senate, following its usual practice, will offer a great many amendments to it before the discussion ends. The suggestions which will be made in this Chamber will but confirm my statement that the subject is a most difficult one to solve and adjust, for no two Senators will entertain the same views upon it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment to this section, if the original section has been perfected so far as the acting chairman of the committee is concerned. I will ask the Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, whether he has amended the original section so far as he cares to have it amended? If so, I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the only amendment I proposed to offer to the substitute, Mr. President. I assumed that Senators would offer other amendments.

Mr. THOMPSON. My amendment is to strike out the interstate and foreign commerce clause wherever it appears in this section. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the words "which constitutes a part of interstate commerce" where they appear twice in the amendment, and the words "which enters into interstate or foreign commerce" where those words appear four times in the amendment, and all similar words wherever they may appear in said section or in said proposed amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment and desire a vote upon it, because the matter proposed to be stricken out has no place in a bill of this kind, and because, in my judgment, it will interfere very greatly with the full operation and administration of the law as contemplated by the act.

It seems to have been the plan of those opposed to this bill to put in the bill as many objectionable things as they could to prevent its passage; and, falling in that, to put in the bill as many things as possible to limit it in its operation.

These clauses, in my judgment, are the most objectionable of any in the bill, so far as the operation of the act is concerned. I am aware that there are some Senators who have claimed that this was necessary to make the act constitutional, but I do not believe that the constitutional lawyers who made the argument will seriously contend that there is greater power under the commerce clause of the Constitution than there is under the war power of the Constitution.

This is not an attempt, Mr. President, to exercise the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution. There is no intention of that character, but it is purely and

simply, as stated on the face of the bill, and as every line of the bill indicates, an exercise of the war power, which is the greatest power we have under the Constitution, it having been laid down fundamentally and by the highest court in this land as to be absolutely without limitation, except, of course, according as it may be modified by international law.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to present a constitutional argument in the limited time I have this afternoon, but I wish briefly to review many of the authorities which have been produced here, so that the minds of all may at least be at rest as to the constitutionality of the bill without these clauses, and also to make the bill better in its enforcement within the object of the law. First, we have the case of *Miller against The United States*, reported in *Eleventh Wallace*, page 268, where the Supreme Court held that the confiscation statute passed during war times was constitutional, and where it laid down the doctrine that legislation founded upon the war powers—

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I can not yield in the limited time I have. I would be glad to yield if I could do it without it being taken out of my 10 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I wish to remind the Senator that in the case of *Miller against The United States* it was the confiscation of the property of an enemy, not of a citizen.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the court did lay down the proposition, and it is the law of this case, and the Senator can not produce an authority of any higher court to the contrary, that the war powers of the Government have no express limitation in the Constitution, and the only limitation to which their exercise is subject is the law of nations. In this same case the proposition is laid down flatly:

The Constitution confers upon Congress expressly power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules respecting captures on land and water. Upon the exercise of these powers no restrictions are imposed. Of course, the power to declare war involves the power to prosecute it by all means and in any manner in which war may be legitimately prosecuted.

It is also held in this case:

For it is evident that legislation founded upon the war powers of the Government, and directed against the public enemies of the United States, is subject to different considerations and limitations from those applicable to legislation founded upon the municipal power of the Government and directed against criminals. Legislation in the former case is subject to no limitations, except such as are imposed by the law of nations in the conduct of the war.

The war powers of the Government have no express limitation in the Constitution, and the only limitation to which their exercise is subject is the law of nations.

We have heard read one of the leading cases which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], *Luther v. Borden* (7 How., 1), where the court lays down the principle that the constitutional guaranties against search and seizure, two of the most vital rights of citizens, do not prevail under martial law, a form of civil war.

We have here the case of *McCulloch against Maryland*, which has been read so many times, reported in *Fourth Wheaton*, where this principle is laid down by Chief Justice Marshall on page 421:

Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution—

As it is in this case under the war power—

and all the means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Then we had cited the celebrated *Legal Tender cases*, *Knox v. Lee and Parker v. Davis* (12 Wall., 45), the *National Bank cases*, and *Willoughby on the Constitution*, where the whole principle is summed up in section 715, which I desire to have made a part of my remarks, as I have not time to read it now.

The constitutional power given to the United States to declare and wage war, whether foreign or civil, carries with it the authority to use all means calculated to weaken the enemy and to bring the struggle to a successful conclusion. When dealing with the enemy all acts that are calculated to advance this end are legal. Indeed, the President in the exercise simply of his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy may, unless prohibited by congressional statute, commit or authorize acts not warranted by commonly received principles of international law, and Congress may by law authorize measures which the courts must recognize as valid, even though they provide penalties not supported by the general usage of nations in the conduct of war. Thus during the Civil War in certain cases the provision by congressional statute for the confiscation of certain enemy property or land was enforced, though such confiscation was not in accordance with the general usage of foreign States.

Even in dealing with its own loyal subjects, the power to wage war enables the Government to override in many particulars private rights which in time of peace are inviolable.

The power to wage war carries with it the authority not only to bring it to a full conclusion but, after the cessation of active military operations, to take measures to provide against its renewal. As the

court says in *Stewart v. Kahn*: "The measures to be taken in carrying on war and to suppress insurrection are not defined. The decision of all such questions rests wholly in the discretion of those to whom the substantial powers involved are confided by the Constitution. In the latter case the power is not limited to victories in the field and to the dispersion of the insurgent forces. It carries with it inherently the power to guard against the immediate renewal of the conflict and to remedy the evils which have arisen from its rise and progress."

In the case of *Stewart against Kahn* (11 Wall., 493) these fundamental principles have been applied by the Supreme Court of the United States. They have so briefly and succinctly stated the case that I desire to read this much of the opinion:

Congress is authorized to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into effect the granted powers. The measures to be taken in carrying on war and to suppress insurrection are not defined. The decision of all such questions rests wholly in the discretion of those to whom the substantial powers involved are confided by the Constitution.

We have had a long line of authorities both from the fundamental law and the decisions of the higher courts sustaining this principle.

We are here exercising the war power and not a single authority has been produced which in any way contradicts the right of Congress to pass this law without any limitation in interstate commerce. Limiting it to interstate commerce raises the question immediately as to all products as to whether they are to enter into interstate commerce or not, which is a needless controversy and throws a damper upon the enforcement of the law in the very outset. The party we aim to reach will dodge behind the interstate-commerce clause.

These authorities show that Congress had passed these acts strictly as a necessity of war, and whether the power was express or implied it made no difference as to their constitutionality. The life of the Nation was in jeopardy, as it is now, and the doctrine of self-preservation was resorted to to maintain it. Self-preservation is the first law of nature as well as the first law of nations. The construction of the courts on the war power of Congress is in accordance with the old maxim, "Salus populi suprema lex"—the good of the people is the supreme law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Oregon in charge of the bill. I should like to ask him why this licensing provision is limited to the storing of such articles as will constitute a part of interstate or foreign commerce. What is the purpose in connection with that limitation?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator will recall that in the Agricultural Committee there was a great diversity of opinion amongst the members of the committee as to whether it was necessary to confine it to interstate commerce. The committee was fairly evenly divided, and when we reported out a bill, the Senator will remember, there was a sort of a compromise reached under the terms of which one section of the bill omitted interstate commerce and the other section included the words "interstate commerce." I myself do not believe that the bill is framed under the interstate clause of the Constitution. I believe it was contemplated to have been framed, and the powers given under it are under the war-power clauses of the Constitution, but because there has been such a difference of opinion among Senators on it, that was inserted.

Mr. KNOX. I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon, as I do with the argument just made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], that we are not fighting this war under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, and if we were, section 4 of the bill should have had the limitation in the section now under consideration. I feared that the thought might have been in the mind of some Senators, because the argument has been advanced on this floor, that the only power we have is under the interstate commerce power. I quote from an argument made upon the bill by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], some week or 10 days ago, who, having read the fourth section of the bill, said that it applies to "the provisions of interstate and foreign commerce, which is the full limit of the power of Congress." I do not think the interstate and foreign commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States is the full limit of the power of Congress in a case of this kind. I think it has nothing whatever to do with this legislation. We are legislating, as the Senator from Kansas has well said, under the war power. To emphasize the opposite doctrine the Senator from Georgia read section 4 of the bill which provides, for instance—

That it is hereby made unlawful for any person willfully to destroy any necessities for the purpose of enhancing the price or restricting the supply thereof.

He said that in a measure to prevent the destruction, for instance, of wheat or of corn or of food of any kind, or of steel or of any supplies which might be necessary for the Government, if it is done within a State it is beyond the reach of the Federal

Government to prevent such destruction; and that any act, or this act specifically, which was then under consideration as it is now, which undertook to lay its hand upon the authorities of the State or individuals residing within the State to prevent them from destroying things that were necessary for the prosecution of the war was beyond the power of Congress.

To me that idea is not only repugnant but it can not be sustained by any process of reasoning of which I am aware. If it were true, all that our enemies would have to do would be to gain control of the central products located within the State and destroy them at their own sweet will, unless the State exercised its authority to prevent it. In other words, the United States at war would be helpless to prevent the destruction of articles which were essential to the prosecution of the war. I am glad to know that the Senator having charge of the bill disavows any such idea.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me answer the Senator. If I had not thought that everything mentioned in the section was such products as go into interstate commerce, I could not have brought myself to accept this as a compromise. I believe everything mentioned in it goes into interstate commerce, but, as I said before, I think the position the Senator takes is absolutely correct, that under the war power the Congress can legislate and go right into the States and do whatever it pleases to carry out the purposes of the war power.

Mr. KNOX. I am not, however, Mr. President, in favor of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kansas, because I can see a difference between the necessity of a provision such as the fourth section, which would prevent hoarding and prevent destruction or prevent willful waste of things that are necessary for the prosecution of the war, and the necessity for licensing concerns that are engaged wholly in intrastate commerce. I believe in all of the limitations that can be imposed upon the licensing system, and as this is one of the licensed limitations imposed upon that system, I would be opposed to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have on more than one occasion in committee urged that the licensing system, whatever it shall be, shall be limited to persons and corporations handling articles going into interstate commerce. In doing that I have not had in mind any constitutional question. To my mind it is entirely a practical question. If we were to clothe the Government with the power to license every person, firm, or corporation engaged in handling the products recited in this bill, we would bring within the jurisdiction of the Government thousands and thousands of small local dealers in all the tiny hamlets and small villages all over the United States, whose business is strictly local in character, and to bring them under the terms of this bill and under the jurisdiction of the commission that is going to enforce this law would simply pile up a tremendous burden of intricate and useless details upon the commission which is going to administer this statute.

It can not be contended, I think, Mr. President, that any little produce dealer, we will say, who purchases wool or butter or eggs or grain, in a little hamlet of two or three hundred people, is a factor in fixing prices. Certainly it can not be contended that he is a factor to a sufficient extent to justify compelling him and thousands and thousands of men like him to take out a Federal license. But those produce dealers who engage in business upon a scale sufficiently large to compel them to ship the products which they buy and sell in interstate commerce may be said to be factors in the national food situation.

I have believed from the beginning if we are to have any licensing system at all we would accomplish everything that we want to accomplish by limiting the license to those firms, persons, or corporations dealing in goods which are going in turn into interstate commerce.

For those reasons I hope the amendment suggested by the Senator from Oregon, as at present printed in the committee print, will prevail.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think I ought to say a few words on account of the fact that I have favored the basing of the licensing section on the commerce clause of the Constitution. To my own mind the licensing section is utterly repugnant. To require a free man in a free country to take out a license to transact business when he should be encouraged to transact business runs counter to my view of first principles as well as of sound public policy.

I do not think that any one man, however wise, ought to be vested with the power to revoke any man's license to carry on business and thus hold in the hollow of his hand millions of hon-

est business men in a free Republic. The power to license and the power to revoke license is the power of life and death.

My conclusion that this licensing provision ought to be based on the commerce clause of the Constitution is founded on the license-tax cases reported in Fifth Wallace. Those cases arose out of a statute passed in 1864. It was an internal-revenue measure. It was passed during the Civil War. It was passed when the war power was at the very summit of its omnipotence, when all limitations had been cast away, and whatever of infinity there is in the war power was then in unlimited operation.

But the Supreme Court, in interpreting that statute, held that it was a taxing law; that the licenses required were merely a receipt for the tax; and the court declared that Congress could regulate commerce over which it had the power of regulation; that Congress could regulate interstate and foreign commerce by requiring a person engaged in such commerce to take out a license. But the court indicated that Congress could not require a man carrying on a purely intrastate business to take out a license, and that such a license, if required by Congress, would confer no authority upon such person to carry on such commerce—purely domestic commerce—within the limits of the State.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. For a question. When did I understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say the act was passed which he is discussing?

Mr. GORE. In 1864.

Mr. KNOX. The case is reported in Fifth Wallace?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNOX. I am reading from the RECORD the speech of the junior Senator from Georgia, in which he quotes from that case, which says:

The twenty-ninth section of the internal-revenue act of March 2, 1867—

Reading from the case in Fifth Wallace to which I assume the Senator is referring.

Mr. GORE. I may say that in 1867 the law was amended so as to strike out the word "license" and make it purely a taxing law in terms as well as in fact. The court having held that the license was merely a receipt for the tax, the law was amended in that way.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am rather inclined to think I shall vote for the amendment as offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; but I am very jealous of any movement to base the powers under this bill on the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. I wish to say a word about the tax license case just referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

In that case the statute was upheld, and the defendants were convicted, but there was no word said about the war power. The statute was not passed as an exercise of the war power. There is nothing in the case or in the opinion that would indicate that. All there is is a dictum by a single judge that the action in the case must not be construed as extending the power of Congress to interfere with business within a State. The war power is not discussed at all in his opinion, and the case cited is no authority in any sense against putting anything we want in this bill as a war measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the constitutional phase of this amendment or to oppose it. I do desire, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when a few days ago I offered an amendment which suspended the right of the owners of whisky to remove it from bond during the period of the war it was strongly asserted—and after a night's reflection the assertion was persuasive—that it was unconstitutional, because without compensation it deprived the owner of the property of the right to use it. This provision attempts to give to the President the right to forbid all property owners within the scope of its provision the right to use their property at all; the right to use property which is not ordinarily subject to the police power of the State, as is intoxicating liquor. I do not in the least think that we can give to the President, either as a war power or otherwise, the authority to forbid the owners of property of this sort its use without compensation; but I have said this only to commend it to those who were so solicitous about the constitutional privileges of those who happen to own intoxicating liquor.

I rise principally, Mr. President, to suggest that there is upon the table, and will shortly be presented by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], an amendment relating to the regulation of coal, which I regard as infinitely more effective than the one contained in this section.

While I do not intend to move to strike out the paragraph in this section which relates to coal, when the time comes I shall endeavor to point out how utterly futile it will be in the protection of the people of this country against the excessive prices for coal which now prevail, and which we have every reason to believe will prevail in the future. It is simply idle to suggest the relief through the fixing of profits for each individual coal operator. I did not want silence on my part to mislead the Senate into the belief that I regard this provision as sufficient in that respect; and I hope that when the Senator from Ohio presents the amendment to which I have referred it will be considered upon its merits, without regard to the provision which happens to be in this licensing section.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe that a declaration of war in any sense suspends the Constitution; I hardly think a lawyer can seriously take that position; but I believe the power given by the Constitution to Congress to legislate for the conduct of the war gives Congress a vast power beyond what Congress has in times of peace, and if the necessity arises for legislation which in a measure might be considered in disregard of the usual rights growing out of State lines, I believe that a large discretion rests with Congress to determine the necessity and then to act.

But, so far as the licensing provision is concerned, I do not believe there is a necessity to require a license for more than that class of persons covered by this section. I think it goes as far as the necessity requires. I think it would be unwise to extend the licensing power to every line of food sales, to every line of food and fuel business. If we reach those engaged in interstate commerce, we reach the larger dealer and we carry the control practically to the retailer. I think we go as far as the necessity requires, and I think we cover the case so as to accomplish all that we are called upon to accomplish.

Without passing upon the question as to whether there might not be a necessity which would justify legislation going further, I think the facts that confront us really require us to stop with the provision as offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I shall therefore vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON]. I do not know just what the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is with reference to coal. Those amendments will probably come up as independent propositions. It will be sufficiently soon to reach conclusions with reference to them when they are before the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I prefer the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the provision in the bill, but I do not think that there is at this time any necessity for conferring this vast amount of power upon the President of the United States. I agree with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] a few moments ago, that nothing but the most manifest national necessity would justify Congress in attempting to confer upon the President the authority, either himself or through an agent, to say what amount of profit the business men of this country may make in their individual businesses. It is utterly abhorrent to my idea of free institutions.

I do not think the time has come when we ought to say to the President, "Look around, and whenever, in your judgment, you think it should be done, say to this man or to that man, 'You can not do business without taking a license from me; and when you take it you can only conduct your business according to the regulations I will hand to you, together with your license, one of which will be that you shall not make more than 3 per cent or 4 per cent profit on your business.'" I do not think there is any occasion whatever for that kind of legislation at this time. I regret that any such provision is in the bill at all. I prefer the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the provision of the bill because it limits the universal extension enumerated in section 4.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator from Idaho desires to speak, I will yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has spoken once.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was going to suggest an executive session, that is all.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator desires an executive session, I do not care to occupy the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There are a number of Senators who desire an executive session; and, unless there is some Senator who desires to go on now, I will move an executive session, but I do not want to lay this bill aside unless that course meets with the general approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho wish to be recognized?

Mr. BORAH. No.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 40 minutes p. m., Thursday, July 19, 1917) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, July 20, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 19 (legislative day of July 18), 1917.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Albert Schoonover, of Los Angeles, Cal., to be United States attorney, southern district of California. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Charles W. Lapp, of Ohio, to be United States marshal, northern district of Ohio. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be colonels with rank from May 15, 1917, to fill original vacancies.

Lieut. Col. Henry D. Snyder, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Allen M. Smith, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Joseph T. Clarke.

Lieut. Col. Merritte W. Ireland.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Fisher.

Lieut. Col. Henry A. Shaw, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Francis A. Winter.

Lieut. Col. Champe C. McCulloch, jr.

Lieut. Col. Frederick P. Reynolds.

Lieut. Col. Paul F. Straub, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Alexander N. Stark.

Lieut. Col. Charles Lynch.

Lieut. Col. Edward L. Munson, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. James M. Kennedy.

Lieut. Col. Deane C. Howard.

Lieut. Col. William H. Wilson.

Lieut. Col. William F. Lewis, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Thomas S. Bratton.

Lieut. Col. Thomas J. Kirkpatrick.

Lieut. Col. Irving W. Rand, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Powell C. Fauntleroy.

Lieut. Col. James S. Wilson.

Lieut. Col. Basil H. Dutcher, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Leigh A. Fuller, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. George A. Skinner.

Lieut. Col. Carl R. Darnall, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Henry Page.

Lieut. Col. Bailey K. Ashford.

Lieut. Col. Henry A. Webber, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Jere B. Clayton, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Weston P. Chamberlain, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Edward R. Schreiner, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Frederick M. Hartsock, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Douglas F. Duval, subject to examination required by law.

Lieut. Col. Clarence J. Manly, subject to examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from May 15, 1917, to fill original vacancies.

Maj. David Baker, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Albert E. Truby.
 Maj. James R. Church, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Joseph H. Ford.
 Maj. Percy M. Ashburn, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Elmer A. Dean.
 Maj. Francis M. C. Usher, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Willard F. Truby.
 Maj. Frederick F. Russell.
 Maj. Edwin P. Wolfe.
 Maj. Henry S. Greenleaf, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Louis T. Hess, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Christopher C. Collins, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Benjamin J. Edger, jr.
 Maj. Samuel M. Waterhouse.
 Maj. Eugene H. Hartnett.
 Maj. Clyde S. Ford, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Charles E. Marrow, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. M. A. W. Shockley, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Theodore C. Lyster.
 Maj. Sanford H. Wadhams, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Chandler P. Robbins, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Thomas L. Rhoads.
 Maj. Harry L. Gilchrist, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. William J. L. Lyster, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Elbert E. Persons.
 Maj. William N. Bishop, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Edward F. Geddings.
 Maj. Arthur W. Morse.
 Maj. Frank C. Baker.
 Maj. Charles R. Reynolds.
 Maj. Paul C. Hutton, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Frederick A. Dale.
 Maj. Jay Ralph Shook.
 Maj. William E. Vose, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Frank T. Woodbury.
 Maj. Henry H. Rutherford.
 Maj. Ernest L. Ruffner.
 Maj. Eugene R. Whitmore, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Patrick H. McAndrew.
 Maj. Charles Y. Brownlee, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. John A. Murtagh.
 Maj. George M. Ekwurzel, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Gideon McD. Van Poole, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. William W. Reno, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Carroll D. Buck, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. George H. R. Gosman.
 Maj. Conrad E. Koerper, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. John H. Allen.
 Maj. Robert U. Patterson, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Robert E. Noble.
 Maj. James W. Van Dusen, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Roger Brooke, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Wallace De Witt.
 Maj. Robert M. Thornburgh.
 Maj. Robert B. Grubbs, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Matthew A. De Laney, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Horace D. Bloombergh.
 Maj. Paul S. Halloran.
 Maj. Kent Nelson, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Peter C. Field.
 Maj. Herbert G. Shaw.
 Maj. Louis Brechemin, jr.
 Maj. Clement C. Whitcomb.
 Maj. Wilson T. Davidson.
 Maj. Cosam J. Bartlett, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Reuben B. Miller, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Charles A. Ragan, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. William R. Eastman, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. James F. Hall.
 Maj. Raymond F. Metcalfe.
 Maj. Edwin W. Rich.
 Maj. Perry L. Boyer, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. James M. Phalen, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. James L. Bevans, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. William L. Little, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. Alle W. Williams, subject to examination required by law.
 Maj. John L. Shepard, subject to examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from May 15, 1917, to fill casual vacancies.

Maj. William L. Keller, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Henry D. Snyder, promoted.
 Maj. Charles C. Billingslea, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Allen M. Smith, promoted.
 Maj. William H. Moncrief, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Joseph T. Clarke, promoted.
 Maj. Nelson Gapen, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Merritte W. Ireland, promoted.
 Maj. Charles F. Morse, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Henry C. Fisher, promoted.
 Maj. Haywood S. Hansell, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Henry A. Shaw, promoted.
 Maj. Junius C. Gregory, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Francis A. Winter, promoted.
 Maj. Clarence H. Connor, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Champe C. McCulloch, jr., promoted.
 Maj. Jay W. Grissinger, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Frederick P. Reynolds, promoted.
 Maj. Will L. Pyles, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Paul F. Straub, promoted.
 Maj. William M. Smart, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Alexander N. Stark, promoted.
 Maj. Robert M. Blanchard, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Charles Lynch, promoted.
 Maj. Samuel M. De Loffre, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Edward L. Munson, promoted.
 Maj. Louis C. Duncan, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. James M. Kennedy, promoted.
 Maj. Edward M. Talbott, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Deane C. Howard, promoted.
 Maj. John A. Clark, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. William H. Wilson, promoted.
 Maj. Samuel J. Morris, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. William F. Lewis, promoted.
 Maj. Jacob M. Coffin, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Thomas S. Bratton, promoted.
 Maj. John W. Hanner, vice Lieut. Col. Thomas J. Kirkpatrick, promoted.
 Maj. Levy M. Hathaway, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Irving W. Rand, promoted.
 Maj. Alexander Murray, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Powell C. Fauntleroy, promoted.
 Maj. Philip W. Huntington, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. James S. Wilson, promoted.
 Maj. James D. Fife, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Basil H. Dutcher, promoted.
 Maj. William A. Powell, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Leigh A. Fuller, promoted.
 Maj. George H. Scott, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. George A. Skinner, promoted.
 Maj. Robert L. Carswell, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Carl R. Darnall, promoted.
 Maj. Charles F. Craig, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Henry Page, promoted.
 Maj. William P. Banta, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Bailey K. Ashford, promoted.

Maj. Robert H. Pierson, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Henry A. Webber, promoted.

Maj. James I. Mabee, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Jere B. Clayton, promoted.

Maj. George P. Peed, vice Lieut. Col. Weston P. Chamberlain, promoted.

Maj. Ralph S. Porter, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Edward R. Schreiner, promoted.

Maj. Henry D. Thomason, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Frederick M. Hartsock, promoted.

Maj. Percy L. Jones, vice Lieut. Col. Douglas F. Duval, promoted.

Maj. Fred W. Palmer, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. Clarence J. Manly, promoted.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from June 25, 1917, to fill a casual vacancy.

Maj. Edward B. Vedder, subject to examination required by law, vice Lieut. Col. George D. Deshon, who died June 24, 1917.

To be major with rank from March 22, 1917, to fill a casual vacancy.

Capt. Ray W. Bryan, subject to examination required by law, vice Maj. William M. Roberts, retired from active service March 21, 1917.

To be majors with rank from May 15, 1917, to fill original vacancies.

Capt. William H. Richardson, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William K. Bartlett, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John R. Barber.

Capt. Joseph A. Worthington, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Mahlon Ashford.

Capt. Edward G. Huber, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John S. Lambie, jr., subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Arthur N. Tasker, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Howard McC. Snyder.

Capt. Calvin D. Cowles, jr.

Capt. Garfield L. McKinney.

Capt. Hiram A. Phillips.

Capt. William L. Hart.

Capt. Henry C. Coburn, jr., subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Arnold D. Tuttle, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William R. Dear.

Capt. Charles E. Doerr.

Capt. Daniel P. Card, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Ralph H. Goldthwaite.

Capt. Edgar W. Miller.

Capt. Frederick S. Wright.

Capt. Daniel W. Harmon, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. James C. Magee, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Corydon G. Snow, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Norman L. McDiarmid, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George H. McLellan.

Capt. Alexander D. Parce.

Capt. James A. Wilson

Capt. Morrison C. Stayer.

Capt. Robert W. Kerr, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Lee R. Dunbar.

Capt. Leon C. Garcia, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William S. Shields, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Addison D. Davis, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William H. Smith.

Capt. Clarence E. Fronk.

Capt. Thomas J. Leary.

Capt. Albert S. Bowen, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Ernest R. Gentry.

Capt. Roy C. Hefebower.

Capt. George M. Edwards, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George B. Foster, jr.

Capt. Joseph Casper.

Capt. Henry Beeuwkes.

Capt. Edward M. Welles, jr., subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Condon C. McCornack.

Capt. William H. Thearle, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Glenn I. Jones, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George W. Cook.

Capt. Charles C. Demmer, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Charles T. King.

Capt. Thomas H. Johnson, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William H. Allen.

Capt. Larry B. McAfee.

Capt. Adam E. Schlanser, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Carl E. Holmberg, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John P. Fletcher.

Capt. Joseph E. Bastion.

Capt. Thomas D. Woodson.

Capt. Alexander T. Cooper, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John T. Aydelotte.

Capt. Taylor E. Darby.

Capt. Thomas C. Austin, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edward Kremers.

Capt. Charles W. Haverkamp, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Harry R. Beery, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. James R. Mount, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Royal Reynolds.

Capt. James S. Fox.

Capt. Felix R. Hill, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Ralph G. De Voe.

Capt. Wayne H. Crum, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John A. Burket, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Webb E. Cooper.

Capt. Thomas L. Ferenbaugh.

Capt. William L. Sheep.

Capt. Edgar C. Jones, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Arthur O. Davis.

Capt. Floyd Kramer.

Capt. Edward L. Napier, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. W. Cole Davis, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John S. Coulter, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Frederick H. Foucar.

Capt. Paul W. Gibson, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George B. Lake.

Capt. Frank N. Chilton, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Leo C. Mudd.

Capt. Leonard S. Hughes, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Jay D. Whitham.

Capt. Henry P. Carter.

Capt. James L. Robinson.

Capt. Francis X. Strong.

Capt. Robert C. McDonald.

Capt. Howard Clarke.

Capt. Alleyne von Schrader, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Clemens W. McMillan, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Harry G. Ford.

Capt. James F. Johnston.

Capt. Henry C. Maddux, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Samuel S. Creighton.

Capt. Henry C. Michie, jr.

Capt. Lauren S. Eckels.

Capt. Albert P. Clark.

Capt. Charles E. McBrayer.

Capt. Eugene G. Northington.

Capt. Harley J. Hallett, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Sanford W. French.

Capt. Thomas J. Flynn, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. George E. Pariseau.

Capt. Daniel F. Maguire.

Capt. Edward C. Register, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John M. Willis, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Joseph L. Siner.

Capt. William Denton.

Capt. John J. Reddy, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Herbert H. Sharpe, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Lloyd A. Kefauver.

Capt. William T. Cade, jr.

Capt. John R. McKnight, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Edgar D. Craft, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Neal N. Wood.

Capt. William B. Meister, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Leeson O. Tarleton.

Capt. Shelley U. Marietta.

Capt. Harry H. Van Kirk, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Robert Skelton.

Capt. Omar H. Quade.

Capt. Thomas E. Scott.

Capt. Alfred P. Upshur.

Capt. Thomas E. Harwood, jr.

Capt. Philip B. Connolly.

Capt. Samuel J. Turnbull, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Michael A. Dalley.

Capt. Leopold Mitchell.

Capt. Adna G. Wilde.

Capt. Frederick C. A. Kellam, jr.

Capt. Johnson F. Hammond, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John G. Ingold, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Alvin C. Miller.

Capt. Chester R. Haig, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John H. Trinder, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. William E. Hall.

Capt. Hew B. McMurdo.

Capt. Thomas W. Burnett, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Kerwin W. Kinard, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Robert M. Hardaway, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John W. Sherwood, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Guy L. Qualls.

Capt. James E. Baylis.

Capt. Douglas W. McEnery, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John W. Meehan.

Capt. Charles M. Watson.

Capt. Luther R. Poust, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Benjamin B. Warriner.

Capt. William D. Herbert.

Capt. Stephen H. Smith.

Capt. George F. Lull.

Capt. Charles C. Hillman, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Sidney L. Chappell.

Capt. Fletcher O. McFarland.

Capt. Harry L. Dale.

Capt. Alvin W. Schoenleber, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Ernest C. McCulloch.

Capt. George R. Callender.

Capt. Edward T. B. Weidner.

Capt. Raymond W. Bliss.

Capt. Raymond C. Bull, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Norman T. Kirk.

Capt. William B. Borden, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Clarence R. Bell.

Capt. Robert H. Duenner.

Capt. Harry Selby Purnell.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander William C. Asserson to be a commander in the Navy from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Lieut. Charles H. Bullock to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of February, 1917.

Lieut. George S. Bryan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 23d day of May, 1917.

Lieut. Eldred B. Armstrong to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1917.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1917:

William A. Glassford, jr., and

Conant Taylor.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard S. Galloway to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1917:

Edmund S. R. Brandt,

Frank E. Johnson,

James R. Barry, and

Stewart A. Manahan.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1917:

Carl H. Jones,

Alfred H. Balsley,

Edmund W. Burrough,

Albert H. Rooks,

Byron B. Ralston,

Richard L. Conolly,

Edwin T. Short,

Robert A. Dyer, 3d,

Francis K. O'Brien,

Marion Y. Cohen,

Philip R. Weaver,

John F. Moloney,

Paul Fitzsimons, jr., and

Haiden T. Dickinson.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 30th day of March, 1917:

Lawrence Wainwright, and

John V. Murphy.

Naval Constructor Horatio G. Gillmor, with rank of commander, to be a naval constructor in the Navy with rank of captain from the 1st day of July, 1917.

The following-named naval constructors, with rank of lieutenant commander, to be naval constructors in the Navy with rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1917:

Henry T. Wright,

Guy A. Bisset, and

John E. Bailey.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1917:

Robert N. S. Baker and

William Nelson.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy from the 7th day of July, 1917:

George E. Maynard,

Arthur B. McCrary,

Seldon L. Almon, and

William E. O'Connor.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 30th day of March, 1917:

William F. Dietrich and

William McK. Reifel.

Ensign Conrad D. Fry to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1917.

Pay Clerk Frank D. Hathaway to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 17th day of July, 1916.

Pay Clerk Frank Lewis to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 19th day of July, 1916.

First Lieut. Howard W. Stone to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of August, 1916.

Second Lieut. DeWitt Peck to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of August, 1916.

The following-named pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 20th day of June, 1917:

Rufus B. Langsford,

Blaine Hunter,

Harry Atwood, and

Samuel B. Deal, jr.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps for a probationary period of two years:

Dan E. Root, a citizen of California, and

Lucian W. Burnham, a citizen of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Edward C. Barnes to be postmaster at Evergreen, Ala., in place of Edward C. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

John W. Barnes to be postmaster at Prattville, Ala., in place of John W. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

J. F. Beatty to be postmaster at Atmore, Ala., in place of J. F. Beatty. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

H. T. Brown to be postmaster at Calera, Ala., in place of H. T. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Clarence Byrd to be postmaster at Opp, Ala., in place of Clarence Byrd. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Mary E. Cain to be postmaster at Wetumpka, Ala., in place of M. E. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

J. A. Cluck to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Ala., in place of J. A. Cluck. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

W. L. Crew to be postmaster at Good Water, Ala., in place of W. L. Crew. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

H. H. Farrar to be postmaster at Blocton, Ala., in place of H. H. Farrar. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

J. F. Frazer to be postmaster at Lafayette, Ala., in place of J. F. Frazer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Zenella K. Glover to be postmaster at Millport, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

S. J. Griffin to be postmaster at Cullman, Ala., in place of S. J. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Welborn V. Jones to be postmaster at Auburn, Ala., in place of Welborn V. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

A. A. Leach to be postmaster at Dadeville, Ala., in place of A. A. Leach. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Henry C. Oswald to be postmaster at Fairhope, Ala., in place of Henry C. Oswald. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Hamilton B. Ralls to be postmaster at Piedmont, Ala., in place of H. B. Ralls. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

O. M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Anniston, Ala., in place of O. M. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

David M. Scott to be postmaster at Selma, Ala., in place of D. M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. B. Siquefield to be postmaster at Lockhart, Ala., in place of J. B. Siquefield. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

J. L. Thornton to be postmaster at Alexander City, Ala., in place of J. L. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Dora G. Wendel to be postmaster at Tallassee, Ala., in place of Dora G. Wendell. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Richard D. Williams to be postmaster at Opelika, Ala., in place of R. D. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

ARIZONA.

Letitia F. Murphy to be postmaster at Pearce, Ariz., in place of Letitia F. Cunningham; name changed by marriage.

Christoph Scheele to be postmaster at St. Johns, Ariz. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

ALASKA.

J. Clifford Hendee to be postmaster at Thane, Alaska. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

ARKANSAS.

Pearl Berkheimer to be postmaster at Augusta, Ark., in place of P. Berkheimer. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

C. A. Berry to be postmaster at Huttig, Ark., in place of C. A. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

A. W. Cammack to be postmaster at Portland, Ark., in place of A. W. Cammack. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

H. R. Cantrell to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ark., in place of H. R. Centrell. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

G. G. Dandridge to be postmaster at Paris, Ark., in place of G. G. Dandridge. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Laura B. Denton to be postmaster at Luxora, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

J. F. Gillespie to be postmaster at Carlisle, Ark., in place of J. F. Gillespie. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Noah J. Hazel to be postmaster at Marked Tree, Ark., in place of Noah J. Hazel. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

P. G. Henry to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark., in place of P. G. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

H. B. Ingram to be postmaster at Conway, Ark., in place of H. B. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

W. E. Lamb to be postmaster at Lepanto, Ark. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Anne Patton to be postmaster at Altheimer, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Ernest J. Patton to be postmaster at Cabot, Ark., in place of E. J. Patton. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

T. L. Pound to be postmaster at Danville, Ark., in place of T. L. Pound. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

T. G. Robinson to be postmaster at Marvell, Ark., in place of T. G. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Alice L. Rolley to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Edward R. Sreeton to be postmaster at Hazen, Ark., in place of Edward R. Sreeton. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

A. J. Stephens to be postmaster at Morrilton, Ark., in place of A. J. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

D. B. Thompson to be postmaster at Hope, Ark., in place of D. B. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

W. F. Turner to be postmaster at Atkins, Ark., in place of W. F. Turner. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Miles J. Webb to be postmaster at Lamar, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John D. Wilbourne to be postmaster at Pine Bluff, Ark., in place of John D. Wilbourne. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

CALIFORNIA.

Lutie M. Anderson to be postmaster at Roseville, Cal., in place of L. M. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

R. J. Bagby to be postmaster at Visalia, Cal., in place of R. J. Bagby. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Crete Gardiner de Back to be postmaster at Isleton, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Percy B. Brown to be postmaster at Holtville, Cal., in place of Percy B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John P. Day to be postmaster at Woodlake, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Albert E. Dixon to be postmaster at Point Loma, Cal., in place of Albert E. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Emma Dodge to be postmaster at Danville, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Alice T. Durnin to be postmaster at Colfax, Cal., in place of Alice T. Durnin. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Otto Haese to be postmaster at Mojave, Cal., in place of Otto Haese. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

E. Earl Hughes to be postmaster at Fresno, Cal., in place of E. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Henrietta L. Juhler to be postmaster at Spreckels, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Flora S. Knauer to be postmaster at Reedley, Cal., in place of F. S. Knauer. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

W. A. Lucas to be postmaster at Cucamonga, Cal., in place of W. A. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Luke F. Morgan to be postmaster at East Auburn, Cal., in place of Luke F. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Miriam T. Paine to be postmaster at Mariposa, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Percy S. Peek to be postmaster at Mokelumne Hill, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Ellis T. Tanner to be postmaster at San Jacinto, Cal., in place of Ellis T. Tanner. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Charles Whited to be postmaster at Willits, Cal., in place of Charles Whited. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Bert Woodbury to be postmaster at Fall Brook, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

COLORADO.

Jefferson D. Frazey to be postmaster at Antonito, Colo., in place of J. D. Frazey. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1916.

Eva B. Hamilton to be postmaster at Stratton, Colo., in place of E. B. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Gladys L. Johnson to be postmaster at Olney Springs, Colo. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Olive A. Killin to be postmaster at Kiowa, Colo. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

H. E. Maxville to be postmaster at Paonia, Colo., in place of H. E. Maxville. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

F. F. Reinert to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, Colo., in place of F. F. Reinert. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

M. M. Sutley to be postmaster at Center, Colo., in place of M. M. Sutley. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

CONNECTICUT.

John J. Bohl to be postmaster at Stamford, Conn., in place of J. J. Bohl. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

John J. Cassidy to be postmaster at Woodbury, Conn., in place of J. J. Cassidy. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

W. S. Clarke to be postmaster at Milford, Conn., in place of W. S. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

John L. Elliot to be postmaster at Clinton, Conn., in place of John L. Elliot. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

George F. Hammill to be postmaster at Georgetown, Conn., in place of George F. Hammill. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. A. Leahy to be postmaster at Plainfield, Conn., in place of J. A. Leahy. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Matthew E. McDonald to be postmaster at Simsbury, Conn., in place of M. E. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1917.

Thomas McGrath to be postmaster at Washington, Conn., in place of T. McGrath. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

John J. Molans to be postmaster at Seymour, Conn., in place of J. J. Molans. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Edward Perkins to be postmaster at Suffield, Conn., in place of E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Harry W. Potter to be postmaster at Glastonbury, Conn., in place of Harry W. Potter. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ashmun P. Prickett to be postmaster at Hazardville, Conn., in place of A. P. Prickett. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Peter J. Prior to be postmaster at Plainville, Conn., in place of P. J. Prior. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Frederick H. Smith to be postmaster at Darien, Conn., in place of Frederick H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

DELAWARE.

William Brockson to be postmaster at Middletown, Del., in place of W. Brockson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Elijah E. Carey to be postmaster at Millsboro, Del., in place of E. E. Carey. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

E. Pierce Ellis to be postmaster at Laurel, Del., in place of E. P. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John P. Murphy to be postmaster at New Castle, Del., in place of J. P. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

John B. Mustard to be postmaster at Milton, Del., in place of J. B. Mustard. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

William H. Robinson to be postmaster at Milford, Del., in place of W. H. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Orlando W. Short to be postmaster at Seaford, Del., in place of O. W. Short. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

FLORIDA.

John W. Alvarez to be postmaster at Starke, Fla., in place of J. W. Alvarez. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Joseph B. Bower to be postmaster at Rockledge, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Marcy B. Darnall to be postmaster at Key West, Fla., in place of M. B. Darnall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Florida E. Gay to be postmaster at Lynn Haven, Fla., in place of F. E. Gay. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Samuel J. Giles to be postmaster at Carrabelle, Fla., in place of S. J. Giles. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

Crawford I. Henry to be postmaster at Apalachicola, Fla., in place of C. I. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

W. H. Hoffman to be postmaster at Dunnellon, Fla., in place of W. H. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Lewis L. Kenny to be postmaster at Fruitland Park, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles E. Kettle to be postmaster at Hastings, Fla., in place of C. E. Kettle. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

George D. Langston to be postmaster at Haines City, Fla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Edward C. Lewis to be postmaster at Marianna, Fla., in place of E. C. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Lula Newton to be postmaster at Winter Garden, Fla., in place of Lula Newton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Elmer J. Roux to be postmaster at Fernandina, Fla., in place of E. J. Roux. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Bessie Bryan Simpson to be postmaster at Kissimmee, Fla., in place of B. B. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Addison L. Smith to be postmaster at Groveland, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Clarence C. Thullbery to be postmaster at Lake Wales, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Eva R. Vaughn to be postmaster at Century, Fla., in place of E. R. Vaughn. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

J. A. Williams to be postmaster at Alachua, Fla., in place of J. A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

J. N. Willis to be postmaster at Williston, Fla., in place of J. N. Willis. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

GEORGIA.

Jackson C. Atkinson to be postmaster at Midville, Ga., in place of J. C. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

B. T. Baker to be postmaster at Woodbury, Ga., in place of B. T. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

W. H. Beddingfield to be postmaster at Unadilla, Ga., in place of W. H. Beddingfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles Beaty to be postmaster at Moultrie, Ga., in place of Charles Beaty. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

James Park Bowie to be postmaster at Rome, Ga., in place of J. P. Bowie. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Elvira T. Burghard to be postmaster at Crumps Park, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Charles V. Clark to be postmaster at Louisville, Ga., in place of C. V. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Thomas K. Dunham to be postmaster at Darien, Ga., in place of T. K. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

R. H. Dunlap to be postmaster at Chipley, Ga., in place of R. H. Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Fannie T. Elmore to be postmaster at Oglethorpe, Ga., in place of F. T. Elmore. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Hattie F. Gilmer to be postmaster at Toccoa, Ga., in place of H. F. Gilmer. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Martha E. Gorham to be postmaster at Crawfordville, Ga., in place of M. E. Gorham. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Mattie E. Gunter to be postmaster at Social Circle, Ga., in place of M. E. Gunter. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Josephine Hilliard to be postmaster at Union Point, Ga., in place of J. Hilliard. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Minnie E. Hogan to be postmaster at Collegepark, Ga., in place of M. E. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Andrew J. Irwin to be postmaster at Sandersville, Ga., in place of A. J. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Charles Jackson to be postmaster at Palmetto, Ga., in place of Chas. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

John F. Jenkins to be postmaster at Ashburn, Ga., in place of John F. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William F. Jones to be postmaster at Hogansville, Ga., in place of Wm. F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

John N. King to be postmaster at Rochelle, Ga., in place of J. N. King. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Richard E. Lee to be postmaster at Concord, Ga., in place of R. E. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Samuel B. Lewis to be postmaster at Fayetteville, Ga., in place of S. B. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

William B. McCants to be postmaster at Winder, Ga., in place of W. B. McCants. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Vivian McCurdy to be postmaster at Stone Mountain, Ga., in place of V. McCurdy. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Lonnie J. Moye to be postmaster at Davisboro, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

B. A. Parker to be postmaster at Whigham, Ga., in place of B. A. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

David P. Philips to be postmaster at Lithonia, Ga., in place of D. P. Philips. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

L. J. Pritchard to be postmaster at Tennille, Ga., in place of L. J. Pritchard. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
 W. A. Talley to be postmaster at Milltown, Ga., in place of W. A. Talley. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
 J. L. Wells to be postmaster at Smithville, Ga., in place of J. L. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

HAWAII.

M. J. Borges to be postmaster at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, in place of M. J. Borges. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Henry D. Corbett to be postmaster at Hilo, Hawaii, in place of H. D. Corbett. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

A. F. Costa to be postmaster at Wailuku, Hawaii, in place of A. F. Costa. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Christopher B. Hofgaard to be postmaster at Waimea, Hawaii. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

A. H. Silva, jr., to be postmaster at Kahului, Hawaii, in place of A. H. Silva, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

IDAHO.

Manford W. Harland to be postmaster at Troy, Idaho, in place of M. W. Harland. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Charles L. Hollar to be postmaster at Kellogg, Idaho, in place of C. L. Hollar. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Frances H. Langford to be postmaster at Rogerson, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Elmer G. Lightfoot to be postmaster at Fairfield, Idaho. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Samuel J. Linder to be postmaster at Ilo, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Franklin A. Miller to be postmaster at St. Anthony, Idaho, in place of F. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Mike A. Rogan to be postmaster at Avery, Idaho. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

L. A. Wisener to be postmaster at Grangeville, Idaho, in place of L. A. Wisener. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

ILLINOIS.

Eber E. Bassett to be postmaster at West McHenry, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

David R. Bennett to be postmaster at Panama, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Walter V. Berry to be postmaster at Irving, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

E. F. Bieser to be postmaster at Nashville, Ill., in place of E. F. Bieser. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Alonzo Boren to be postmaster at Herrin, Ill., in place of Alonzo Boren. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

John D. Brady to be postmaster at Buda, Ill., in place of J. D. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

F. W. Burley to be postmaster at Winslow, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

E. E. Burton to be postmaster at Newton, Ill., in place of E. E. Burton. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

James E. Caley to be postmaster at Mackinaw, Ill., in place of J. E. Caley. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

W. H. Chapman to be postmaster at Clifton, Ill., in place of W. H. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

William Champion to be postmaster at Granite City, Ill., in place of William Champion. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

W. E. Clayton to be postmaster at Johnston City, Ill., in place of W. E. Clayton. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Nellie S. Cowing to be postmaster at Homewood, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John C. Crawford to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Ill., in place of J. C. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Thomas J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Taylorville, Ill., in place of T. J. Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Marshall E. Daniel to be postmaster at McLeansboro, Ill., in place of M. E. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

William B. Davis to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, Ill., in place of W. B. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Lillian M. Dilg to be postmaster at Morton Grove, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles A. Fletcher to be postmaster at Mendon, Ill., in place of C. A. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

William Foran to be postmaster at Sorento, Ill., in place of W. Foran. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

D. M. Fullmer to be postmaster at New Athens, Ill., in place of D. M. Fullmer. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Henry Gilbert to be postmaster at Ashley, Ill., in place of H. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Daniel A. Grady to be postmaster at Waukegan, Ill., in place of D. A. Grady. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

George A. Griffith, sr., to be postmaster at Rankin, Ill., in place of G. A. Griffith, sr. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

William F. Hagebusch to be postmaster at Okawville, Ill., in place of W. F. Hagebusch. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

W. H. Harkrader to be postmaster at Hamilton, Ill., in place of W. H. Harkrader. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

W. D. Hall to be postmaster at Port Byron, Ill., in place of W. D. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Benjamin T. Hart to be postmaster at Altona, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

James F. Harrison to be postmaster at Leap River, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

George B. Howison to be postmaster at Waterman, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

E. P. Kimball to be postmaster at Virden, Ill., in place of E. P. Kimball. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Arthur M. Kloepper to be postmaster at Winnetka, Ill., in place of A. M. Kloepper. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Joseph H. Knebel to be postmaster at Pocahtontas, Ill., in place of J. H. Knebel. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

C. M. Lewis to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Ill., in place of C. M. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Daniel Du Russell to be postmaster at Trenton, Ill., in place of D. Du Russell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

W. J. McKenna to be postmaster at Melvin, Ill., in place of W. J. McKenna. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

William McNeill to be postmaster at Prophetstown, Ill., in place of Wm. McNeill. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. P. McPherren to be postmaster at Homer, Ill., in place of J. P. McPherren. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

W. F. Lutyen to be postmaster at Flanagan, Ill., in place of W. F. Lutyen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

A. E. Martin to be postmaster at Benton, Ill., in place of A. E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

F. Marion Martin to be postmaster at Noble, Ill., in place of F. M. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Mabel Minger to be postmaster at Buckley, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Thomas J. Mowbray to be postmaster at Bradford, Ill., in place of T. J. Mowbray. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

James M. Nunamaker to be postmaster at Greenup, Ill., in place of J. M. Nunamaker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

George Petertil to be postmaster at Berwyn, Ill., in place of G. Petertil. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

H. Poffenberger to be postmaster at Freeport, Ill., in place of H. Poffenberger. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William A. Reeds to be postmaster at Oakland, Ill., in place of W. A. Reeds. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Harry L. Reinoehl to be postmaster at Flat Rock, Ill., in place of H. L. Reinoehl. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Robert L. Rich to be postmaster at Cobden, Ill., in place of R. L. Rich. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

William T. Robinson to be postmaster at Kenilworth, Ill., in place of W. T. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1916.

Howard L. Scott to be postmaster at Fox Lake, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

M. O. Scott to be postmaster at Neponset, Ill., in place of M. O. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

O. Cammie Seeders to be postmaster at Palestine, Ill., in place of O. C. Seeders. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Claude Shaffner to be postmaster at Dallas City, Ill., in place of Claude Shaffner. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Porter B. Simcox to be postmaster at Patoka, Ill., in place of P. B. Simcox. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Hugh C. Smith to be postmaster at Lake Forest, Ill., in place of H. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

George Spicer to be postmaster at Hindsboro, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

David B. Troxel to be postmaster at De Land, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

William Twohig to be postmaster at Galesburg, Ill., in place of William Twohig. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Edgar F. Voshall to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Lewis A. Westbrook to be postmaster at Creal Springs, Ill., in place of L. A. Westbrook. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles J. Wightman to be postmaster at Grayslake, Ill., in place of C. J. Wightman. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

INDIANA.

William E. Aydelotte to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ind., in place of W. E. Aydelotte. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Charles F. Bardonner to be postmaster at Cicero, Ind., in place of C. F. Bardonner. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

William J. Ten Barge to be postmaster at Poseyville, Ind., in place of W. J. Ten Barge. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

James E. Burke to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of J. E. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James W. Carroll to be postmaster at Otterbein, Ind., in place of J. W. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Oliver J. Chapman to be postmaster at Eaton, Ind., in place of O. J. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Lewis E. Chowning to be postmaster at Dugger, Ind., in place of L. E. Chowning. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

David D. Corn to be postmaster at Petersburg, Ind., in place of D. D. Corn. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Charles E. Couch to be postmaster at Sheridan, Ind., in place of C. E. Couch. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Oscar H. Cravens to be postmaster at Bloomington, Ind., in place of O. H. Cravens. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

John Davidson to be postmaster at Lyons, Ind., in place of John Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Warren L. Dick to be postmaster at Pierceton, Ind., in place of W. L. Dick. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Charles B. Donovan, jr., to be postmaster at East Chicago, Ind., in place of C. B. Donovan, jr. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James M. Driver to be postmaster at Arcadia, Ind., in place of J. M. Driver. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Levi A. Eaton to be postmaster at Wanatah, Ind., in place of L. A. Eaton. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

William B. Fox to be postmaster at South Whitley, Ind., in place of W. B. Fox. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Daniel Gantz to be postmaster at Odon, Ind., in place of Daniel Gantz. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Charles L. Haslet to be postmaster at Chesterton, Ind., in place of C. L. Haslet. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James P. Hawkins to be postmaster at Shoals, Ind., in place of J. P. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Frank M. Hillman to be postmaster at Milan, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

B. F. Hofferth to be postmaster at Kouts, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Geston P. Hunt to be postmaster at Rushville, Ind., in place of G. P. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Walter D. Hunt to be postmaster at Gas City, Ind., in place of W. D. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Harry Hunter to be postmaster at Ossian, Ind., in place of Harry Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William Kostbade to be postmaster at Hobart, Ind., in place of W. Kostbade. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Charles C. Leisure to be postmaster at Earl Park, Ind., in place of C. C. Leisure. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Adolph H. Martin to be postmaster at Newburg, Ind., in place of A. H. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

N. Eddy Mason to be postmaster at Hagerstown, Ind., in place of Eddy Mason. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Fred G. Rice to be postmaster at Roachdale, Ind., in place of F. G. Rice. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John L. Roblyer to be postmaster at Flora, Ind., in place of J. L. Roblyer. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Atwell J. Shriner to be postmaster at Brookville, Ind., in place of A. J. Shriner. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles M. Snepp to be postmaster at Kewanna, Ind., in place of C. M. Snepp. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

James H. Spilman to be postmaster at Milroy, Ind., in place of James R. Sage, resigned. Nominated March 12, 1917, but failed of confirmation.

Edward B. Spohr to be postmaster at Jamestown, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

R. E. Springsteen to be postmaster at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of R. E. Springsteen. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

Lewis Walker to be postmaster at Loogootee, Ind., in place of Lewis Walker. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Ira M. Whitaker to be postmaster at Morgantown, Ind., in place of I. M. Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Garland D. Williamson to be postmaster at Ridgeville, Ind., in place of G. D. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles L. Wood to be postmaster at Albany, Ind., in place of C. L. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Quincy A. Wright to be postmaster at Fortville, Ind., in place of Q. A. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Daniel C. Zehner to be postmaster at Windfall, Ind., in place of D. C. Zehner. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

IOWA.

George W. Bensler to be postmaster at Delta, Iowa, in place of G. W. Bensler. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Carl Bentson to be postmaster at Jewell, Iowa, in place of Carl Bentson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Frank Carpenter to be postmaster at Estherville, Iowa, in place of Frank Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Harry F. Chance to be postmaster at Redfield, Iowa, in place of H. F. Chance. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles K. Coontz to be postmaster at Lineville, Iowa, in place of C. K. Coontz. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Lloyd Crow to be postmaster at Mapleton, Iowa, in place of Lloyd Crow. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Stephen A. Douglas to be postmaster at Adel, Iowa, in place of S. A. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Kaspar Faltinson to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa, in place of K. Faltinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

William W. Finn to be postmaster at Wesley, Iowa, in place of W. W. Finn. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Thomas M. Fitzgerald to be postmaster at Charles City, Iowa, in place of T. M. Fitzgerald. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Jacob S. Forgrave to be postmaster at Farmington, Iowa, in place of J. S. Forgrave. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

E. F. Gauthier to be postmaster at Corning, Iowa, in place of E. F. Gauthier. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Edward F. Glau to be postmaster at Charter Oak, Iowa, in place of E. F. Glau. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Thomas Geneva to be postmaster at What Cheer, Iowa, in place of Thomas Geneva. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Arthur Goshorn to be postmaster at Winterset, Iowa, in place of A. Goshorn. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

John W. Hanna to be postmaster at Winfield, Iowa, in place of J. W. Hanna. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Charles W. Harris to be postmaster at Coin, Iowa, in place of C. W. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Burdette Hersom to be postmaster at Diagonal, Iowa. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

A. D. Hix to be postmaster at Zearing, Iowa, in place of A. D. Hix. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Eva Keith to be postmaster at Goldfield, Iowa, in place of Eva Keith. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Christian Konrad to be postmaster at Lacona, Iowa, in place of Christian Konrad. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Leroy H. Lyon to be postmaster at Colfax, Iowa, in place of L. H. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Thomas J. McCaffrey to be postmaster at West Bend, Iowa, in place of T. J. McCaffrey. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Lizzie D. McCormick to be postmaster at Letts, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Stephen C. Maynard to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Iowa, in place of S. C. Maynard. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Edward J. Mitchell to be postmaster at Graettinger, Iowa, in place of E. J. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

William R. Minard to be postmaster at Little Rock, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

William W. Moore to be postmaster at Ainsworth, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles N. Nelson to be postmaster at Bedford, Iowa, in place of C. N. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Clint L. Price to be postmaster at Indianola, Iowa, in place of Clint L. Price. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Orien J. Perdue to be postmaster at Altoona, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Walter Rae to be postmaster at Massena, Iowa, in place of W. Rae. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Carrie H. Randall to be postmaster at Epworth, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Robert M. Reid to be postmaster at Lake City, Iowa, in place of Robert M. Reid. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

C. W. Remore to be postmaster at Northwood, Iowa, in place of C. W. Remore. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Rudolph W. Schlug to be postmaster at Strawberry Point, Iowa, in place of R. W. Schlug. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Bessie C. Swan to be postmaster at Story City, Iowa, in place of Bessie C. Swan. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Edward E. Swank to be postmaster at Richland, Iowa, in place of E. E. Swank. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Alfred E. Thomas to be postmaster at Buxton, Iowa, in place of A. E. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

George M. Waterman to be postmaster at Sidney, Iowa, in place of G. M. Waterman. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

KANSAS.

Lottie R. Boulls to be postmaster at Jennings, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Gus C. Buche to be postmaster at Miltonvale, Kans., in place of G. C. Buche. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Ida J. Butler to be postmaster at Morland, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Alfred D. Carpenter to be postmaster at Oswego, Kans., in place of A. D. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

L. D. Cassler to be postmaster at Canton, Kans., in place of L. D. Cassler. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Edward Corrigan to be postmaster at Effingham, Kans., in place of Edward Corrigan. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Caroline Doerschlag to be postmaster at Ransom, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Jefferson Dunham to be postmaster at Little River, Kans., in place of J. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

Elmer A. Dye to be postmaster at Logan, Kans., in place of E. A. Dye. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Axel Ellingson to be postmaster at Scandia, Kans., in place of A. Ellingson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

J. O. Ferguson to be postmaster at Independence, Kans., in place of J. O. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Frank S. Foster to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Kans., in place of F. S. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Agnes H. Gallagher to be postmaster at Summerfield, Kans., in place of A. H. Gallagher. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Robert V. Grattan to be postmaster at Burden, Kans., in place of R. V. Grattan. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Viola Hamilton to be postmaster at Altamont, Kans., in place of Viola Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

S. J. Hampshire to be postmaster at Overbrook, Kans., in place of S. J. Hampshire. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Charles Hewitt to be postmaster at Wakefield, Kans., in place of C. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Emma L. Hoopman to be postmaster at Lucas, Kans., in place of E. L. Hoopman. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Frederick M. Cook to be postmaster at Jamestown, Kans., in place of F. M. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

E. C. McDermott to be postmaster at Spearville, Kans., in place of E. C. McDermott. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

John McKee to be postmaster at Clay Center, Kans., in place of John McKee. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

C. C. McKenzie to be postmaster at Morrill, Kans., in place of C. C. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

W. A. Matteson to be postmaster at Abilene, Kans., in place of W. A. Matteson. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

Martin Miller to be postmaster at Fort Scott, Kans., in place of Martin Miller. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

R. H. Miles to be postmaster at Lyndon, Kans., in place of R. H. Miles. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Thomas O'Mara to be postmaster at Colony, Kans., in place of Thomas O'Mara. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

E. L. Pepper to be postmaster at Conway Springs, Kans., in place of E. L. Pepper. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Claude Rowland to be postmaster at Protection, Kans., in place of Claude Rowland. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Mary E. Shaffer to be postmaster at Fulton, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Leonard Shamleffer to be postmaster at Douglass, Kans., in place of L. Shamleffer. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Eugene Skinner to be postmaster at Cherokee, Kans., in place of Eugene Skinner. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

P. D. Spellman to be postmaster at Plainville, Kans., in place of P. D. Spellman. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

J. H. Stanbery to be postmaster at Attica, Kans., in place of J. H. Stanbery. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

James A. Thompson to be postmaster at White Water, Kans., in place of J. A. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

L. G. Wagner to be postmaster at Sylvia, Kans., in place of L. G. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

William Walker, jr., to be postmaster at Goodland, Kans., in place of W. Walker, jr. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Cora M. Waters to be postmaster at Bird City, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

J. J. Wilson to be postmaster at Moran, Kans., in place of J. J. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

KENTUCKY.

A. K. Bowles, jr., to be postmaster* at Jenkins, Ky., in place of A. K. Bowles, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Cleo W. Brown to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ky., in place of C. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

John C. Carrithers to be postmaster at Taylorsville, Ky., in place of J. C. Carrithers. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

Sandy P. Cooke to be postmaster at Smiths Grove, Ky., in place of S. P. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Jordan Walker Crossfield to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, Ky., in place of J. W. Crossfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

D. B. Fields to be postmaster at Olive Hill, Ky., in place of D. B. Fields. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

John H. Grimes to be postmaster at Harrodsburg, Ky., in place of J. H. Grimes. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Morgan Kuykendall to be postmaster at Kevil, Ky., in place of Morgan Kuykendall. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Coney Kitchen Lewis to be postmaster at Grayson, Ky., in place of C. K. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles E. Lightfoot to be postmaster at Cloverport, Ky., in place of C. E. Lightfoot. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

William G. O'Hara to be postmaster at Williamstown, Ky., in place of W. G. O'Hara. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

E. F. Thomasson to be postmaster at Livermore, Ky., in place of E. F. Thomasson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

A. B. Tilton to be postmaster at Carlisle, Ky., in place of A. B. Tilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Orrin Derby Todd to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ky., in place of O. D. Todd. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

Paul H. White to be postmaster at La Center, Ky. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

LOUISIANA.

Joseph Abadie to be postmaster at Rayne, La., in place of J. Abadie. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Ulysses J. Barrios to be postmaster at Lockport, La., in place of U. J. Barrios. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. W. Bouanchaud to be postmaster at New Roads, La., in place of J. W. Bouanchaud. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Carl C. Brown to be postmaster at Haynesville, La., in place of C. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Tina Collins to be postmaster at Bastrop, La., in place of Tina Collins. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Hattie M. Cooke to be postmaster at Washington, La., in place of H. M. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

George D. Domengeaux to be postmaster at Breaux Bridge, La., in place of G. D. Domengeaux. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Harry J. Geary to be postmaster at Lake Charles, La., in place of H. J. Geary. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Wilfred Guigou to be postmaster at Donaldsonville, La., in place of W. Guigou. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

J. H. Houck to be postmaster at Gibsland, La., in place of J. H. Houck. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Frank G. Hulse to be postmaster at Delhi, La., in place of F. G. Hulse. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Mary S. Hunter to be postmaster at Pineville, La., in place of Mary Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Charles Manning to be postmaster at Cheneyville, La., in place of Charles Manning. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

John R. Nash to be postmaster at Logansport, La., in place of J. R. Nash. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

George A. Payne to be postmaster at Winnfield, La., in place of G. A. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

H. H. Sample to be postmaster at Lecompte, La., in place of H. H. Sample. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

H. H. Schindler to be postmaster at Sulphur, La., in place of H. H. Schindler. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Wilmer A. Steidley to be postmaster at Kinder, La., in place of W. A. Steidley. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Felicien H. Toups to be postmaster at Lafourche Crossing, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

MAINE.

Joseph D. Chamberland to be postmaster at Jackman Station, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Ned W. Coombs to be postmaster at Castine, Me., in place of N. W. Coombs. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Harold M. Crockett to be postmaster at North Haven, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Irene Cyr to be postmaster at Fort Kent, Me., in place of I. Cyr. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

R. T. Flavin to be postmaster at West Paris, Me., in place of R. T. Flavin. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

S. H. Frost to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Me., in place of S. H. Frost. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

William N. Gough to be postmaster at York Beach, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Reuben A. Huse to be postmaster at Kingfield, Me., in place of R. A. Huse. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Frederick H. Macomber to be postmaster at Seal Harbor, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Delbert M. Story to be postmaster at Washburn, Me. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Milford A. Waite to be postmaster at Canton, Me., in place of M. A. Waite.

MARYLAND.

Alice L. Exley to be postmaster at Kensington, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Clarence J. Rathbun to be postmaster at Mountain Lake Park, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Sherlock Swann to be postmaster at Baltimore, Md., in place of S. Swann. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles H. Wilson to be postmaster at Forest Hill, Md. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Jesse W. Crowell to be postmaster at South Yarmouth, Mass., in place of J. W. Crowell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ralph L. Getman to be postmaster at Cheshire, Mass. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Lewis N. Gilman to be postmaster at Allerton, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Benjamin R. Gifford to be postmaster at Woods Hole, Mass., in place of B. R. Gifford. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Alexander F. Gray to be postmaster at Charles River, Mass. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Martin Hickey to be postmaster at Grafton, Mass., in place of M. Hickey. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

John Howe to be postmaster at North Brookfield, Mass., in place of John Howe. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Benjamin C. Kelley to be postmaster at Harwich Port, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Oliver P. Kendrick to be postmaster at West Brookfield, Mass., in place of O. P. Kendrick. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1916.

William M. Knowles to be postmaster at Brewster, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George T. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Sandwich, Mass., in place of G. T. McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Henry E. Madden to be postmaster at West Medway, Mass., in place of H. E. Madden. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

William J. O'Brien to be postmaster at Kingston, Mass., in place of W. J. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Charlotte L. Parker to be postmaster at Osterville, Mass., in place of C. L. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired July 18, 1916.

Elisha S. Pride to be postmaster at Prides Crossing, Mass., in place of E. S. Pride. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1914.

Frank M. Reynolds, jr., to be postmaster at Nantasket Beach, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Austin R. Stearns to be postmaster at Conway, Mass., in place of A. R. Stearns. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1915.

Charles H. Walker to be postmaster at North Dighton, Mass., in place of C. H. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1915.

Josephine E. Worster to be postmaster at Hull, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

MICHIGAN.

Hiram R. Bouma to be postmaster at Grandville, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Emerson L. Bunting to be postmaster at Walkerville, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Fred B. Carr to be postmaster at Dundee, Mich., in place of F. B. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

M. S. Carney to be postmaster at Decatur, Mich., in place of M. S. Carney. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Francis B. Clark to be postmaster at Suttons Bay, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles W. Crago to be postmaster at Bellevue, Mich., in place of C. W. Crago. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

C. Dale Downing to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mich., in place of C. D. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Chester E. Farrier to be postmaster at Hillman, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Ada E. Gibbs to be postmaster at Fife Lake, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Lena T. Gilbert to be postmaster at Metamora, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

William J. Gleason to be postmaster at Ludington, Mich., in place of W. J. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William Grant to be postmaster at Coloma, Mich., in place of W. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ina M. Hammond to be postmaster at Rose City, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Cora Harden to be postmaster at Morley, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John C. Hoopingarner to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, Mich., in place of J. C. Hoopingarner. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Berend Kamps to be postmaster at Zeeland, Mich., in place of Berend Kamps. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

B. W. Klackle to be postmaster at Bridgman, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank L. Logan to be postmaster at Petersburg, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Edwin C. Maxwell to be postmaster at Carleton, Mich., in place of E. C. Maxwell. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Frank J. Melligan to be postmaster at Port Hope, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Roy A. Mott to be postmaster at Middleton, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Leonard J. Patterson to be postmaster at Tawas City, Mich., in place of L. J. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Anthony M. Wagner to be postmaster at Kinde, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

MINNESOTA.

Albert Anderson to be postmaster at Clearbrook, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Albert K. Anderson to be postmaster at Spicer, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Frederick W. Betz to be postmaster at Fairmont, Minn., in place of F. W. Betz. Incumbent's commission expired August 26, 1916.

George A. Blackmun to be postmaster at Hancock, Minn., in place of G. A. Blackmun. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Simon P. Brick to be postmaster at Little Falls, Minn., in place of S. P. Brick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Robert K. Brough to be postmaster at Alexandria, Minn., in place of R. K. Brough. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1917.

H. L. Buck to be postmaster at Winona, Minn., in place of H. L. Buck. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Martin Christensen to be postmaster at Barnum, Minn., in place of M. Christensen. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Bernard W. Cumiskey to be postmaster at Currie, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John Deviny to be postmaster at Owatonna, Minn., in place of J. Deviny. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Charles H. Dietz to be postmaster at Mapleton, Minn., in place of C. H. Dietz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Alma E. Fisher to be postmaster at Arlington, Minn., in place of A. E. Bauer, name changed by marriage.

E. L. Flaten to be postmaster at Moorhead, Minn., in place of E. L. Flaten. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

John F. Flynn to be postmaster at Worthington, Minn., in place of J. F. Flynn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Henry Goulet to be postmaster at Onamia, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Nels E. Hawkinson to be postmaster at Grove City, Minn., in place of N. E. Hawkinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Michael Hollaren to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Minn., in place of M. Hollaren. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Gustav J. Jarchow to be postmaster at Harris, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Ludwig L. Johnson to be postmaster at Brookpark, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John C. Klein to be postmaster at St. Joseph, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Alton E. Martin to be postmaster at Woodlake, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Paul D. Mitchell to be postmaster at Brooten, Minn., in place of P. D. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Gertrude A. Muske to be postmaster at Swanville, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Fred Von Ohlen to be postmaster at Henning, Minn., in place of F. Von Ohlen. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Walter W. Parish to be postmaster at Rushford, Minn., in place of W. W. Parish. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Walter W. Pearson to be postmaster at Nevis, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

E. E. Putnam to be postmaster at Big Lake, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Amelia M. Rajkowski to be postmaster at Rice, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Mark T. Randall to be postmaster at Amboy, Minn., in place of M. T. Randall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Olof Ristad to be postmaster at Lancaster, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Frank E. Smith to be postmaster at Kimball, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1916.

George H. Smith to be postmaster at Excelsior, Minn., in place of G. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Ruth G. Soderberg to be postmaster at Grand Marais, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Edward C. Sommermeyer to be postmaster at Marietta, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Robert W. Stewart to be postmaster at Ceylon, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Hugh Toohey to be postmaster at Fuld, Minn., in place of H. Toohey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Ralph V. Townsend to be postmaster at Minnesota Lake, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

O. C. Vaaler to be postmaster at Spring Grove, Minn., in place of O. C. Vaaler. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Halbert L. Webb to be postmaster at Glyndon, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Emanuel Yngve to be postmaster at Cambridge, Minn., in place of E. Yngve. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

MISSISSIPPI.

C. E. McAlexander to be postmaster at Holly Springs, Miss., in place of C. E. McAlexander. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

C. W. Bolton to be postmaster at Pontotoc, Miss., in place of C. W. Bolton. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Walter Lee Bourland to be postmaster at Amory, Miss., in place of W. L. Bourland. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

C. W. Carr to be postmaster at Newton, Miss., in place of C. W. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

T. M. Fuller to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, Miss., in place of T. M. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Truman Gray to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Miss., in place of Truman Gray. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Monroe L. Lott to be postmaster at Sumrall, Miss., in place of M. L. Lott. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles W. McKeithen to be postmaster at Woodville, Miss., in place of C. W. McKeithen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Frederick J. McDonnell, jr., to be postmaster at Okolona, Miss., in place of F. J. McDonnell, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Fielden H. Mitts to be postmaster at Tupelo, Miss., in place of F. H. Mitts. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

W. M. Noah to be postmaster at Kosciusko, Miss., in place of W. M. Noah. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Lillie W. Nugent to be postmaster at Rosedale, Miss., in place of L. W. Nugent. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Samuel W. Pendarvis to be postmaster at Magnolia, Miss., in place of S. W. Pendarvis. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Joseph H. Sheppard to be postmaster at Braxton, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1916.

L. W. Smith to be postmaster at Shubuta, Miss., in place of L. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Marshall Spiva to be postmaster at Ackerman, Miss., in place of M. Spiva. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

C. S. Summers to be postmaster at Charleston, Miss., in place of C. S. Summers. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Mary E. Tubb to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Miss., in place of M. E. Tubb. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Charlie P. Wadley to be postmaster at Tunica, Miss., in place of C. P. Wadley. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Henrietta Welch to be postmaster at Carrollton, Miss., in place of H. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

MISSOURI.

J. W. Allen to be postmaster at Mountain Grove, Mo., in place of J. W. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Charles B. Bacon to be postmaster at Marshall, Mo., in place of C. B. Bacon. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

A. P. Beazley to be postmaster at Eldon, Mo., in place of A. P. Beazley. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

C. W. Brady to be postmaster at Independence, Mo., in place of C. W. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Harlie F. Clark to be postmaster at Harrisonville, Mo., in place of H. F. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

P. L. Connolly to be postmaster at Norwood, Mo., in place of P. L. Connolly. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Walter L. Cox to be postmaster at Osceola, Mo., in place of W. L. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Harry R. Culp to be postmaster at Alton, Mo., in place of H. R. Culp. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

M. W. Daugherty to be postmaster at Ironton, Mo., in place of M. W. Daugherty. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

J. B. Davis to be postmaster at Schell City, Mo., in place of J. B. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Thomas A. Dodge to be postmaster at Milan, Mo., in place of T. A. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Edward T. Duval to be postmaster at Skidmore, Mo., in place of E. T. Duval. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Charles T. Ferguson to be postmaster at Burlington Junction, Mo., in place of C. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

John S. Fowler to be postmaster at Cole Camp, Mo., in place of J. S. Fowler. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Patrick C. Gibbons to be postmaster at Edina, Mo., in place of P. C. Gibbons. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Maud E. Halle to be postmaster at Duenweg, Mo. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

T. B. Hardaway to be postmaster at Jasper, Mo., in place of T. B. Hardaway. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

John Hetrick to be postmaster at Laclede, Mo., in place of J. Hetrick. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

DeCoursey D. Hitt to be postmaster at Rockville, Mo., in place of D. D. Hitt. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

W. L. Hixson to be postmaster at Billings, Mo., in place of W. L. Hixson. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

J. Walter Hogan to be postmaster at Willow Springs, Mo., in place of J. W. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Hugh B. Ingler to be postmaster at Republic, Mo., in place of H. B. Ingler. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Louie L. Jobe to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Mo., in place of L. L. Jobe. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

J. Lee Johnson to be postmaster at Flat River, Mo., in place of J. L. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Edgar Jones to be postmaster at Frankford, Mo., in place of E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Meredit B. Lane to be postmaster at Sullivan, Mo., in place of M. B. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Benjamin R. Lingle to be postmaster at Warsaw, Mo., in place of B. R. Lingle. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Alfred H. Long to be postmaster at Festus, Mo., in place of A. H. Long. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

S. D. McMillen to be postmaster at Lockwood, Mo., in place of S. D. McMillen. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

A. H. Martin to be postmaster at Perry, Mo., in place of A. H. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

John F. Miller to be postmaster at Cardwell, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Edward H. Moran to be postmaster at Clarksville, Mo., in place of E. H. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Roscoe C. Murphy to be postmaster at St. Clair, Mo., in place of R. C. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

William C. Murray to be postmaster at Doniphan, Mo., in place of W. C. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

James E. Phillips to be postmaster at Meadville, Mo., in place of J. E. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William G. Pike to be postmaster at Martinsburg, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John S. Smith to be postmaster at Eldorado Springs, Mo., in place of J. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Perry B. Smith to be postmaster at Ellington, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

May W. Spurling to be postmaster at Higbee, Mo., in place of M. W. Spurling. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

G. W. Summers to be postmaster at Hartville, Mo., in place of G. W. Summers. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Francis E. Thurston to be postmaster at Knobnoster, Mo., in place of F. E. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

H. J. von Gremp to be postmaster at Dixon, Mo., in place of H. J. von Gremp. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

William Warmack to be postmaster at Greenville, Mo., in place of W. Warmack. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Richard B. Wilson to be postmaster at Montrose, Mo., in place of R. B. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

MONTANA.

Dan C. Ayer to be postmaster at Jordan, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Charles L. Beers to be postmaster at Judith Gap, Mont., in place of C. L. Beers. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Mordena C. Busey to be postmaster at Eureka, Mont., in place of M. C. Busey. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Roy M. Corley to be postmaster at Stevensville, Mont., in place of R. M. Corley. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

John Dailey to be postmaster at Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of J. Dailey. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Bruce O. Dean to be postmaster at Musselshell, Mont. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

B. L. Golden to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mont., in place of B. L. Golden. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Benedict J. Gossack to be postmaster at Highwood, Mont. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Sophia J. Guthrie to be postmaster at Reedpoint, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Alice B. Hensley to be postmaster at Moore, Mont., in place of Alice Hensley. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. P. Lavelle to be postmaster at Columbus, Mont., in place of J. P. Lavelle. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Alfred S. Opheim to be postmaster at Opheim, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

J. S. Pearson to be postmaster at Belt, Mont., in place of J. S. Pearson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Eugene L. Poindexter to be postmaster at Dillon, Mont., in place of E. L. Poindexter. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

T. A. Rigney to be postmaster at Laurel, Mont., in place of T. A. Rigney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Margaret Roach to be postmaster at Outlook, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Thomas H. Rush to be postmaster at Wibaux, Mont., in place of T. H. Rush. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John H. Suydam to be postmaster at Walkerville, Mont. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Lloyd L. Stewart to be postmaster at Ingomar, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Marie R. Worth to be postmaster at Carter, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

J. A. Wright to be postmaster at Chester, Mont., in place of J. A. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

NEBRASKA.

W. C. Bartlett to be postmaster at Elmwood, Nebr., in place of W. C. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

Edward J. Brady to be postmaster at McCook, Nebr., in place of E. J. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Frank A. Cox to be postmaster at Sutherland, Nebr., in place of Frank Cox. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Frederick C. Easley to be postmaster at Dunbar, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

A. J. Ferris to be postmaster at Palmer, Nebr., in place of A. J. Ferris. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Mary J. Flynn to be postmaster at Jackson, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Vernon L. Green to be postmaster at Merriman, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Charles J. Huber to be postmaster at Rulo, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

J. B. Lane to be postmaster at Blue Hill, Nebr., in place of J. B. Lane. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

R. V. McPherson to be postmaster at Craig, Nebr., in place of R. V. McPherson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Fred H. Ossenkop to be postmaster at Louisville, Nebr., in place of F. H. Ossenkop. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Frank R. Parker to be postmaster at Wilsonville, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Hannah Price to be postmaster at Bennet, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Herbert C. Robbins to be postmaster at Wallace, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Harry C. Rogers to be postmaster at Upland, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Mell A. Schmied to be postmaster at Dakota City, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Charles J. Smersh to be postmaster at Brainard, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Frank D. Strobe to be postmaster at Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strobe. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

Elsie B. Thompson to be postmaster at Wynot, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Margaret A. Waggoner to be postmaster at Wood Lake, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Harry N. Wallace to be postmaster at Coleridge, Nebr., in place of H. N. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

NEVADA.

Jennie R. Backus to be postmaster at Golconda, Nev., in place of J. R. Backus. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James L. Denton to be postmaster at Callente, Nev. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Wilson J. Forbes to be postmaster at Deeth, Nev. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Mason E. McLeod to be postmaster at Yerington, Nev., in place of M. E. McLeod. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

William J. Neeley to be postmaster at Wadsworth, Nev. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Franklin S. Smith to be postmaster at Derby, Nev. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Philip S. Triplett to be postmaster at Wells, Nev., in place of P. S. Triplett. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Adelia M. Barrows to be postmaster at Hinsdale, N. H., in place of A. M. Barrows. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

David V. Cahalane to be postmaster at Charlestown, N. H., in place of D. V. Cahalane. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Fred W. Dinsmore to be postmaster at Intervale, N. H. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Herbert F. Elkins to be postmaster at The Weirs, N. H. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Grace E. Emerson to be postmaster at East Rochester, N. H., in place of G. E. Emerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Clarence H. George to be postmaster at Bartlett, N. H. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

H. Warren K. Hale to be postmaster at Dixville Notch, N. H. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Irving H. Hicks to be postmaster at Contoocook, N. H., in place of I. H. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Atkinson to be postmaster at Freehold, N. J., in place of J. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

E. R. Barrett to be postmaster at West Fort Lee, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John V. L. Booraem to be postmaster at Milltown, N. J., in place of J. V. L. Booraem. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Chester A. Burt to be postmaster at Helmetta, N. J., in place of C. A. Burt. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Samuel H. Chatten to be postmaster at Pennington, N. J., in place of S. H. Chatten. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

R. M. Chorpenning to be postmaster at Atco, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Jeanette H. Claypoole to be postmaster at Cedarville, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Joseph B. Cornish, jr., to be postmaster at Washington, N. J., in place of J. B. Cornish, jr. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

William H. Cottrell to be postmaster at Princeton, N. J., in place of W. H. Cottrell. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

John J. Foley to be postmaster at Bernardsville, N. J., in place of J. J. Foley. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Katherine E. Fraleigh to be postmaster at Seagirt, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank Hampton to be postmaster at Sea Bright, N. J., in place of F. Hampton. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Peter H. S. Hendricks to be postmaster at New Brunswick, N. J., in place of P. H. S. Hendricks. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Frank Hill to be postmaster at Dumont, N. J., in place of F. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1913.

Harrison C. Hurley to be postmaster at Asbury Park, N. J., in place of H. C. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Edward Iredell to be postmaster at Mullica Hill, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Adrian P. King to be postmaster at Beachhaven, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Harry M. Knight to be postmaster at Camden, N. J., in place of H. M. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

E. Tracy Lanterman to be postmaster at East Orange, N. J., in place of E. T. Lanterman. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Charles McCue to be postmaster at Lakewood, N. J., in place of C. McCue. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Clarence O. McCullough to be postmaster at Carneys Point, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

James P. McNair to be postmaster at Paterson, N. J., in place of J. P. McNair. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Joseph Mark to be postmaster at South River, N. J., in place of J. Mark. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Walter M. Miller to be postmaster at Netcong, N. J., in place of W. M. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Charles Rittenhouse to be postmaster at Hackettstown, N. J., in place of C. Rittenhouse. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

John F. Ryan to be postmaster at Woodbridge, N. J., in place of J. F. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Patrick H. Ryan to be postmaster at Elizabeth, N. J., in place of P. H. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

John J. Schilcox to be postmaster at Keasbey, N. J. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Edwin T. Van Horn to be postmaster at Newfoundland, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Albert L. Williams to be postmaster at Vineland, N. J., in place of A. L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Adam Worth to be postmaster at Elberon, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

NEW MEXICO.

Howard S. Boise to be postmaster at Hurley, N. Mex., in place of H. S. Boise. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

A. G. Daggett to be postmaster at Chama, N. Mex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

W. E. Foulks to be postmaster at Deming, N. Mex., in place of W. E. Foulks. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

A. B. Wagner to be postmaster at Clovis, N. Mex., in place of A. B. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

NEW YORK.

E. F. Abbott to be postmaster at Old Forge, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1914.

Clare B. Allen to be postmaster at Springwater, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles H. Akerley to be postmaster at Round Lake, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Samuel F. Andrews to be postmaster at Homer, N. Y., in place of S. F. Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles J. Beams to be postmaster at Oneonta, N. Y., in place of C. J. Beams. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Edward Blackwell to be postmaster at Pearl River, N. Y., in place of E. Blackwell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

David S. Boyer to be postmaster at Romulus, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Daniel F. Brown to be postmaster at Eastport, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

George L. Brown to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, N. Y., in place of G. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

John H. Bullock to be postmaster at Cohoes, N. Y., in place of J. H. Bullock. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

George H. Burres to be postmaster at Garnerville, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank Cronk to be postmaster at Grand Gorge, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles A. Daniels to be postmaster at Gilbertsville, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Arthur B. Dewey to be postmaster at Tully, N. Y., in place of A. B. Dewey. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Isabel G. Duvall to be postmaster at Shelter Island Heights, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

G. R. Paul Engert to be postmaster at Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., in place of G. R. P. Engert. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Harry M. Fisher to be postmaster at Nanuet, N. Y., in place of H. M. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Alphonzo E. Fitch to be postmaster at Cazenovia, N. Y., in place of A. E. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Oswald F. Freeman to be postmaster at Edwards, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Peter M. Giles to be postmaster at Le Roy, N. Y., in place of P. M. Giles. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

John J. Glynn to be postmaster at Valatie, N. Y., in place of J. J. Glynn. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Hanna Hallock to be postmaster at Highland Mills, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Catherine A. Hamilton to be postmaster at Manhasset, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

William H. Harding to be postmaster at Roscoe, N. Y., in place of W. H. Harding. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. A. Harrington to be postmaster at Arkville, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Willis H. Hawkins to be postmaster at Bellport, N. Y., in place of W. H. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles N. Hickey to be postmaster at Gainesville, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

James Hogan to be postmaster at Marcellus, N. Y., in place of J. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Horace J. Howk to be postmaster at Mount McGregor, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Harry A. Inglee to be postmaster at Amityville, N. Y., in place of H. A. Inglee. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Robert B. Irwin to be postmaster at Nichols, N. Y., in place of R. B. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Edward C. Johnson to be postmaster at East Chatham, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

J. Harold Jones to be postmaster at Yorkville, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Alfred J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Flushing, N. Y., in place of A. J. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

J. Marvin Lotridge to be postmaster at Cincinnati, N. Y., in place of J. M. Lotridge. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Mary A. Lynch to be postmaster at Buchanan, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

William E. McDonell to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of W. E. McDonell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Herbert McMullen to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. Y., in place of H. McMullen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Frederick J. Manchester to be postmaster at Clark Mills, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Bernard A. Marzolf to be postmaster at North Java, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Andrew Mealey to be postmaster at Greenwich, N. Y., in place of A. Mealey. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Fred L. Merrell to be postmaster at Copenhagen, N. Y., in place of F. L. Merrell. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

J. F. Metoskie to be postmaster at Hillburn, N. Y., in place of J. F. Metoskie. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Blanche L. Morgan to be postmaster at Parish, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Delbert M. O'Brien to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. Y., in place of D. M. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

William F. O'Connell to be postmaster at Andover, N. Y., in place of W. F. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Morris J. O'Neill to be postmaster at Woodridge (late Centerville Station), N. Y., in place of M. J. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

F. N. Parquet to be postmaster at Inlet, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frederick W. Piotrow to be postmaster at Hamilton, N. Y., in place of F. W. Piotrow. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Adda B. Pomeroy to be postmaster at Eastwood, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles Ray to be postmaster at Barker, N. Y., in place of C. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Eva C. Sager to be postmaster at Frewsburg, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Fred A. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Averill Park, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Howard M. Smith to be postmaster at North White Lake, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

John Soemann to be postmaster at Lancaster, N. Y., in place of J. Soemann. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Clarence A. Talbot to be postmaster at Edmeston, N. Y., in place of C. A. Talbot. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Albert B. Taylor to be postmaster at Hunter, N. Y., in place of A. B. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Jerome Terpening to be postmaster at Jefferson, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

James M. Tuohy to be postmaster at Medina, N. Y., in place of J. M. Tuohy. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Franklin D. Wade to be postmaster at Addison, N. Y., in place of F. D. Wade. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Albert W. Wells to be postmaster at Newman, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Miles G. Wellman to be postmaster at Youngstown, N. Y., in place of M. G. Wellman. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

William F. Wild to be postmaster at Lindenhurst, N. Y., in place of Wm. F. Wild. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

NORTH CAROLINA.

E. H. Avent to be postmaster at East Durham, N. C., in place of E. H. Avent. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

J. D. Bivins to be postmaster at Albemarle, N. C., in place of J. D. Bivins. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. H. Bowen to be postmaster at West Durham, N. C., in place of J. H. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

Richard A. Bruton to be postmaster at Mount Gilead, N. C., in place of R. A. Bruton. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

A. N. Bulla to be postmaster at Randleman, N. C., in place of A. N. Bulla. Office became presidential June 18, 1917.

P. J. Caudell to be postmaster at St. Pauls, N. C., in place of P. J. Caudell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

J. H. Carter to be postmaster at Mount Airy, N. C., in place of J. H. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

W. T. Chambers to be postmaster at Madison, N. C., in place of W. T. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

G. H. Currie to be postmaster at Clarkton, N. C., in place of G. H. Currie. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

William H. Etheredge to be postmaster at Selma, N. C., in place of W. H. Etheredge. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

M. M. Faison to be postmaster at Roanoke Rapids, N. C., in place of M. M. Faison. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Arthur Ford to be postmaster at Crestmont, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Hector McL. Green to be postmaster at Wilmington, N. C., in place of H. McL. Green. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

G. L. Griffin to be postmaster at Oriental, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Virgil D. Guire to be postmaster at Lenoir, N. C., in place of V. D. Guire. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James G. Hackett to be postmaster at Northwilkeshoro, N. C., in place of J. G. Hackett. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

W. C. Hall to be postmaster at Black Mountain, N. C., in place of W. C. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

E. E. Hunt, sr., to be postmaster at Mocksville, N. C., in place of E. E. Hunt, sr. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

A. H. Huss to be postmaster at Cherryville, N. C., in place of A. H. Huss. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

H. D. Lambeth to be postmaster at Elon College, N. C., in place of H. D. Lambeth. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Albert B. Laughter to be postmaster at Norlina, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

E. T. Lee to be postmaster at Dunn, N. C., in place of E. T. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

S. S. Lockhart to be postmaster at Wadesboro, N. C., in place of S. S. Lockhart. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

E. T. McKeithen to be postmaster at Aberdeen, N. C., in place of E. T. McKeithen. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Leonidas M. Michaux to be postmaster at Goldsboro, N. C., in place of L. M. Michaux. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. W. Noell to be postmaster at Roxboro, N. C., in place of J. W. Noell. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

W. L. Ormand to be postmaster at Bessemer City, N. C., in place of W. L. Ormand. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Elijah B. Perry to be postmaster at Littleton, N. C., in place of E. B. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

W. D. Pethel to be postmaster at Spencer, N. C., in place of W. D. Pethel. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

John B. Petteway to be postmaster at Jacksonville, N. C., in place of J. B. Petteway. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Kate Reagan to be postmaster at Weaverville, N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Plato C. Rollins to be postmaster at Rutherfordton, N. C., in place of P. C. Rollins. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

L. M. Sheffield to be postmaster at Spray, N. C., in place of L. M. Sheffield. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Julia M. Smith to be postmaster at Liberty, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1917.

W. H. Stearns to be postmaster at Tryon, N. C., in place of W. H. Stearns. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

Russell A. Strickland to be postmaster at Elm City, N. C., in place of R. A. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

R. B. Terry to be postmaster at Hamlet, N. C., in place of R. B. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. H. Weddington to be postmaster at Charlotte, N. C., in place of J. H. Weddington. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

George L. Whitfield to be postmaster at Franklinton, N. C., in place of G. L. Whitfield. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

David J. Whichard to be postmaster at Greenville, N. C., in place of D. J. Whichard. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

F. M. Williams to be postmaster at Newton, N. C., in place of F. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

George A. Woods to be postmaster at Nazareth, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Werner B. Andrus to be postmaster at Hazleton, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John P. Galyen to be postmaster at Belfield, N. Dak., in place of J. Galyen. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Robert Hunke to be postmaster at Richardton, N. Dak., in place of R. Hunke. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

John Robertson to be postmaster at Willow City, N. Dak., in place of J. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

OHIO.

John Q. Baker to be postmaster at Middletown, Ohio, in place of J. Q. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John P. Bakle to be postmaster at Antwerp, Ohio, in place of J. P. Bakle. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Charles G. Bartlett to be postmaster at State Soldiers Home, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Orrell M. Brobst to be postmaster at Linden Heights, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John W. Campbell to be postmaster at Sardinia, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Joseph O. Carpenter to be postmaster at Spencer, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John M. Cockrell to be postmaster at Lucasville, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

B. E. Custer to be postmaster at Montpelier, Ohio, in place of B. E. Custer. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Hartley D. Devore to be postmaster at Vinton, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Daniel D. Duty to be postmaster at Wellsville, Ohio, in place of D. D. Duty. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

O. S. Earnest to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ohio, in place of O. S. Earnest. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Ida L. Flenniken to be postmaster at Smithfield, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Rolla N. Frysinger to be postmaster at Rockford, Ohio, in place of R. N. Frysinger. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

John C. Gorman to be postmaster at Ironton, Ohio, in place of J. C. Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1917.

Emile F. Juillard to be postmaster at Stryker, Ohio, in place of E. F. Juillard. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

H. E. Kinzly to be postmaster at Nevada, Ohio, in place of H. E. Kinzly. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

J. W. Kissell to be postmaster at West Unity, Ohio, in place of J. W. Kissell. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Frank V. Lantz to be postmaster at McArthur, Ohio, in place of F. V. Lantz. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Clement V. Lash to be postmaster at Edon, Ohio, in place of C. V. Lash. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Arthur L. McCarthy to be postmaster at Franklin, Ohio, in place of A. L. McCarthy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

William T. Mann to be postmaster at Clyde, Ohio, in place of W. T. Mann. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Forrest L. May to be postmaster at Dayton, Ohio, in place of F. L. May. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Edward J. Meagher to be postmaster at Glendale, Ohio, in place of E. J. Meagher. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Neal M. Osborn to be postmaster at Burton, Ohio, in place of N. M. Osborn. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

H. M. Pomeroy to be postmaster at Maumee, Ohio, in place of H. M. Pomeroy. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Byron C. Porter to be postmaster at Kinsman, Ohio, in place of B. C. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

F. L. Priday to be postmaster at Euclid, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Harley W. Purdy to be postmaster at Bradford, Ohio, in place of H. W. Purdy. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

J. E. Rubin to be postmaster at Payne, Ohio, in place of J. E. Rubin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Albert Schnell to be postmaster at Morrow, Ohio, in place of Albert Schnell. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Armand L. Van Sciever to be postmaster at Grove City, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

H. B. Sibila to be postmaster at Massillon, Ohio, in place of H. B. Sibila. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Jacob W. Simon to be postmaster at Bloomdale, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

W. F. Uhle to be postmaster at Attica, Ohio, in place of W. F. Uhle. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Charles Warnke to be postmaster at Huron, Ohio, in place of C. Warnke. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Elias D. Warren to be postmaster at Fairport Harbor, Ohio, in place of E. D. Warren. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Harmon Wensinger to be postmaster at Fremont, Ohio, in place of H. Wensinger. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

OKLAHOMA.

Wharton H. Breedlove to be postmaster at Muldrow, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

O. H. P. Brewer to be postmaster at Muskogee, Okla., in place of O. H. P. Brewer. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

Cassius L. Byrne to be postmaster at Ardmore, Okla., in place of C. L. Byrne. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

J. R. Capshaw to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Okla., in place of J. R. Capshaw. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

J. W. Chism to be postmaster at Medford, Okla., in place of J. W. Chism. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Bonnie A. Coley to be postmaster at Davidson, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Milton B. Cope to be postmaster at El Reno, Okla., in place of M. B. Cope. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

K. C. Cox to be postmaster at Granite, Okla., in place of K. C. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Sydney A. Doyle to be postmaster at Maud, Okla., in place of S. A. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Joseph H. English to be postmaster at Walters (late Walter), Okla., in place of J. H. English. Change of name of office.

J. M. Ennis to be postmaster at Antlers, Okla., in place of J. M. Ennis. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Hattie Gore to be postmaster at Nowata, Okla., in place of Hattie Gore. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Andrew J. Grayson to be postmaster at Blanchard, Okla., in place of A. J. Grayson. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

D. M. Hamlin to be postmaster at Newkirk, Okla., in place of D. M. Hamlin. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

George H. Hancock to be postmaster at Welch, Okla., in place of G. H. Hancock. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Della Hickman to be postmaster at Spiro, Okla., in place of Della Hickman. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

J. T. Holley to be postmaster at Stigler, Okla., in place of J. T. Holley. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Frank E. King to be postmaster at Braman, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

J. F. Larecy to be postmaster at Hugo, Okla., in place of J. F. Larecy. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Ira B. McCrary to be postmaster at Dewey, Okla., in place of I. B. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Robert Burton Mayfield to be postmaster at Blair, Okla., in place of R. B. Mayfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

W. F. Parker to be postmaster at Davis, Okla., in place of W. F. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Francis M. Reed, jr., to be postmaster at Afton, Okla., in place of F. M. Reed, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

N. L. Sanders to be postmaster at Broken Arrow, Okla., in place of N. L. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Bettie Smythe to be postmaster at Marlow, Okla., in place of B. Smythe. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

C. E. Steele to be postmaster at Sayre, Okla., in place of C. E. Steele. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Charles J. Townsend to be postmaster at Idabel, Okla., in place of C. J. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Galen B. Townsend to be postmaster at Mangum, Okla., in place of G. B. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Simon Peter Treadwell to be postmaster at Ryan, Okla., in place of S. P. Treadwell. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1917.

T. I. Truscott to be postmaster at Olustee, Okla., in place of T. I. Truscott. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

David M. Watson to be postmaster at Francis, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

OREGON.

C. W. Brown to be postmaster at Canyon City, Oreg., in place of C. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1917.

Grant L. Grant to be postmaster at Riddle, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

R. L. Guiss to be postmaster at Woodburn, Oreg., in place of R. L. Guiss. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

August Huckestein to be postmaster at Salem, Oreg., in place of A. Huckestein. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Lucius L. Hurd to be postmaster at Glendale, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

H. Y. Kirkpatrick to be postmaster at Lebanon, Oreg., in place of H. Y. Kirkpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John Larkin to be postmaster at Newberg, Oreg., in place of John Larkin. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

George H. Letteller to be postmaster at Mill City, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Arunah Longwell to be postmaster at Echo, Oreg., in place of A. Longwell. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

J. A. McMorris to be postmaster at Condon, Oreg., in place of J. A. McMorris. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

H. E. Mahoney to be postmaster at Oakland, Oreg., in place of H. E. Mahoney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Ira C. Mehrling to be postmaster at Falls City, Oreg., in place of Ira C. Mehrling. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Frank S. Myers to be postmaster at Portland, Oreg., in place of F. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1917.

O. J. Skiff to be postmaster at Union, Oreg., in place of O. J. Skiff. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Harry M. Stewart to be postmaster at Springfield, Oreg., in place of H. M. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

William E. Tate to be postmaster at Wasco, Oreg., in place of W. E. Tate. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1916.

Guy E. Tex to be postmaster at Central Point, Oreg., in place of G. E. Tex. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

James W. Thompson to be postmaster at Westport, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Lewis Ulrich to be postmaster at Jacksonville, Oreg., in place of Lewis Ulrich. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ben Weathers to be postmaster at Enterprise, Oreg., in place of Ben Weathers. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

L. R. Van Winkle to be postmaster at Weston, Oreg., in place of L. R. Van Winkle. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Mamie E. Winters to be postmaster at Burns, Oreg., in place of Mamie Winters. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Herman Wise to be postmaster at Astoria, Oreg., in place of H. Wise. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Eugene L. Aldrich to be postmaster at New Milford, Pa., in place of E. L. Aldrich. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Leroy Alexander to be postmaster at West Alexander, Pa., in place of L. Alexander. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Cornelius Allen to be postmaster at Dubois, Pa., in place of C. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

Earl L. Anderson to be postmaster at Parnassus, Pa., in place of E. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ada U. Ashcom to be postmaster at Ligonier, Pa., in place of A. U. Ashcom. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1915.

Timothy F. Berney to be postmaster at Tower City, Pa., in place of T. F. Berney. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

Edward J. Bernhardt to be postmaster at Northampton, Pa., in place of E. J. Bernhardt. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

B. Frank Batcher to be postmaster at Abington, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Arthur E. Brown to be postmaster at Osceola Mills, Pa., in place of A. E. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Patrick F. Campbell to be postmaster at Portage, Pa., in place of P. F. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Joshua W. Coolidge to be postmaster at Pen Mar, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Max A. Crain to be postmaster at Winburne, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Matthew M. Cusack to be postmaster at Steelton, Pa., in place of M. M. Cusack. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

James G. Downward, jr., to be postmaster at Coatesville, Pa., in place of J. G. Downward, jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Benjamin F. Evans to be postmaster at Hopewell, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank C. Fisher to be postmaster at Cheltenham, Pa., in place of F. C. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

E. Howell Fisk to be postmaster at Dalton, Pa., in place of E. H. Fisk. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Charles S. Gardner to be postmaster at Blue Ridge Summit, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Fletcher C. George to be postmaster at Lilly, Pa., in place of F. C. George. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ellsworth F. Giles to be postmaster at Altoona, Pa., in place of E. F. Giles. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Julia C. Gleason to be postmaster at Villanova, Pa., in place of J. C. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

Harry Hagan to be postmaster at Uniontown, Pa., in place of H. Hagan. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Stephen L. Hennigan to be postmaster at Old Forge, Pa., in place of S. L. Hennigan. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

William F. Johnston to be postmaster at Westgrove, Pa., in place of W. F. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Ira J. Keller to be postmaster at Yeagertown, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

James Kingsbury to be postmaster at Pottsville, Pa., in place of J. Kingsbury. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

John A. Kramer to be postmaster at Middletown, Pa., in place of J. A. Kramer. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

William C. Kreider to be postmaster at Mauch Chunk, Pa., in place of W. C. Kreider. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1917.

D. J. Kyle to be postmaster at Harrisville, Pa., in place of D. J. Kyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Joshua P. Lamborn to be postmaster at Berwyn, Pa., in place of J. P. Lamborn. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Robert U. Lange to be postmaster at Belle Vernon, Pa., in place of R. U. Lange. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Christian S. Lichliter to be postmaster at Elk Lick, Pa., in place of C. S. Lichliter. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

G. B. Livingston to be postmaster at Conneaut Lake, Pa., in place of G. B. Livingston. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

William M. Lynch to be postmaster at Tobyhanna, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Junius W. U. McBride to be postmaster at Beaver, Pa., in place of J. W. U. McBride. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

R. J. McGee to be postmaster at Dunbar, Pa., in place of R. J. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

T. H. McKenzie to be postmaster at Barnesboro, Pa., in place of T. H. McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

John H. Mitchell to be postmaster at Newtown, Pa., in place of J. H. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John D. Moore to be postmaster at Oxford, Pa., in place of J. D. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Frederick E. Obley to be postmaster at West Newton, Pa., in place of F. E. Obley. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

Allen A. Orr to be postmaster at Lewiston, Pa., in place of A. A. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. Frank Patterson to be postmaster at Mifflintown, Pa., in place of J. F. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Christopher T. Peale to be postmaster at Eagles Mere, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

H. E. Petrie to be postmaster at Greencastle, Pa., in place of H. E. Petrie. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

W. H. Portser to be postmaster at Saltsburg, Pa., in place of W. H. Portser. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

George B. Richardson to be postmaster at Knox, Pa., in place of G. B. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Roy R. Rowles to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, Pa., in place of R. R. Rowles. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Eli D. Ruth to be postmaster at High Spire, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Marion S. Schoch to be postmaster at Selinsgrove, Pa., in place of M. S. Schoch. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

T. Cheyney Scott to be postmaster at Malvern, Pa., in place of T. C. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Frank H. Shenck to be postmaster at Landisville, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank C. Sites to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Pa., in place of F. C. Sites. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

John T. Slattery to be postmaster at Port Carbon, Pa., in place of J. T. Slattery. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Jesse H. Smith to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of J. H. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

W. H. Strauss to be postmaster at Johnstown, Pa., in place of W. H. Strauss. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

A. J. Sweeney to be postmaster at Gallitzen, Pa., in place of A. J. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Charles N. Thompson to be postmaster at Buck Falls, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

A. R. Traugh to be postmaster at Hollisdaysburg, Pa., in place of A. R. Traugh. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John M. Wallace to be postmaster at Delaware Water Gap, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George A. Woodside to be postmaster at Sugargrove, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Oscar Wolfensberger to be postmaster at Lemoyne, Pa., in place of O. Wolfensberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

PORTO RICO.

America Rossy to be postmaster at Ensenada, P. R. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

RHODE ISLAND.

James Brennan to be postmaster at River Point, R. I., in place of J. Brennan. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Charles F. Holroyd to be postmaster at Thornton, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Samuel Seabury, 2d, to be postmaster at Tiverton, R. I. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

E. C. Bethea to be postmaster at Latta, S. C., in place of E. C. Bethea. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

James A. Cannon to be postmaster at Fountain Inn, S. C., in place of J. A. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

W. Clarence Clinkscales to be postmaster at Belton, S. C., in place of W. C. Clinkscales. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

George M. Collins to be postmaster at Due West, S. C., in place of G. M. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1917.

Pierre H. Fike to be postmaster at Spartanburg, S. C., in place of P. H. Fike. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

Francis B. Gaffney to be postmaster at Gaffney, S. C., in place of F. B. Gaffney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

James F. Hunter to be postmaster at Lancaster, S. C., in place of J. F. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Lella J. Huntley to be postmaster at Cheraw, S. C., in place of L. J. Huntley. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Arthur G. King to be postmaster at Easley, S. C., in place of A. G. King. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John T. Lawrence to be postmaster at Seneca, S. C., in place of J. T. Lawrence. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

William M. McMillan to be postmaster at Clinton, S. C., in place of W. M. McMillan. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

T. M. Mahon to be postmaster at Williamston, S. C., in place of T. M. Mahon. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Florence K. Metcalf to be postmaster at Campobello, S. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Rachel H. Minshall to be postmaster at Abbeville, S. C., in place of R. H. Minshall. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

John M. Pagan to be postmaster at Great Falls, S. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Joseph M. Poulnot to be postmaster at Charleston, S. C., in place of J. M. Poulnot. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

E. D. Raney to be postmaster at Beaufort, S. C., in place of E. D. Raney. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Lemuel Reid to be postmaster at Iva, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Ernest L. Richardson to be postmaster at Wagener, S. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John H. Rothrock to be postmaster at Inman, S. C., in place of J. H. Rothrock. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Edward W. Shull to be postmaster at New Brookland, S. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Louis Stackley to be postmaster at Kingstree, S. C., in place of L. Stackley. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

Julius F. Way to be postmaster at Holly Hill, S. C., in place of J. F. Way. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Henry B. Baer to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of H. B. Baer. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

William Brady to be postmaster at Beresford, S. Dak., in place of W. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Mary E. Brennan to be postmaster at Lake Preston, S. Dak., in place of M. Brennan. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1917.

D. J. Delaney to be postmaster at Custer, S. Dak., in place of D. J. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Rush O. Fellows to be postmaster at Bellefourche, S. Dak., in place of R. O. Fellows. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Dennis Foley to be postmaster at Menno, S. Dak., in place of D. Foley. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Fred W. Hink to be postmaster at Raymond, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

William A. Hodson to be postmaster at Cresbard, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

O. M. Iverson to be postmaster at Hudson, S. Dak., in place of O. M. Iverson. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Charles F. Jenks to be postmaster at Egan, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Stephen Jones to be postmaster at Canton, S. Dak., in place of S. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. B. Lundy to be postmaster at Mellette, S. Dak., in place of J. B. Lundy. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. I. McNeil to be postmaster at Wessington, S. Dak., in place of J. I. McNeil. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Curtis J. Padmore to be postmaster at Rockham, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Harriet Pope to be postmaster at Delmont, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Edith A. Sproat to be postmaster at Bradley, S. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

W. M. Walters to be postmaster at Fairfax, S. Dak., in place of W. M. Walters. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles L. Wohlheter to be postmaster at White, S. Dak., in place of C. L. Wohlheter. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

TENNESSEE.

William J. Allen to be postmaster at Wartrace, Tenn., in place of W. J. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

Alvin L. Bilbrey to be postmaster at Cumberland City, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Eugene Blakemore to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Tenn., in place of E. Blakemore. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Kate S. Booker to be postmaster at Mason, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Carl B. Bowden to be postmaster at Martin, Tenn., in place of C. B. Bowden. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Robert E. L. Brasfield to be postmaster at Dresden, Tenn., in place of R. E. L. Brasfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

J. R. Brown to be postmaster at Cleveland, Tenn., in place of J. R. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

George P. Brummitt to be postmaster at Gleason, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Andrew B. Cook to be postmaster at Woodbury, Tenn., in place of A. B. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Margaret G. Elliott to be postmaster at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in place of M. G. Elliott. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Hugh G. Haworth to be postmaster at New Market, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Richard D. Hunt to be postmaster at Sharon, Tenn., in place of R. D. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

John F. Johnson to be postmaster at Watertown, Tenn., in place of J. F. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Robert M. Lindsay to be postmaster at Alcoa, Tenn. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Adam S. Nichols to be postmaster at Dandridge, Tenn., in place of A. S. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Gaston H. Rhodes to be postmaster at Whiteville, Tenn., in place of G. H. Rhodes. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Isaac R. Roberts to be postmaster at Erwin, Tenn., in place of I. R. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Charles E. Rodes to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn., in place of C. E. Rodes. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1917.

Robert L. Strong to be postmaster at Collierville, Tenn., in place of R. L. Strong. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1917.

Lawrence E. Stroup to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

TEXAS.

A. H. Ables to be postmaster at Terrell, Tex., in place of A. H. Ables. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Pope Allen to be postmaster at Valley Mills, Tex., in place of Pope Allen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

John J. Ball to be postmaster at Orange, Tex., in place of J. J. Ball. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Robert W. Bennett to be postmaster at Kenedy, Tex., in place of R. W. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

William C. Boyett to be postmaster at College Station, Tex., in place of W. C. Boyett. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Myrtle C. Bradshaw to be postmaster at Roxton, Tex., in place of M. C. Bradshaw. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

H. L. Brooks to be postmaster at Pearsall, Tex., in place of H. L. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

R. L. Bronaugh to be postmaster at Edna, Tex., in place of R. L. Bronaugh. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Kate G. Burke to be postmaster at Crosbyton, Tex., in place of K. G. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Minnie S. Burke to be postmaster at Blossom, Tex., in place of Minnie Burke. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

B. M. Burgher to be postmaster at Dallas, Tex., in place of B. M. Burgher. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

N. A. Burton to be postmaster at McKinney, Tex., in place of N. A. Burton. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

George H. Candlin to be postmaster at Presidio, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

W. G. Carpenter to be postmaster at Kerrville, Tex., in place of W. G. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Alice C. Cheney to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. C. Cheney. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

M. A. Chancey to be postmaster at Hondo, Tex., in place of M. A. Chancey. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

W. H. Clement to be postmaster at Palacios, Tex., in place of W. H. Clement. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

William H. Cook to be postmaster at Henrietta, Tex., in place of W. H. Cook. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

W. D. Daniel to be postmaster at Hughes Springs, Tex., in place of W. D. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Mina Daughtry to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Tex., in place of M. Daughtry. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Calvin C. Davis to be postmaster at Iowa Park, Tex., in place of C. C. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

C. S. Davis to be postmaster at Ranger, Tex., in place of C. S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

James W. Davis to be postmaster at Alvord, Tex., in place of J. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

- S. M. Davis to be postmaster at Nocona, Tex., in place of S. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- Joseph R. De Witt to be postmaster at Brackettville, Tex., in place of J. R. De Witt. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.
- A. Y. Donegan to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of A. Y. Donegan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- Amos E. Duffy to be postmaster at Matagorda, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- Ada F. Duffey to be postmaster at Emory, Tex., in place of Ada Duffey. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- Jonathan W. Duncan to be postmaster at Malakoff, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.
- George F. English to be postmaster at Glen Rose, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.
- J. J. Erwin to be postmaster at Ballinger, Tex., in place of J. J. Erwin. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Newton S. Farmer to be postmaster at Graham, Tex., in place of N. S. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.
- M. C. Fields to be postmaster at Lott, Tex., in place of M. C. Fields. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- W. D. Foster to be postmaster at Miles, Tex., in place of W. D. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Minnie B. Francis to be postmaster at Farwell, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- J. T. Fulcher to be postmaster at Thorndale, Tex., in place of J. T. Fulcher. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- B. T. Gardner to be postmaster at Rogers, Tex., in place of B. T. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.
- Sallie M. Gardner to be postmaster at Frankston, Tex., in place of S. M. Ayres (name changed by marriage).
- J. W. Gaskin to be postmaster at Jacksboro, Tex., in place of J. W. Gaskin. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- Henry Van Geem to be postmaster at Eastland, Tex., in place of H. Van Geem. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- J. S. J. Gober to be postmaster at Sanger, Tex., in place of J. S. J. Gober. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- Sam K. Hailey to be postmaster at Conroe, Tex., in place of S. K. Hailey. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Laura V. Hammer to be postmaster at Claude, Tex., in place of L. V. Hammer. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- S. R. Haynes to be postmaster at De Leon, Tex., in place of S. R. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- S. A. Hill to be postmaster at Bellville, Tex., in place of S. A. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- Thomas H. Hood to be postmaster at Wortham, Tex., in place of T. H. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.
- S. J. Holchak, jr., to be postmaster at Runge, Tex., in place of S. J. Holchak, jr. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- Jean Hornbuckle to be postmaster at Venus, Tex., in place of Jean Hornbuckle. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- F. P. Ingerson to be postmaster at Barstow, Tex., in place of F. P. Ingerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- A. S. Jarvis to be postmaster at Troup, Tex., in place of A. S. Jarvis. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- T. W. Johnston to be postmaster at Wallis, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.
- William L. Rea to be postmaster at Refugia, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.
- R. H. King to be postmaster at Alvin, Tex., in place of R. H. King. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- M. J. Kirilin to be postmaster at Kingsville, Tex., in place of M. J. Kirilin. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- George P. Knight to be postmaster at Stephenville, Tex., in place of G. P. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- Houston H. Knight to be postmaster at Avery, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- W. J. Lamb to be postmaster at Mabank, Tex., in place of W. J. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Emma M. Love to be postmaster at Sierra Blanca, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- R. K. McCleskey to be postmaster at Rule, Tex., in place of R. K. McCleskey. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- William D. McGown to be postmaster at Hemphill, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- P. B. McNatt to be postmaster at Arlington, Tex., in place of P. B. McNatt. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- C. E. Maxwell to be postmaster at Strawn, Tex., in place of C. E. Maxwell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- John W. Miller to be postmaster at Dilley, Tex., in place of J. W. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- Benjamin F. Mitchell to be postmaster at Gainesville, Tex., in place of B. F. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Charles B. Moore to be postmaster at Lovelady, Tex., in place of C. B. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- J. L. Noel to be postmaster at Pilot Point, Tex., in place of J. L. Noel. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- T. J. Oden to be postmaster at Lindale, Tex., in place of T. J. Oden. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- E. T. Oliver to be postmaster at Caldwell, Tex., in place of E. T. Oliver. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- Charles E. Parkham to be postmaster at Pottsboro, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.
- D. A. Paulus to be postmaster at Hallettsville, Tex., in place of D. A. Paulus. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.
- John W. Person to be postmaster at Colorado, Tex., in place of J. W. Person. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- J. B. Phillips to be postmaster at Howe, Tex., in place of J. B. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.
- Charles C. Porter to be postmaster at Meridian, Tex., in place of C. C. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- D. P. Porter to be postmaster at DeKalb, Tex., in place of D. P. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.
- J. M. Price to be postmaster at San Augustine, Tex., in place of J. M. Price. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- D. U. Ramsay to be postmaster at Gonzales, Tex., in place of D. U. Ramsay. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- Shaw D. Ray to be postmaster at Winnsboro, Tex., in place of S. D. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- J. M. Richards to be postmaster at Weatherford, Tex., in place of J. M. Richards. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- T. H. Riddle to be postmaster at Omaha, Tex., in place of G. H. Riddle. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- S. A. Roberts to be postmaster at Blooming Grove, Tex., in place of S. A. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.
- S. P. Robbins to be postmaster at Lubbock, Tex., in place of S. P. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- Henry B. Rushing to be postmaster at Batson, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- L. H. Salter to be postmaster at Stanton, Tex., in place of L. H. Salter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.
- B. O. Sanford to be postmaster at Plainview, Tex., in place of B. O. Sanford. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- E. P. Shands to be postmaster at Mesquite, Tex., in place of E. P. Shands. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- J. W. Shaw to be postmaster at San Diego, Tex., in place of J. W. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.
- Mattie H. Shelton to be postmaster at Valentine, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.
- O. B. Slayden to be postmaster at Rusk, Tex., in place of O. B. Slayden. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- Billie W. Simmons to be postmaster at Mexia, Tex., in place of B. W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.
- W. W. Sloan to be postmaster at Falfurrias, Tex., in place of W. W. Sloan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- G. W. Smith to be postmaster at Sonora, Tex., in place of G. W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- Thomas A. Stafford to be postmaster at Robstown, Tex., in place of T. A. Stafford. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.
- Thomas R. Stewart to be postmaster at Whitney, Tex., in place of T. R. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.
- Annie H. Stryker to be postmaster at Woodville, Tex., in place of Annie Stryker. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.
- J. Wiley Taylor to be postmaster at Midland, Tex., in place of J. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.
- C. C. Teas to be postmaster at Karnes City, Tex., in place of C. C. Teas. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.
- S. W. Thomas to be postmaster at Aspermont, Tex., in place of S. W. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1917.

Shadrac S. Tullos to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, Tex., in place of S. S. Tullos. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

T. E. VanLandingham to be postmaster at Lone Oak, Tex., in place of T. E. VanLandingham. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

C. Herbert Walker to be postmaster at Dalhart, Tex., in place of C. H. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

J. A. White to be postmaster at Goliad, Tex., in place of J. A. White. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

Young C. White to be postmaster at Hamlin, Tex., in place of Y. C. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Thomas W. Winsett to be postmaster at Higgins, Tex., in place of J. W. Winsett. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Sterling P. Wilcoxson to be postmaster at Edgewood, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Ira J. Wright to be postmaster at Mission, Tex., in place of I. J. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1917.

Joseph E. Woods to be postmaster at Teague, Tex., in place of J. E. Woods. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1917.

Thomas P. Woodward to be postmaster at Yoakum, Tex., in place of T. P. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

J. C. Woodworth to be postmaster at Cuero, Tex., in place of J. C. Woodworth. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1917.

UTAH.

Ewell C. Bowen to be postmaster at Hiawatha, Utah. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

B. M. Woolley to be postmaster at Magna, Utah. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

VERMONT.

Allan T. Calhoun to be postmaster at Middlebury, Vt., in place of A. T. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Marion T. Flynn to be postmaster at Alburg, Vt. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Robert J. Orvis to be postmaster at Manchester, Vt., in place of R. J. Orvis. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Emeroy G. Page to be postmaster at Hyde Park, Vt., in place of E. G. Page. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1917.

Murray K. Paris to be postmaster at Lyndon, Vt. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Lota A. Patch to be postmaster at Cambridge, Vt. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Victor L. Smith to be postmaster at East Arlington, Vt. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Patrick H. Thompson to be postmaster at Arlington, Vt., in place of P. H. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Charles F. Thurber to be postmaster at Fairlee, Vt. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

VIRGINIA.

Howard W. Brent to be postmaster at Kilmarnock, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

W. A. Brooks to be postmaster at Chase City, Va., in place of W. A. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

George V. Cameron to be postmaster at Louisa, Va., in place of G. V. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

J. D. Crenshaw to be postmaster at Cambria, Va., in place of J. D. Crenshaw. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Bertha M. Faison to be postmaster at Ettricks, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Leslie F. Ferguson to be postmaster at Appomattox, Va., in place of L. F. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Hattie B. Ferrel to be postmaster at Newcastle, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

W. E. Halley to be postmaster at Keysville, Va., in place of W. E. Halley. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Ellis F. Harris to be postmaster at Crozet, Va., in place of E. F. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Clarence H. Johnson to be postmaster at Narrows, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

William C. Johnston to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Va., in place of W. C. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1917.

William F. Kennedy to be postmaster at Kenbridge, Va., in place of W. F. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

J. S. Lauek to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Va., in place of J. S. Lauek. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

R. H. Latane to be postmaster at Buchanan, Va., in place of R. H. Latane. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

J. F. Lowman to be postmaster at Hot Springs, Va., in place of J. F. Lowman. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

E. M. Morrison to be postmaster at Smithfield, Va., in place of E. M. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Andrew T. Organ to be postmaster at Chester, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Lula M. Ray to be postmaster at Mount Jackson, Va., in place of Lula M. Ray. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

John E. Rogers to be postmaster at Strasburg, Va., in place of J. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired May 1, 1917.

Charles F. Russell to be postmaster at Herndon, Va., in place of C. F. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

Charles F. Shumaker to be postmaster at Lovettsville, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Sadie A. Southall to be postmaster at Amelia Court House, Va., in place of S. A. Southall. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

E. L. Toone to be postmaster at Boydton, Va., in place of E. L. Toone. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

W. W. Tuck to be postmaster at Virgilina, Va., in place of W. W. Tuck. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1917.

H. I. Tuggle to be postmaster at Martinsville, Va., in place of H. I. Tuggle. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

J. R. Williams to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of J. R. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Lucy E. Yancey to be postmaster at Forest Depot, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

WASHINGTON.

Otto Holmberg to be postmaster at Molson, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

Henry R. James to be postmaster at Rochester, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

John M. Jones to be postmaster at Morton, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

F. A. Kennett to be postmaster at Prosser, Wash., in place of F. A. Kennett. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1917.

Tyrah D. Logsdon to be postmaster at Endicott, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Michael J. Murphy to be postmaster at Oakville, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

W. H. Padley to be postmaster at Reardan, Wash., in place of W. H. Padley. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1917.

Michael Reisenauer to be postmaster at Uniontown, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1917.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Floyd J. Brown to be postmaster at Bluefield, W. Va., in place of F. J. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Henry W. Early to be postmaster at Kimball, W. Va., in place of H. W. Early. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1917.

Thomas F. Henritze to be postmaster at Welch, W. Va., in place of T. F. Henritze. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

David W. McConaughy to be postmaster at Cameron, W. Va., in place of D. W. McConaughy. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

Benjamin F. Patton to be postmaster at Harrisville, W. Va., in place of B. F. Patton. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Andrew Price to be postmaster at Marlinton, W. Va., in place of Andrew Price. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1917.

Oliver C. Sweeney to be postmaster at St. Marys, W. Va., in place of O. C. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1917.

WISCONSIN.

A. C. Bishop to be postmaster at Bloomington, Wis., in place of A. C. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

G. Andrew Braemer to be postmaster at Blackcreek, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Frank S. Brazeau to be postmaster at Port Edwards, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

M. Vivian Brown to be postmaster at Minong, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

William E. Cavanaugh to be postmaster at Berlin, Wis., in place of W. E. Cavanaugh. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Wardlaw A. Clapp to be postmaster at Wanwatosa, Wis., in place of W. A. Clapp. Incumbent's commission expired July 23, 1916.

Emma V. Clark to be postmaster at Black Earth, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Dennis Deneen to be postmaster at Hammond, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Elizabeth A. Forsyth to be postmaster at Westboro, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Nina M. Frankland to be postmaster at Montfort, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Julia L. Groot to be postmaster at Elmwood, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Albert J. Hemmy to be postmaster at Hartford, Wis., in place of Albert J. Hemmy. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

John Henninger to be postmaster at Markesan, Wis., in place of J. Henninger. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Jerry Holland to be postmaster at Phelps, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Joseph V. Janda to be postmaster at Boyd, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1917.

Jessie A. Little to be postmaster at Pepin, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Robert L. Nash to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, Wis., in place of Robert Nash. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

E. R. Peck to be postmaster at Bangor, Wis., in place of E. R. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Richard B. Runke to be postmaster at Merrill, Wis., in place of R. B. Runke. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Frederick A. Russell to be postmaster at Superior, Wis., in place of F. A. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Harvey G. Smith to be postmaster at Maiden Rock, Wis., in place of H. G. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

William R. Stephan to be postmaster at Sawyer, Wis., in place of W. R. Stephan. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1917.

Dwight S. York to be postmaster at Hazel Green, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

WYOMING.

Arthur R. Bastian to be postmaster at Chugwater, Wyo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Lillian S. Pascoe to be postmaster at Sunrise, Wyo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George Whittaker to be postmaster at Yellowstone Park, Wyo., in place of George Whittaker. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1917.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 19 (legislative day of July 18), 1917.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF OREGON.

Edward G. Worth to be surveyor general of Oregon.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Lewis T. Erwin to be United States marshal, District of Alaska, division No. 4.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Francis Albion Carmelia to be passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Lionel Elean Hooper to be passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Liston Paine to be passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Moses Victor Safford to be passed assistant surgeon.

Asst. Surg. Ernest Winfield Scott to be passed assistant surgeon.

Dr. James Edge Faris to be assistant surgeon.

Dr. Anthony A. S. Giordano to be assistant surgeon.

Dr. Mark Victor Ziegler to be assistant surgeon.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lucian W. Burnham to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Dan E. Root to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 20, 1917.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 18, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

CONSERVATION OF FOOD AND FUEL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4961) to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to offer four amendments so that they may be pending.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish to offer some amendments to be pending, two of which I send to the desk. I also desire to move to strike out "\$1.75," where it appears in the amendment offered to section 12 by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and to insert "\$2."

Mr. SMOOT. I send to the desk a statement giving the advertising pages of Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular showing the cost of tax-paying whisky and the cost of carrying whiskies in bond. I ask that it may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The table referred to is as follows:

COST OF TAX-PAYING WHISKY.

Table showing various prices for whiskies, original gauge, in bond and cost thereof when tax-paid during any 4 months included in 8-year bonded period.

[Based on 47-gallon barrel, regular Government allowance for each period, distillers' excess allowance guaranty of 1 gallon in Kentucky also allowing loss of 1 gallon for each four-month period in eighth year.]

Table with 27 columns representing time periods (1 to 4 months to 92 to 96 months) and 23 rows representing price original gauge (15 cents to 57 1/2 cents). The table contains numerical data for each cell.